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ABSTRACT

Australian churchmen accepted war when it came in August 1914 and sought to explain it to the Australian people. Their explanation relied on the belief that God could only permit what was ultimately good. They expected the war to convince the people that faith in material progress was inadequate and hoped that they would turn to faith in God. They expected, too, that the people would learn the value of sacrifice, devotion to duty and prayer. Clergymen enlisted in the A.I.F. as chaplains, in the hope that they could teach these lessons to Australian manhood. As the war dragged on it became clear that many Australians, perhaps the majority, were indifferent to war's redemptive value. Their lives mocked the clerical prediction of reform and renewal. The chaplains found that the bulk of the troops were indifferent, even antagonistic, to the religion of the churches. Such realisations undermined the faith with which churchmen had accepted the war and encouraged conflict and division between and within the churches. This bitterness reduced even further any prospect that the clerical thesis would be fulfilled. By 1918 churchmen longed for peace.
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A NOTE ON TERMS

'Clergyman' and 'Churchman'.

In this thesis a distinction is made between a clergyman and a churchman. The word 'clergyman' refers to an ordained member of a church. For the sake of variety, 'minister' and, where appropriate, 'priest' is occasionally substituted. 'Chaplain' refers exclusively to military chaplain. 'Churchman' is a more general word used to describe a church member, minister or layman, who took a real interest in the life of the church. I rejected the word 'christian' as a general descriptive term because while most Australians claimed to be 'Christians' relatively few participated in organised church life.

'Protestant'.

The word 'Protestant' has a dual use in the thesis. When it is contrasted with 'Catholic' it refers to the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist churches, and, by extension, to the other 'non-Catholic' churches. When 'Protestant' is used in contrast to 'Anglican' it embraces all the churches other than the Anglican and Catholic. Few Anglicans regarded themselves as Protestants, except in the low dioceses, and many felt nearer, spiritually, to the Catholics. It would be wrong, therefore, not to point occasionally to the distinction between Anglicans and Protestants. In England the term 'Nonconformist' was used to describe 'Protestants'. The historian is warned not to use 'nonconformist' in the Australian context: 'all decently educated persons know that where there is no State Church there are no Nonconformists'.

'Church' and Denomination'.

These are used indiscriminately or interchangeably.

1 Messenger of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, 29 November 1918.
'Sectarianism'.

The term is used in the sense elaborated by Mark Lyons and describes any conflict between churchmen; it is not reserved to describe attacks by Protestants on the Catholic church.¹

INTRODUCTION
This thesis examines the reaction of Australian churchmen, ministers and laity, to the war of 1914-1918. It is one of a growing number of studies which have reconsidered the impact of war on various segments of Australian society. It seeks to contribute to our understanding of how the Australian people adjusted to the new experience of total war, and to add to our understanding of their society by examining one part of it in detail. Until recently, historians of the movement of social ideas in Australia have concentrated most of their attention on politicians, labour leaders and others of the 'ruling class'. Many, however, now appreciate that a more complete picture emerges when the area of investigation is expanded. Australians claimed to be a religious people. Their religious leaders assumed the right to speak on matters of public importance and worked strenuously to convert the people to their point of view. To ignore such activity is to reduce the size of the canvas on which the outline of Australian society will be portrayed.

When war came, clergymen used the considerable resources at their disposal to explain and interpret what was happening in Belgium and France. They preached about the war, spoke of it at public meetings and wrote of it in church and local newspapers, drawing on their theology and the preconceptions they held about the war to make sense of events. An examination of these clerical ideas gives an insight into the general Australian debate and tests hypotheses other historians have made about Australia's reaction to the war. Clergymen hoped that Australia's participation, her 'baptism of fire', would have a regenerating effect on the nation. They expected that the crisis of war would allow them to wean the people from materialism and a love of pleasure and encourage them, instead, to reflect on eternal truths. In elaborating these expectations they and other churchmen expressed a large measure of dissatisfaction with the society in which they lived. They deplored the willingness of Australians to adopt the 'business-as-usual' attitude to drinking, gambling and sport. Since it was impossible to prohibit or even significantly to reduce such interests, churchmen experienced growing frustration and even anger as society refused to adopt
what they considered to be the means of improvement. Church leaders saw themselves as the guardians of public morals, as leaders of thought and as initiators of action; this thesis argues that they were rarely able to fulfil such self-appointed roles. The chaplains who served the men of the A.I.F. had the clearest proof that clergymen had only a marginal influence over the behaviour of Australian males. Some were bewildered by the fact that the indifference of their charges to formal religion did not breed the immorality they expected. Clergymen at home were unable to understand why men resisted their appeals to enlist. When they turned to conscription to 'help' men to follow the morally correct path they were troubled that the majority of the people rejected their point of view. Some even lamented their manifestly meagre influence over society. This frustration bred sectarianism, as churchmen searched for scapegoats to account for the defeat of conscription. The war, therefore, forced churchmen to examine their role in society. It also allows the historian to assess to what extent society valued the mission of the church. Thus, this thesis, although narrowing its scope to one section of society, attempts to throw some light on the motivations and aspirations of the whole society.

This study is not 'church history' as it is normally understood. It does not encompass the whole range of church activity, as an account of a particular denomination during the war years might do. It ignores many areas of great importance to churchmen. Each denomination continued to grow and develop despite the war. Each maintained, as far as possible, the normal peace-time activities of parish, school and mission, and through them sought to lead Australians to live holier lives, to bring them to a more intimate relationship with God. Such activities pass almost unmentioned in this thesis. Nor is much emphasis placed on the piety of individual church leaders although this element of their private lives may well have seemed very important to them. Almost the whole attention is focused on their public lives. But the thesis does not concentrate on the impact of clerical views on the political decision-making of the Australian people. Churchmen should not be considered solely as political
lobbyists; to do so is to misunderstand the nature of their influence on society. In this thesis conscription does not emerge as an issue dominating all others. It is seen, rather, in the context of the total clerical response to war. Finally, although the thesis examines how clergymen justified the war to their people, it should not be seen as a history of Australian theology or ethics in regard to war. Such a study would make a slim volume indeed, because few Australian churchmen gave evidence of concentrating on the theological problem of war. Nor is much account taken of the reflections on war of British, German or American theologians because there is little indication that Australian clergymen studied them.

The nature of the sources largely determined the extent and scope of the thesis. Few churchmen left personal papers or memoirs and few librarians, church or public, have shown much interest in listing or cataloguing what records do remain. The researcher is involved in extensive correspondence and travel for often meagre returns. His method, regrettably, sometimes bears signs of 'hit and miss'. As the governing bodies of the various churches employed no Hansard reporters the pages of the Minutes miss the arguments of the speakers and the animation of debate. They provide much factual information but usually hide the fact that each churchman was a human person often vitally interested in manoeuvring his particular project through the shoals and eddies of official business. Other printed material is equally disappointing. Few satisfactory biographies have been written about Australia's churchmen and sometimes simple biographical details have been very difficult to determine. Church leaders, therefore, sometimes appear as disembodied spirits. With rare exceptions, the official histories of the various churches are almost inevitably celebratory, and often misleading. On the other hand, the historian is well served by the church newspapers which provide him with the factual basis of his story. They report, usually in some detail, the sermons and speeches of church leaders and give a good indication of general church activity. Too often, unfortunately, these newspapers were bland, did not subject the ideas and actions of churchmen to
critical scrutiny, and did not encourage debate in which
divergent views would be expressed. Such a concentration on
one side of any issue tempts the historian to imagine that all
churchmen adhered to the 'official' view. This was rarely the
case. Most church newspapers also failed to give reasonable
prominence to the activities of the church's lay-people.
Consequently laymen appear infrequently in this thesis, a
neglect which is due entirely to the lack of information
rather than to a belief that laymen contributed nothing of
significance to the Australian churches. The defect of the
sources in general is that they rarely help the historian to
show church people in more than their public or official pose.
They seemed to be more interested in the propagation of ideas
than in the ideals and aspirations of humanity. They seemed
remarkably assured and self-confident in the face of a
catastrophe of the magnitude of the Great War. They seemed to
suffer little in spite of the war. Yet there are glimpses, all
too rare, of the agony that war caused the more sensitive men.
The sources also prevent the historian from suggesting
why individual clergymen acted as they did. Some assume that
churchmen were bound to encourage Australia's commitment to
the war because they belonged to the 'patriotic' class of
people, who suffered least, in a material sense, from war.
Certainly, as a biographical appendix shows, most church
leaders were well-educated men whose background placed them in
the middle-class. Few were Australian born. This evidence
does not warrant the generalisation implied. Nor can a
churchman's reaction to war be explained, completely, by the
necessity he may have felt to support the nation whatever its
decision. There was a certain inevitability, and indeed tragedy,
in the clerical response to war. Had the churches unitedly and
vigorously opposed the nation's involvement great confusion
would have resulted; opposition was almost unthinkable. So
they supported the nation although many of them disliked war
intensely and saw that it conflicted with the Christian law of
love. Such was the nature of the Great War that initial
support led, almost inevitably, to wholehearted commitment.
Churchmen were as much victims of the war as were their fellow
citizens. It is clear that despite these influences churchmen
added an extra dimension to their response: they tried to measure all their actions against the principles of Christ as they understood them. Too often the specifically Christian beliefs are ignored when seeking to explain Christian behaviour. Churchmen would have confessed that they practised those beliefs imperfectly during the war years but the historian should remember that at least those were the standards against which they judged themselves.

Despite these limitations and defects this thesis seeks to contribute to an understanding of church and society in Australia during the years of war. Many have argued that the war was a watershed in Australian history, a dividing line between a society that was immature and unsure of its place in world affairs and a society that, tested on the hills of Gallipoli, came to a new understanding of itself. Whether this was true for the whole society may be disputed. Certainly Australian churchmen believed that war would forge a new society. They had a vision of the society they wished to see created; the thesis shows to what extent the vision was realised.
If it is true that in England the Church has failed to reach the mass of the people, is it not more abundantly and sadly true here. Our clergy are fewer, our conditions of church life more difficult, our task heavier. The hold of religion here upon the people is less marked than it is in England - of that we are convinced.

Church of England Messenger, 5 May 1916.
By August 1914, when the European nations rushed to war, the Christian churches were entering the second century of their endeavour in Australia. The history of the first century influenced their behaviour during the new experience of total war. Catholics regarded themselves as an aggrieved and persecuted minority surrounded by a dominant Protestant society; the withdrawal of state assistance from the Catholic education system in the 1870s was responsible, largely, for this view. The Protestant churches, Presbyterian and Methodist, fought valiantly to impose their somewhat puritanical rules of social conduct on the general community because they suffered from a sense of inferiority and insecurity as a result of the dominance of Anglicanism in Australia. The Anglican church wavered between high church and low church, between Protestantism and Catholicism. The theological complexion of the church varied from diocese to diocese and depended, often, on the theology of the first bishop of each diocese. Differing theological traditions impaired the Anglican effort: some neighbouring bishops refused to co-operate and some neighbouring clergymen even refused to speak to one another. The physical and organisational structure of each church had been determined by 1914. The churches were built, the colleges were in operation, the pioneering, except in the remote areas, was over. The large number of often imposing buildings that churchmen erected in the first century gave their successors a feeling of assurance and a sense of permanence within the Australian community. By 1914 radicals rarely questioned the place of the church in the new society. The churches had won acceptance. The purpose of this introductory chapter is to


2For the earlier radical debate see J.S. Gregory, Church and State, Melbourne, 1973, especially chapter 5, 'Secularism Rampant'.
describe the composition and nature of the four largest Christian denominations in Australia and the stage to which they had developed by 1914. Since church people, leaders, ministers and laity, shaped the growth and development of the churches I will endeavour to say who the church people were, how they were governed, how they regarded themselves and what impression they gave to society at large.

The census of 1911 showed that the overwhelming majority of Australians adhered to some form of religion; only 0.24 per cent of the population claimed to have no religion.\(^1\) Christianity predominated: the Anglican, Catholic, Methodist and Presbyterian denominations accounted for 88 per cent of the Australian people while the smaller Christian denominations attracted a further 10 per cent.\(^2\) The Baptist church was the largest of the smaller groups with 2.4 per cent of the total.\(^3\) I have largely ignored whatever impact these smaller denominations had on Australian society during the war years because they were dispersed and numerically weak.\(^4\) Moreover, their contribution to the debate about the war was in no way unique; they repeated the sentiments expressed by the leaders of the larger Protestant denominations. The denominational strength of the four larger churches varied from state to state. The Anglicans, whose national percentage of the population was 39.40, were strongest in Tasmania and New South Wales with 47.72 per cent, and 45.45 per cent of the populations of those states respectively. They were weakest in South Australia with 29.22 per cent.\(^5\) The national Catholic percentage was

\(^1\)Commonwealth of Australia, *Census*, vol.1, part 1, Melbourne, 1911, p.201. This amounted to 10,584 people from a total of nearly four and a half million. Ibid., p.200.

\(^2\)Ibid., p.201.

\(^3\)Ibid., p.201. The Baptist church had 99,555 adherents.

\(^4\)Lutheranism was the only small denomination (1.67 per cent) concentrated in one state. In South Australia Lutherans made up 6.80 per cent of the population and thus were stronger than the Presbyterians (5.80). In general the smaller denominations were strongest in South Australia where they made up 19.43 per cent of the population. Ibid., p.201.

\(^5\)Ibid., p.201. The numbers of adherents were: N.S.W. 748,493; Vic. 462,388; Qld. 219,614; S.A. 119,385; W.A. 112,975; C’wlth, 1,755,473; ibid., p.200.
22.96; they were strongest in New South Wales (25.51) and Queensland (24.71) and weakest in South Australia (14.78).\textsuperscript{1}
The Presbyterians were the third largest Christian denomination in Australia with 12.86 per cent; they were most populous in Victoria (18.28) and least populous in South Australia (5.80).\textsuperscript{2}
Only marginally weaker were the Methodists who comprised 12.61 of the total; they were strongest in South Australia (25.66), where they claimed almost as many adherents as the Anglicans, and were weakest in New South Wales (9.32).\textsuperscript{3}
The strength of a denomination in a particular state often accounted for its public face; thus the Catholic church in South Australia was far less aggressive and more accommodating than its counterpart in New South Wales. The census figures do not permit a detailed picture of the type of people who were Methodists or Catholics. A stereotype exists about the composition of the membership of each church; Catholics were said to be largely working class, Methodists were accused of being upwardly mobile lower middle class.\textsuperscript{4}
Catholics were, however, the least

\textsuperscript{1}Catholic figures are obtained by adding those who described themselves as 'Catholic' to those who followed their church in describing themselves as 'Roman Catholic'. The statistician, G.H. Knibbs, approved of this: 'there is reason to believe that a very large proportion, if not practically the whole of the persons who returned themselves simply as 'Catholic'... belonged to the Roman Catholic Church' (ibid., p.200). For Archbishop Kelly's recommendation that Catholics accept the term 'Roman Catholic' in relation to themselves see P.J. O'Farrell, Documents in Australian Catholic History, vol.II, 1884-1968, London, 1969, p.290. The Catholic totals were: N.S.W. 420,094; Vic. 293,523; Qld. 149,717; S.S. 60,387; W.A. 63,973; C'wlth 1,022,656. Ibid., p.200.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p.201. The figures were: N.S.W. 186,592; Vic. 240,515; Qld. 78,048; S.A. 23,709; W.A. 27,569; C'wlth, 573,073.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p.201. The figures were: N.S.W. 153,512; Vic. 180,339; Qld. 61,577; S.A. 104,836; W.A. 35,298; C'wlth, 561,550.

\textsuperscript{4}Little attempt has been made to investigate these stereotypes. The exception is Renate Howe, 'The Wesleyan Church in Victoria 1855-1901: Its Ministry and Membership', M.A. Thesis, Melbourne, 1965. The findings of this thesis were set out in an article 'Social Composition of the Wesleyan Church in Victoria in the Nineteenth Century', Journal of Religious History, vol.4 (1966), pp.206-17.
literate of the denominations. Thus 4.29 per cent of Catholics over five were unable to read while only 2.50 per cent of Presbyterians fell into this category. The percentage amongst all Australians was 3.52.\(^1\) Anglicans were more numerous in the metropolitan centres (41.38 per cent) while Presbyterians and Methodists found more of their adherents in the country; their metropolitan strength was below their national average (11.72 and 10.68 respectively).\(^2\) Catholics were evenly represented in city and country.

Although the census figures showed that the bulk of Australians described themselves as Christians, churchmen were reluctant to accept such descriptions at face value. A Bulletin correspondent drew attention to the problem of 'nominalism', of claiming allegiance to a Christian denomination while taking no active part in its corporate life, but he exaggerated clerical fears when he wrote that

> the old creeds are quite dead. They have a few thousands of real followers here and there, and the majority who in practice reject their tenets make some sort of belated acknowledgement of them on census papers.\(^3\)

Churchmen recognised the problem. It was clear that not everyone who described himself as an Anglican on the census form worshipped regularly or even occasionally in the Anglican church. L.V. Biggs, an influential Melbourne layman, told the Church Congress in Brisbane in 1913 that four out of every nine Australians described themselves as Anglicans. He doubted if 5 per cent of them were ever in church. He pictured 'the Churches of the great metropolitan cities where an average parish will embrace from 12,000 to 13,000 nominal churchmen, churchwomen and church children'. The total attendance at all services at such churches, he lamented, 'rarely exceed[ed] a few hundreds'.\(^4\) Biggs compared this

\(^1\)Commonwealth of Australia, Census, 1911, p.207.
\(^2\)Ibid., p.213.
\(^3\)Bulletin, 11 December 1915. The term 'nominalism' is now widely used to describe the phenomenon of nominal Christians. It has no connection with the nominalism of William of Occam.
situation with that prevailing in the Catholic church where large numbers of people attended Sunday Mass. His comparison was not unusual; many Protestants marvelled at the hold of Rome over her adherents. Indeed, a priest boasted that because so many people attended his church 'Protestants go purposely to see [the] sight'. Not all priests were so complacent. The pastor of an inner-city working class parish wrote that of the 4-5,000 Catholics under his care 2,000 never attended Mass and another 1,000 went only occasionally. These figures, although a great improvement on Biggs' Anglican statistics, so worried the priest that he devoted three years to house to house visitation trying to encourage more people to worship. His effort failed: 'the parish is in just as bad a state as it was in the beginning; there are just as many who never come to Mass'.

In the absence of reliable figures relating to church attendance these impressionistic accounts of nominalism must suffice. Churchmen worried because they failed to entice the majority to church and they feared that Australians rejected

---

1Ibid.


4Ibid., p.55.

5A comparison between the census return and the figures of church membership show the extent of nominalism in the Methodist church.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census 1911</th>
<th>church membership 1917</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>153,512</td>
<td>26,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic.</td>
<td>180,339</td>
<td>41,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qld.</td>
<td>61,577</td>
<td>10,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>104,836</td>
<td>22,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td>35,298</td>
<td>5,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'wlth</td>
<td>561,550</td>
<td>150,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Commonwealth of Australia, Census, 1911, p.200.) (Methodist Church of Australia, Minutes of the Fifth General Conference, Melbourne, 1917, p.46.)

Unfortunately, not all churches kept statistics on membership, nor can we be confident about the accuracy of the figures.
the church as irrelevant. The disappointment they felt about Australian society coloured much of their reaction to war. At first they accepted the war because they expected that the catastrophe would lead the people to God; later they grew resentful over their failure to influence the people. Perhaps churchmen should have taken courage from the fact that Australians, despite their apparent indifference, continued to claim allegiance to a particular church. The allegiance may have owed more to heredity than to theology; nevertheless most Australians thought of themselves as Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists or Catholics when religious controversy arose. Each Australian inherited a church to which he claimed a special relationship and from which he accepted the myths and traditions peculiar to that church. Catholics, whether they attended Mass or not, acquiesced in the tradition that the rest of the community sought to denigrate them and to deny them an equal place in society and an equal share of the commonwealth. Protestants, who may never have attended anything more religious than Sunday school, accepted the tradition that Catholics owed allegiance to a foreign power and wished to impose priestcraft on the community and restrict British freedom. When church leaders spoke they drew on these submerged identifications and were given a wider hearing than perhaps they suspected. In this account of church reaction to the war I will concentrate on what churchmen said. How far churchmen won the respect of their nominal adherents must remain an unanswered but intriguing question.

The organisation of each church, its method of government, arose from and affected its ethos and set the limits within which leaders, ministers and laity worked. A knowledge of the organisation gives some understanding of the individual character of each church. The diocese was the administrative unit of the episcopal churches, Anglican and Catholic. In

---

1914 there were twenty-three Australian Anglican dioceses.¹
A bishop governed each diocese with the assistance of an annual
synod consisting of all diocesan clergymen and two laymen
elected from each parish.² Synod voted in houses, clerical and
lay, but sat in common.³ The bishop opened synod with a
'charge' or presidential address in which he accounted for the
past year and often reflected on current events. He then
chaired each session of synod. Synod examined the general
questions of policy and left the day-to-day running of the
diocese to the bishop who, in turn, delegated much power to
the rector of each parish who was assisted, where numbers
allowed and demand required, by one or more curates. Since
1872 all Australian bishops and representatives of clergy and
laity met in general synod every five years to discuss matters
of common concern. The resolutions of general synod did not
bind any particular diocese.⁴

In 1914 there were nineteen dioceses of the Catholic
church in Australia.⁵ A Catholic bishop reigned supreme in his
diocese although his priests occasionally met in synod to hear

---

¹The dioceses were:
N.S.W.: Sydney, Newcastle, Goulburn, Bathurst, Riverina,
Armidale, Grafton.
Vic.: Melbourne, Ballarat, Wangaratta, Bendigo, Gippsland.
Qld.: Brisbane, North Queensland, Carpentaria, Rockhampton.
Tas.: Tasmania.

²H.L. Clarke, Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions
Beyond the Seas and In other parts of the Anglican Communion,
London, 1924, p.132.

³Ibid., p.134. Representatives must be 'male persons of the
age of twenty-one years each such person being a
Communicant of the Church'.

⁴Ibid., p.91.

⁵The dioceses were:
N.S.W.: Sydney, Armidale, Bathurst, Goulburn, Lismore,
Maitland, Wilcannia-Forbes. [Wagga Wagga 1917].
Vic.: Melbourne, Ballarat, Sale, Sandhurst.
Tas.: Hobart.
S.A.: Adelaide, Port Augusta.
Qld.: Brisbane, Rockhampton.
his views and offer advice.\textsuperscript{1} The bishops met together every ten years in a 'plenary synod' to discuss matters of mutual concern.\textsuperscript{2} Also once every ten years each bishop made an 'ad limina' visit to Rome at which time he reported personally to the Pope on the management of the diocese.\textsuperscript{3} In 1914 the Pope appointed the first Apostolic Delegate to Australia and he reported regularly to Rome on Australian Catholic affairs.\textsuperscript{4} At congregational level the parish priest exercised all authority over his parishioners and the priests on his staff. Although appointed to the parish by the bishop many parish priests were designated rector inamovibilis which meant that not even the bishop could move the man without his consent.\textsuperscript{5} Such security gave the parish priest freedom to exercise his full authority.

The Presbyterians boasted of their democratic form of government. The congregation governed itself through its elected representatives; neighbouring congregations discussed local matters at presbytery meetings consisting of all clergymen and elected laymen.\textsuperscript{6} The church met annually on a State basis at Assembly which considered questions submitted to it from the presbyteries; again, the Assembly consisted of all clergymen and elected laymen.\textsuperscript{7} Every two years the church

\textsuperscript{1}Acta et Decreta, Concilii Plenarii, Australiensis III, Habiti Apud Sydney, A.D. 1905, A Sancta Sede Recognita, Sydney, 1907, p.27.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp.X-XI. Besides the bishops, the priests of each diocese elected one of their number to the synod. The superiors of male Religious Orders also attended.
\textsuperscript{3}Canon Law prescribed that all bishops must perform the Visitatio ad Limina Apostolorum every five years if their dioceses were in Europe and every ten years if they were beyond. Cf. F.L. Cross (ed.), The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, London, 1957, p.18.
\textsuperscript{4}Archbishop Cerretti, the first Apostolic Delegate, arrived in Australia in early 1915. \textit{FJ}, 11 February 1915.
\textsuperscript{5}Acta et Decreta, pp.23-7. The bishop bestowed such positions as a reward for faithful service. The designation was personal and not attached to the parish after the death of the recipient.
\textsuperscript{6}Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, The Procedure and Practice of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, Part I, Australia, Part II, New South Wales, Sydney, 1926, p.160.
\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., pp.207-8.
met at national level in General Assembly to discuss questions of national importance; each state elected clerical and lay representatives. The Methodist organisation corresponded to this although the names used to describe the various bodies differed. Thus presbytery became synod and assembly became conference. In general, the non-episcopal churches gave their adherents a larger role in the church organisation. Few Australians, however, understood these distinctions and the majority probably assessed the statement of an autocratic Catholic bishop in the same light as the resolution of a democratic Presbyterian Assembly.

In Australia, an Anglican bishop was elected to his see by the synod over which he then came to preside. The election of a bishop was a matter of grave importance and often the subject of much lobbying. Thus F.B. Boyce secured the election of J.C. Wright to the see of Sydney although Wright began as an outsider against a far more popular candidate. The practice of electing bishops caused each Australian diocese to become monochromatic or representative of only one party within the church. A low church synod naturally sought a low churchman to rule the diocese; a low church bishop usually chose low churchmen to fill important diocesan offices. For this reason most Australian dioceses were identifiably high or low, although high predominated. Once elected, a bishop no longer depended on his backers and assumed considerable power and independence. As a permanent official he retired when he chose. He controlled the recruitment and promotion of his clergy, licensing them and assigning them to the various parishes. This gave him considerable power of patronage. Few synods chose Australians to rule them. In 1914 there were but five Australian born bishops and only

1Ibid., p.42.

2See, Methodist Church of Australasia, Laws of the Church, Sydney, 1935.

3F.B. Boyce, Fourscore Years and Seven, The Memoirs of Archdeacon Boyce, for over Sixty Years a Clergyman of the Church of England in New South Wales, Sydney, 1934, p.149. Boyce was able to convince the 'Protestant clergy and laity' that Wright though an Evangelical was also a moderate while his most popular rival 'was so low that there might be trouble'. Ibid., p.146.
Reginald Stephen in Hobart occupied a metropolitan see.\(^1\) Englishmen held most other important diocesan positions such as dean of the cathedral, archdeacon and so on. The English bishops held their sees for relatively short periods of time and as the more important men were elected from Britain they came to the dioceses largely unknown and they, in turn, knew little of Australian conditions.\(^2\) The personality of the bishop determined the impact he made on his fellow churchmen and other Australians. While J.C. Wright narrowly won the election for the Primacy from St Clair Donaldson, the latter was the real leader of the church because he had earned the respect of his fellows.\(^3\) The calibre of the bishops varied enormously. Some were young and well-respected like G.M. Long of Bathurst who experienced spectacular promotion within the church.\(^4\) Others were undistinguished men who made little mark

---

\(^1\) The Australian bishops were R. Stephen, Tasmania; J.F. Stretch, Newcastle; A.V. Green, Ballarat; G.M. Long, Bathurst; H. Newton, Carpentaria.

\(^2\) Before he left for the front as a chaplain R.H. Moore sent Archbishop Riley a note about the selection of a new dean. He argued that the policy of going outside the state for the highest officials had been disastrous: 'almost any choice better than that which selected the present occupants of Goldfields and Nor West sees for example...the chiefest reason is that a stranger from abroad not knowing local conditions is bound to come with exalted idea of his stature'. Moore recommended that the diocese import educated young men to junior positions and let them work their way to the top. R.H. Moore Papers, Battye Library, MS 1210A, Folder 9, 'Chaplaincy in the Australian Imperial Forces. Correspondence 1918-19'.

\(^3\) An election was held for the Primacy in 1909. In the first ballot Donaldson and J.C. Wright received an equal number of votes. Donaldson offered to withdraw but was not permitted to do so and in the second ballot Wright won by 11 votes to 10. C.T. Dimont and F. de Witt Batty, St Clair Donaldson, KCMG, DD DCL Archbishop of Brisbane 1904-1921, Bishop of Salisbury 1921-1935, London, 1939, p.89. His biographers believed that 'the result of the election made no difference to his position of leadership, which by then was well established'. Ibid., p.90. The Governor-General believed Donaldson was 'the most gifted man in his church'. Letter from Ronald Munro-Ferguson to Senator Pearce, 12 January 1916, Pearce Papers, Australian War Memorial (hereafter AWM), MS.2222, Third Series.

\(^4\) See Biographical Appendix.
inside or outside the diocese. Bishop Riley celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of his elevation to the see of Perth in 1914 and was a well-known member of the community and a constant visitor and counsellor at Government House. Lowther Clarke, who ruled the more populous and far more important diocese of Melbourne, was a dour man of no great ability; he made little impact on Melbourne's social and political life.

In permitting the election of bishops Australian Anglicans followed the example of their non-episcopal brethren but they gave the bishop much greater power than the elected heads of the other churches and placed no limit on his occupancy of the see. Anglicans paid heavily for any electoral mistake.

Catholic bishops were chosen in Rome although the senior priests of the diocese and the bishops of the province would submit a short list of three names to assist the Roman curia. Rome consistently selected Irishmen to fill Australian sees but since a bishop was 'wedded' to his diocese until he died many of the bishops regarded themselves as Australians.

The bishop of Bendigo, J.D. Langley, was consecrated in 1907 at the age of 71. He resigned the see in 1919. Who's Who in Australia, 1922, p.154.

Riley lunched at Government House in Perth almost every Monday as his diary shows. An entry for 10 May 1915 speaks for itself: 'Saw Sir Edward Stone re Lady Barron's Ball. [Lady Barron was the wife of the Governor.] Governor asked to speak to Lady Barron. Talked to Lady Barron. Ball given up.' Riley was not deferential. On one occasion the Governor spoke of a church matter: 'I was very angry - he exceeded his powers + was beyond the limits of courtesy simply because he "magnifies his office"'; entry for 12 July 1915. On a trip to the eastern capitals in November Riley lunched or dined with the Governors of New South Wales and Victoria and the Governor-General. Diary entries 22 November 1915, 25 November 1915, 29 November 1915. Diary in Battye Library, MS.1921A/25.

Clarke's dean after 1919, J.S. Hart, believed that the archbishop 'had not really a very great mind'; T.B. McCall, The Life and Letters of John Stephen Hart, Sydney, 1963, p.60.

On the whole, however, Australian Catholic bishops were not elevated directly from Ireland to their sees but had some experience of Australia before the appointment. The exceptions, amongst the Archbishops, were Mannix, Kelly and Carr. The first two were coadjutors before they succeeded to the see.
Catholic bishop in this respect differed from his Anglican counterpart who looked forward to promotion or retirement at 'home'. Archbishop O'Reily, when asked how he enjoyed the bishop's life, discouraged those who had set their sights on the episcopal purple: 'it feels like being a prisoner cracking metal on a stoneheap in the gaol. You get no peace, and you get no rest. One worry is no sooner over than another comes.' The image of a prisoner suited the Catholic bishop who devoted himself exclusively to the concerns of his church and rarely co-operated in community interests. Archbishop Spence's diary showed that he never went anywhere or did anything that was not connected, in some way, with the mission of the church. He saw himself as the servant of the church and not of the wider Adelaide community. However, he exercised a meticulous oversight of Catholic affairs. For example, Spence agreed to distribute prizes at a Catholic college only 'on condition [that] the President of the Old Scholars' Association (who was not a practical [sic] Catholic) had nothing to do with the function'. Despite this exclusive concern for the affairs of the church Catholic bishops were often accused of an excessive interest in politics. The two positions were not contradictory. All the bishops pledged themselves to uphold the Catholic school system against the 'godless' state schools. They argued in season and out for state assistance for their own schools. They encouraged Catholics to think of themselves as severely disadvantaged by the state's indifference. Bishop Gallagher of Goulburn advised his flock to remember that you live under a Government which, whatever party be in power, is the narrowest, the most bigoted, the most intolerant, so far as Catholic institutions are concerned, that now exists in Australia; that, perhaps, exists in the civilised world....Persecution, so far as Catholics are concerned, is not far to seek.

---

3. Ibid., entry for 11 June, 1918.
4. Bishop Gallagher was speaking at a prize-giving 17 December 1914. Quoted in O'Farrell, Documents, vol.11, p.262.
The bishops used political means to attempt to remedy the injustices: they wanted Catholics to band together to show the politicians what a large group they formed. Thus the bishops, in the interests of the church, devoted considerable attention to politics. The Apostolic Delegate commented unfavourably on this aspect of clerical life:

he would be invited as representative of the Pope to be present at the opening of a church or convent or some other function of the most praiseworthy character; before the proceedings were over one of the clergy, even a bishop, would get up and without warning deliver a speech devoted largely to current politics. The practice was anything but desirable but it was more difficult to put down as the people seemed to expect it.¹

Some bishops disclaimed any enthusiasm for politics. O'Reily found politicians even more long-winded than clergymen and he knew nothing of parties:

in my voting I am utterly unprejudiced. I pick out from among the candidates the ablest and most honest man I know of. What his politics are does not trouble me in the slightest way.²

Ironically he made this comment in a letter to Archbishop Carr which contained an attack on the Political Labor Council of Victoria. O'Reily allowed Carr to publish the attack which he regarded not as political but as a defence of the church, in this case the Catholic Federation.³ Catholic prelates, although isolated from community concerns were prepared to take political action to an extent never contemplated by their Anglican counterparts. The Catholic bishop enjoyed the respect of his flock because of the office entrusted to him. A bishop exercised great power if his personality was sufficiently

¹This is a report by Count de Salis, the British Envoy at the Vatican, of an interview with Archbishop Cattaneo, the Apostolic Delegate in Australia from 1917. Letter from de Salis to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 24 March 1922. Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence File, Secret and Confidential Series, Third System, 'Archbishop Mannix', 1920-21, CRS A1606, item F42/1, Australian Archives, Canberra. Australian Archives (hereafter AA) were formerly known as Commonwealth Archives Office.


³Ibid.
strong and attractive to reinforce the lay-Catholic's admiration for his office. Such was the case with Archbishop Mannix.

A leading Tasmanian Methodist rather tactlessly remarked to the President of the Methodist General Conference that Methodism was weakest at its head. Carruthers, the President, agreed, understanding the man to mean 'that the "head" of the Church possessed no powers equal to those (say) of an Archbishop or similar functionary'. Because the various heads of Australian Methodism, the President of General Conference and the state Presidents, were elected to office and served for three year and one year terms respectively, they were unable to act as more than nominal leaders. The annual conferences decided matters of policy; the President merely chaired the conference, conducted official correspondence and represented the church at official functions. Even the address that the retiring President delivered to conference had no official sanction. Carruthers insisted that each presidential address represented the personal opinion of the president and he noted that some conferences had disclaimed responsibility for the contents of a particular address. The real leaders of Methodism were those men who impressed their brethren by the force of their personalities or by their heroic deeds. Usually their pre-eminence also guaranteed them at least one term in the presidential chair. Men such as Worrall, Fitchett and MacCallum in Melbourne and Carruthers and Hoban in Sydney expressed the feeling of Methodists on current issues. If Methodism was weakest at the head it was strongest in the body and it is probable that Methodist lay-people took more notice of their local clergyman than of their official leaders; thus it is difficult to speak, in general, of 'Methodist opinion'.

A similar situation prevailed in the other leading non-episcopal church. The Presbyterians elected their Moderator principally to chair the meetings of the Assembly. Other work was incidental although he too acted as the figure-head or symbol of the unity of the church; he did not

---


2 Ibid., p.220.
formulate policy. The Assembly decided policy while the local churches and presbyteries determined ministerial movements. The official description of the church's power structure made no mention of the office of Moderator:

the only Head of the Church is the Lord Jesus Christ, from whom its powers and prerogatives are derived, so that all its functions are to be exercised in His Name, under the guidance of His Word and Spirit, and in subjection to His authority alone. The spiritual oversight of the Church is vested in duly ordained Presbyters, chosen by the Communicants and sitting in representative Courts.

When R.G. Macintyre tried to explain the difference between the Moderator-General and the Moderators and the duties of each, he used the analogy of the Governor-General and the Governors. He chose a successful image because the Governors, too, had little real power and were 'openers' rather than initiators. Like the Methodists, Presbyterians compensated for lack of leadership by involvement at the local level. Inevitably this led to a diffuse impact in time of national crisis. No-one spoke for the Presbyterian people as a bishop was presumed to speak for his; each minister expressed his own point of view. The press tended to quote those ministers who occupied city pulpits or who expressed themselves forcefully. These men became the leaders of Presbyterianism.

Few Australian church-going Christians, however, were in regular contact with the leaders of their churches. The local minister, with his many failings, but also with his many virtues and often simple goodness, represented the church for most Australians. Unfortunately in a thesis as general as this his work tends to be obscured. A Bulletin writer unkindly described the minister as

---

1 Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Presbyterian Procedure, p.13.
2 Prime Minister's Department, General Correspondence File, Annual single number series, CRS A2, item 10/1, 'Patriotic Funds', Letter from R.G. Macintyre to Prime Minister, 22 January 1918.
a futile, inefficient little man, in absurd clothes, who for a starvation wage hurries about ministering to the already 'converted', pouring spiritual comfort into the ears of those who are regenerate and know it.¹

Such a comment needs to be balanced against the problems ministers faced. Their theological education was often of the most rudimentary nature, their pastoral training and initiation into the work of the ministry inadequate, and the size of the parish often prevented detailed attention to any particular problem.

By 1914 Australians predominated in the ranks of the Anglican clergy although bishops still recruited a significant number of Englishmen. A higher proportion of Englishmen worked in the smaller dioceses; in some almost all clergymen were English.² Englishmen occupied most of the important posts in all dioceses and this annoyed some Australian clergymen.³ In general, the English clergymen were better educated than the Australian. In Tasmania for example, of the ninety-six clergymen thirteen were Oxford men, eight had attended Cambridge and eight, other British universities. Thus twenty-nine of the thirty-four Englishmen had graduated from a university. Only eight of the sixty-two Australians were graduates.⁴ Those Australians who sought Anglican ordination attended an Anglican university college if they were able to

¹Bulletin, 29 July 1915.

²Clergy lists are available for 17 of the 23 dioceses. There were 1,326 clergymen listed in these dioceses of whom 348 were educated, for their first degree, in England. Brisbane was the most English diocese with 50 of its 99 clergymen educated in England. Then followed Adelaide, 53/113; Perth 27/53 and Tasmania 34/96. In Sydney (54/262) and Melbourne (43/215), Australians clearly predominated. The dioceses for which figures are unobtainable are Carpentaria, Rockhampton, Willochra, Bunbury, North West Australia and the Goldfields.

³A correspondent in the Church Standard (hereafter cited as CS) complained of the large number of Englishmen amongst Anglican chaplains: 'when there are hard and difficult posts to be filled, with no honour and glory attached, there is need of a native ministry, but when a position of honour and glory [arises], although perhaps dangerous, the motto is, "No Australians need apply"'. CS, 9 October 1914.

take a degree. The 'theolog', as he was known, usually graduated in Arts while at the same time he pursued ancillary theological subjects and was helped in his spiritual development.¹ When he graduated he spent another year at the college reading theology. After some parish experience as a deacon the young man received ordination and took up full parish duties. Those candidates who had not matriculated studied in one of the many theological colleges. These colleges proliferated because bishops wished to retain their students within the diocese so that they could help with parish work. Often, too, a bishop began a college because he suspected the theological orthodoxy of a colleague's college. The New South Wales country bishops would have nothing to do with Sydney's Moore College which they considered too low and opened an inter-diocesan college at Armidale.² In Melbourne, Trinity College catered for the university graduates and Ridley taught the non-graduates. However, because Ridley taught 'low' theology the high church party opened St John's college to train 'high' aspirants.³ As there were also theological colleges in the dioceses of Ballarat and Wangaratta, Victoria gloried in five Anglican theological institutes. It is difficult to imagine how the bishops found adequate staff for all these colleges; in the smaller ones teachers held parish appointments as well. The Australian College of Theology set a common examination for all Anglican candidates which meant that Australian Anglican ministers achieved approximately the same base level.

Martin Boyd studied at St John's for a short time before the war; his description of the life there may be typical of the Anglican colleges at the time. Although he was the youngest student Boyd disapproved of his colleagues' want of decorum. He endured, for example, an initiation ceremony during which he

³T.B. McCall, The Life and Letters of John Stephen Hart, p.32.
was stripped and coated with tar.\textsuperscript{1} He left the college and abandoned his vocation because he could not share the student belief

that the good, though it must be preached in season, should not be allowed to interfere with the course of daily life, with the natural impulses of brutality, the fun of improper conversation, and the all-important design of acquiring preferment and property.\textsuperscript{2}

Some of the bishops shared Boyd's dissatisfaction with the students. Gilbert White lamented that many of the men were 'undersized or feeble and undeveloped'.\textsuperscript{3} How seldom can we say', he continued, 'that there is a set of men of the highest type, physically and mentally. Is it not rather true that the finest type of man is conspicuously rare?\textsuperscript{3} Radford, bishop of Goulburn, complained that many of the graduates of the theological colleges were 'barely educated sufficiently to enable them to teach with authority'.\textsuperscript{4}

Following ordination the young clergyman took his full part in the work of the ministry. Often he cut his teeth on a country parish before moving to a more important, and more prosperous, city parish. Because of the shortage of men young ministers had great responsibility thrust upon them at the beginning of their clerical careers. Ashley-Brown, for example, told how his bishop sent him to the 'back-blocks' of the diocese as soon as he was ordained and the young man saw neither bishop nor fellow clergyman for more than a year. He commented that 'it was a rough apprenticeship to the responsibilities of the parson's life'.\textsuperscript{5} Later, when he married, he could not live with his wife because he refused to

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Martin Boyd, \textit{Day of My Delight, An Anglo-Australian Memoir}, Melbourne, 1965, p.38.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p.40.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Gilbert White, \textit{Leadership Unity Hope, Three addresses given at a devotional day for the Archbishops and Bishops at Sydney, Friday 5 October 1916; For private circulation, n.d., p.13.}
  \item \textsuperscript{4}CS, 19 February 1915.
\end{itemize}
introduce her to the harsh living conditions of his parish. Despite the hardships the Anglican clergy received the deference and respect of their people and seemed to enjoy their way of life. Englishmen found that 'disestablishment' involved the minister in constant anxiety for his stipend which was raised through the voluntary contributions of parishioners. Clergymen of all denominations suffered because their work attracted a higher status than salary and a young family man often needed to watch his income very carefully. Anglican clergymen took an active part in most community ventures and when war came many sought to lead their fellow citizens in patriotic undertakings. However, the tasks for which they were ordained occupied most of their time. Most ministers worked hard on their sermons. G.V. Portus recalled that he paid a good deal of attention to [his] sermons in Cessnock, since the pulpit seemed the most likely avenue of approach to the townsfolk. [He] managed to preach up [sic] the evening congregation from about thirty to over a hundred. [He] preached about the Bible and the history behind it, interspersed with some Church history, some moral pi-jaw, and occasional reflections upon current events. 

Most Anglican clergymen probably preached on much the same subject matter. Not all ministers, of course, succeeded as preachers. L.V. Biggs attributed the unsatisfactory level of church attendance to the 'lamentably low' standard of Anglican preaching. He remarked that 'thousands do not come to church because they have a positive contempt for the sermons of the average Anglican priest'. It is impossible to say what justice Biggs' generalisation contained. In all likelihood the rector's sermon was much like his curate's egg.

Irishmen dominated the Catholic priesthood in Australia. Slightly less than 200 of the 808 secular priests in 1914 were Australian born; in addition, almost all of the 224 religious

---

1Ibid., p.44.

2G.V. Portus, Happy Highways, Melbourne, 1953, p.151.

priests came to Australia from overseas, mostly from Ireland. In 1914 Australia's sole seminary celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary and the ex-students marked the event by forming an association, the Manly Union, to press the claims of an Australian priesthood. Many Australian priests believed that the church suffered through its dependence on Ireland. The priests argued that conditions in Australia differed markedly from those in Ireland and that only Australians could minister competently to their fellow citizens. They argued that 'the priests who now come from Ireland find themselves in somewhat alien surroundings'. The main characteristic of the Catholic church, therefore, was the strong foreign element. The experience of war increased the feeling of alienation among Catholics.

Most of the Irish priests who came to Australia studied in one of the two great Irish seminaries, Maynooth or All Hallows. Students from either seminary took an Arts degree from the National University of Ireland before they began the

---

1 These figures for the number of priests in Australia were from the Australasian Catholic Directory for 1914, Sydney, 1914. To the end of 1914 180 priests had been ordained from Manly. (Manly, vol.5, no.1 (1935), pp.250-2.) There were perhaps about 20 Australians ordained overseas who were not included in the Manly figures. The editors of Manly suggested that in 1922 70 per cent of priests were Irish born and 30 per cent Australian. He referred to secular priests. (Manly, vol.11, no.1 (1922), p.18.) The Australasian Catholic Directory showed that there were 476 Brothers and 5,802 Nuns in Australia in 1914. It is not possible to determine their origin. State figures for secular clergy (although organised on diocesan basis):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Secular Clergy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic.</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qld.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Manly, the journal of the Union, contained many editorials calling for an Australian priesthood in the early years. See P.J. O'Farrell, The Catholic Church in Australia, A Short History: 1788-1967, Melbourne, 1968, p.245.

study of theology. The whole course lasted seven years and as most young men entered the seminary from school the majority were ordained in their mid-twenties. The priest who volunteered for Australia left Ireland as soon as he was ordained and thus assumed the responsibilities of the priesthood in a strange land without the benefit of priestly apprenticeship. One young priest admitted that he wept, so homesick and bewildered was he, when he saw the 'burnt grey land of sand and withered grass with lifeless trees' at Fremantle. It is little wonder that the Irish priest-exiles carried with them intense feelings of loyalty and affection for Ireland wherever they went.

Australians who desired to become priests studied at the seminary at Manly founded by Cardinal Moran. Their course omitted a university degree because of the fear of the 'secular', corrupting university. Instead students received large doses of the philosophy and theology of Thomas Aquinas; students were required to be thoroughly proficient in Latin as

1Mannix, the ex-president of Maynooth, stated that 'no candidate is allowed to begin his theological studies until he is a University graduate', Advocate, 29 March 1913, quoted in Frank Murphy Daniel Mannix: Archbishop of Melbourne 1917-1963, Melbourne, 1972, p.5. An ex-student of All Hallows said this was also the practice in his time (1913-1919) but was discontinued later. J. T. McMahon, College Campus, Cloister, Perth, 1969, p.61.

2Walter McDonald D.D., Reminiscences of a Maynooth Professor, (edited by Denis Gwynn), London, 1925, p.182. McDonald asked why the students who spent so long in training 'are not better than they are'. He believed that 'our lack of success is due, in very great measure, to the use of Latin in our schools', p.183.

3J.T. McMahon, College Campus, Cloister, p.74.


5This point was made in an unpublished paper 'Australian Catholicism and Theological Education' by Father Kevin Livingston given at a seminar at the Australian National University, 29 May 1974. See also the restrictions that surrounded nuns who wished to attend university, quoted in O'Farrell, Documents, vol.II, pp.242-4.
it was the medium of teaching. One or two of the best students of each year completed their courses in Rome. Neither the Irish nor the Australian system produced educated men if the strictures of a severe Catholic critic are believed. H.M. Moran, a young Sydney doctor in 1914, wrote that the Catholic priest contributed almost nothing to the intellectual life of his times. The priests who had any scholarship were few. Most of them distrusted the higher education. For one thing it emphasised their own sense of inferiority. They also disliked the socially ambitious among their flock. One might have thought there was no such thing as a Catholic philosophy. The priests of the time knew only sterile formulas. There was not the semblance of a Catholic culture.

Like the bishops few priests took any part in the life of the community; they considered it their duty to work almost exclusively among the Catholic people. The priest won the fullest measure of respect and affection from his people who admired him as an educated, devoted, selfless man who alone had the power to bring them to God. During the war years many Protestants alleged that the priest used his position to influence his people in non-religious matters; it is extremely difficult to say what truth these allegations contained.

In comparison with the other churches, the Methodist church had an abundance of ministers. There were nearly as many Methodist clergymen as there were Catholic priests. In South Australia, where Methodism rivalled Anglicanism as the most popular denomination there were 152 Methodist ministers and 128 Anglicans. Such an abundance may have been due to the comparatively lower educational requirements for the ministry. In selecting candidates Methodists concentrated on the enthusiastic nature of their faith. They sought candidates who


\[3\] There were 900 Methodist ministers in 1914. 312 in Victoria and Tasmania; 293 in New South Wales; 87 in Queensland; 152 in South Australia and 56 in Western Australia. See the Minutes of Conference, 1914, of the various state conferences.
would preach with fire more than with learning. J.E. Carruthers described how a young man entered the ministry. The first step was by getting converted. Then by praying in the prayer-meeting, speaking in class, teaching in the Sunday school...Presently a watchful brother (usually the minister) detects in him the promise of suitable gifts and graces for a larger sphere, and he is spoken to about 'taking a service or two'...it is the glory of the Methodist Church that it grows its own ministers.

Some Methodists, however, worried about the low educational standards. James Green remarked of Victorian Methodism that 'there seems to be a good supply of candidates for the ministry in Victoria but there are bitter complaints as to the educational qualifications of those offering'. The 1915 Victorian Conference lamented that few prospective ministers 'have the benefit of training in our secondary schools, whether of the State or of the Church'. The General Conference prescribed the students' course of study which ensured uniformity among the States. Texts were set rather than subjects outlined. Thus in first year probationers studied theology from 'Beet's Manual pp.1-228' and church history from 'Foukes Jackson's Church History A.D. 1-313'. Conference required that the students master passages of the Old Testament in Hebrew and passages of the New in Greek. Although the course was uniform throughout Australia the provision each State Conference made for its students differed enormously. In Victoria students lived at Queen's College and were instructed by a tutor who had no other duties. The New South Wales Conference boarded its theological students at Newington College until 1914 and required the headmaster, concerned with the affairs of a great public school, to act as theological.

---

1 J.E. Carruthers, Memoirs of an Australian Ministry, p.35.
2 Methodist, 21 October 1914.
3 Spectator, 5 March 1915.
4 Methodist Church of Australia, Minutes of the 5th General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia, begun in Wesley Church, Melbourne on Thursday, 17 May, 1917, Melbourne, 1917, p.71.
tutor as well.¹ Unlike the three other major denominations Methodism was not identified with one particular part of the British Isles. Most ministers were Australian and there was little movement either of personnel or ideas between English and Australian Methodism. The Australian church, when it celebrated its centenary in 1915, invited an American, Bishop Hoss, to represent overseas Methodism.² This cosmopolitanism did not diminish Methodists' enthusiasm for Empire in time of crisis.

There were 448 Presbyterian ministers in Australia in 1914, almost half the number of Methodist ministers although Methodism had fewer adherents.³ The ministry was largely Australian although the leading ministers were Scots and the church thought of itself as Scottish. While Presbyterians expected all candidates for the ministry to have university degrees only about one-third of those who offered themselves fulfilled the ideal.⁴ However the three larger state Assemblies made provision for professional teaching at the theological halls which were all affiliated to the church's university colleges. General Assembly required that each theological hall have at least three full-time professors who were expected to devote themselves to theological teaching and research.⁵ Occasionally theologians of repute accepted Australian chairs; Samuel Angus became Professor of New Testament at St Andrews in Sydney although he could have had a

¹J.E. Carruthers, Memoirs of an Australian Ministry, p.40.
²Methodist, 7 August 1915. The Methodist church in the United States was episcopal.
³The ministers were distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qld.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the Minutes of Assembly, 1914, of the various state Assemblies.

⁴There were 139 university graduates. Ibid.

⁵Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Presbyterian Procedure, p.46.
chair in Europe or America.\textsuperscript{1} Soon after he arrived he discovered that the prevailing Presbyterian standard was 'at least a half a century behind that of Scotland'.\textsuperscript{2} Because the theological session ran for only six months of the year, from March to August, professors had considerable free time and many accepted honorary positions within or without the church. J. Laurence Rentoul in Melbourne was Presbyterian Chaplain-General, R.G. Macintyre in Sydney became secretary of the New South Wales State Recruiting Committee. Professors also became spokesmen for the church on a wide variety of subjects but because they were 'without pastoral charge' they may have seen things somewhat differently from ministers who were in close contact with parishioners. The parish minister's life, on the other hand, was so busy that it allowed little time for study and reflection. A minister who challenged the contention that a clergyman preached on Sunday and loafed for the rest of the week outlined how he spent his time. He spoke of the innumerable classes, meetings and study groups that his people expected him to attend.\textsuperscript{3} Working on the principle that a 'house-going minister makes a church-going people' the conscientious man spent many hours each week in house visitation.\textsuperscript{4} Should one of the congregation be in hospital the minister was expected to visit him even though this might involve half a day in travelling time. Most ministers spent all Saturday in the study writing the next day's sermon. In fact, the correspondent regretted, 'to have a night absolutely

\textsuperscript{1}Samuel Angus, Alms for Oblivion: Chapters from a Heretic's Life, Sydney, 1943, p.175. Angus only accepted the chair because of his high regard for the idea of a 'call'.


\textsuperscript{3}Messenger of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, 5 January 1917. Hereafter cited as PM (V).

\textsuperscript{4Ibid.}
free to read to his wife and children [was] as rare as a rise in a minister's salary'.

Church newspapers played an important part in the formation and transmission of church opinion which was usually formed by church leaders and reaffirmed, elaborated and occasionally disputed by ministers. By 1914 a substantial church newspaper industry existed in Australia despite church people's indifference to such ventures. The state divisions of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches each owned an 'official organ' published weekly in New South Wales and Victoria and monthly in the smaller states. Anglican publishing activity lagged behind this level but almost every diocese published a journal, usually monthly. However, the most impressive Anglican paper, the Church Standard, was privately owned and, although published in Sydney, it took a decidedly 'high' view on church questions. Various private companies, usually with several priests on their boards, owned the Catholic newspapers which were not, therefore, 'official organs' of the church. Laymen edited the four most important Catholic papers, two in Melbourne and two in Sydney, while clergymen always edited the Protestant papers. Church papers serve the historian well because they reported fully the sermons and speeches of church leaders and gave detailed coverage of church assemblies and meetings. They also tried to give a thorough picture of church activity.

1Ibid.

2The most important Presbyterian paper was the Messenger, in its various state editions. The most important Methodist papers were the Methodist (NSW) and the Spectator (Vic.).

3The Anglican Church Messenger, Melbourne, was the only other newspaper. It was published fortnightly. (Hereafter cited as CM.)

4The Catholic papers were the Advocate and Tribune in Melbourne and the Freeman's Journal and Catholic Press in Sydney. (Freeman's Journal hereafter cited as FJ.)
The historian may doubt the influence of church newspapers, however, because few people, in proportion to church membership, took the papers. The Melbourne Church of England Messenger, a solid, well-produced and forthright fortnightly commands the historian's attention. His admiration for the editor's verve increases when he discovers that the paper had a circulation of about 500 copies. If each of the 215 clerical homes in the diocese subscribed to the Messenger there were few copies remaining for lay-people. Unfortunately circulation figures do not exist for all church newspapers but where they are available it is clear that circulation was uniformly low. The monthly Adelaide Church Guardian of 3,900 copies achieved the highest circulation of Anglican papers; it was a very slight journal. The substantial Protestant weeklies such as the Methodist, Spectator and Presbyterian Messenger sold between 3-4,000 copies in their states. Nor should we assume that people bought these journals to acquaint themselves with church views on questions of the day. The Western Australian Presbyterian consisted largely of an 'inset' of dubious literary material printed in England around which was wrapped a few pages of local church news. Lack of resources limited the coverage of local events. When, for example, the theological hall opened in Perth the editor directed readers to the West Australian for an account of proceedings because 'it would be quite impossible to give an adequate report in The Presbyterian'. Because of the pressures on shipping between England and Australia the editor finally dropped the 'inset' and increased local content to compensate for this.

---

1 This figure is quoted by John Christopher Gleeson in 'The Enemies Within, A Study of Sectarianism in Victoria 1917', B.A. Hons. Thesis, University of Melbourne, 1970, p.8. Circulation figures are very hard to discover. The Press Guide for Australia and New Zealand, Sydney, 1919, does not give circulation figures. I wrote to the business managers of the papers still in existence but only in a very few cases were they able to give me precise figures.

2 A.N. Thomas, Pastoral Address delivered at the Opening of the First Session, Tenth Synod of the Diocese of Adelaide...

3 September 1917..., Adelaide, 1917, p.20.
dropped alarmingly.¹ Nor were editors of the Protestant papers full-time journalists; rather they were hard working parish men who gave much of their free time to the paper. So limited was this free time that often editors wrote in ignorance of the full facts of the case, relying on a hasty reading of daily newspapers for their information.

J.E. Carruthers was perhaps rare in the diversity of his concerns but he illustrates the multiplicity of extra-editorial demands. In 1913, for example, he was elected President of the New South Wales Conference; he was also secretary of the General Conference, superintendent of the Lindfield circuit 'with two important and growing congregations' under his care and, as well, he was editor of the Methodist. His 'staff' consisted of a business manager.² In 1917 when Carruthers became President of the General Conference he continued to edit the Methodist for which he received an annual honorarium.³ Church newspapers were produced on the cheap. Only in a limited sense then, despite the proud claim, were they the 'official organs' of their owners. Church leaders rarely consulted editors about the opinions the paper espoused and editors seldom had time to examine a question from all angles. Church newspapers, therefore, are most valuable to the extent that they report the thoughts of other churchmen, clerical and lay.

Ministers preached, spoke and wrote to influence their lay-people and through them the general community. Unfortunately because lay-people were largely passive and deferential they appear rarely in this thesis. It is even difficult to say whether they accepted the views of their clergy. Although the Protestant churches included laymen in

¹Presbyterian Church of Western Australia, Minutes of Assembly, 1915, p.50 and 1918, p.49.
³Ibid., p.297.
the decision-making processes of the church few laymen played a prominent part at church meetings. Clergymen initiated debate and dominated discussion. Laymen supported what the clergy proposed even in debates on current affairs where their interest and expertise may have surpassed that of the clergy. Few church meetings boasted a dynamic layman like L.V. Biggs who initiated the social questions committee of the Melbourne synod and to an extent dominated the synod. Presbyterians claimed that all church members participated equally in church affairs and, while this may have been true in theory, in practice the ministers dominated the life of the church. Each congregation elected elders from amongst the lay-people but the minister assigned their work and chaired their meetings; he was the leader, they were clearly the subordinates. ¹ The Catholic church restricted the participation of Catholic laymen to works of charity and political agitation in the interests of the church.² The St Vincent de Paul Society emphasised 'the necessity of complete deference to the clergy' and regarded opposition to clerical superiors as 'a strange way of becoming holy'.³ Paradoxically, the attitude of the Catholic laity to conscription influenced the Catholic bishops while Protestant leaders apparently took little notice of their lay-people's views on the question. The machinery that enabled laymen to participate, if they wished, in church government ignored laywomen who formed the majority of most congregations. Churchmen expected women to raise money for church needs and to perform many of the menial tasks such as cleaning but they were not eligible to stand for election to any official church position or to take a significant part in the church's

¹Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Presbyterian Procedure, p.156.

²Archbishop Kelly specifically rejected the participation of laymen in church affairs. He said he disliked deputations of laymen who sought to interview him about church matters 'because they always disturb and hinder us doing our work as well as God wishes'. Advocate, 1 August 1914.

ministry. Historians have guessed that clergymen's enthusiasm for war offended lay-people and that they turned in sorrow from the churches because of it. There is little evidence of such a reaction.

Thus were the churches constituted in 1914. The four major denominations commanded the nominal adherence of most Australians who expected that churchmen would have something to say about the great moral questions as they emerged. Churchmen believed that they had an obligation to interpret human history, with all its twists and turnings, in the light of Christian principles. Furthermore, churchmen were well able to make their views known. A church leader in his pulpit spoke not only to his congregation but to the community at large. The daily press, as well as the church newspaper, invariably reported an important sermon. The resolutions and debates of synods, assemblies and conferences received wide publicity. The churches had gained an eminent position in Australian society by 1914. When war broke out churchmen used that position to full effect.

---

1 Some churchmen even disagreed with the participation of women in political life. Archbishop O'Reily described himself as 'an utter disbeliever in woman suffrage. It unsexes and vulgarises those [to] whom every chivalry is due'. Letter from O'Reily to Dr John Emmet, 2 April 1915, O'Reily Papers, Church Office, Adelaide, Untitled Letter-book.
It is not for me just now to discuss the various bearings of the situation in which we find ourselves as an Empire involved, but it is not too much to say that in the most deliberate judgment of those most competent to determine, Britain's attitude is justifiable not only before the courts of men, but also before the face of Almighty God.

The Rev. S. Scholes preaching at the Forrest Street Methodist Church, Bendigo, 9 August 1914.

Bendigo Advertiser, 10 August 1914.
The outbreak of war came as a shock to most Australians who had been engrossed in the federal election, the drought and the situation in Ireland. Churchmen shared this indifference to the crisis in Europe and had done little to school their congregations in a Christian philosophy of war. In their first reaction to the news of the grave situation in Europe they drew on preconceptions about war which were influenced more by the romance of Empire and battle than by an appreciation of the potential for savagery of modern, mechanised man. Churchmen drew heavily, too, on their Christian beliefs to explain a world plunged suddenly into turmoil. The doctrine of the providence of God could accommodate any catastrophe and churchmen used it to explain the war. They faced the crisis with one, sure central principle: nothing happened unless permitted by God and God could only permit what was ultimately good. From this common standpoint churchmen of all denominations sought to make sense of the war to Australians; the many explanations agreed at all important points.

Church leaders spoke in grave tones when they preached on the threat of war on Sunday 2 August. None welcomed the war; most observed that it would involve suffering, loss and hardship. The Anglican Dean of Sydney, A.E. Talbot, said that no-one could contemplate war without feelings of revulsion. War involved the sacrifice of human life and hard-won prosperity and the Dean wondered what was the purpose of such waste. The approach of war found Bishop Riley almost in despair of Christianity. Bishop Long spoke of the devilish terrors of war, increased by the capacity of modern armaments for widespread carnage. Many others shared this revulsion for war as a method of settling international disputes.

1In July 1914 almost all Argus editorials discussed the federal elections. The first editorial on the situation in Europe appeared on 28 July. The first report that a grave situation existed appeared on 24 July; this was an eleven-line item. See also Ernest Scott, Australia During the War, Sydney, 1936, p.2-3.

2Daily Telegraph, 3 August 1914.

3West Australian, 3 August 1914.

4Daily Telegraph, 4 August 1914.
However, the church leaders stifled these feelings and acquiesced in the approach of war. They became spectators of the actions of men and governments and did not seek to persuade the combatants to turn back from the brink. Nor did they lay before the people the traditional Christian criteria for a just war to allow men to decide for themselves if the coming of war were justified. No church leader suggested an alternative line of action to that of the federal and imperial governments. Churchmen followed the lead of others in this matter; no anti-war lobby emerged in Australia nor was any notice taken of the anti-war position of many British parliamentarians and public figures.\(^1\) Scott correctly assessed Australian reaction to the news of war when he wrote that Australia was 'substantially unanimous in her determination to share the perils and burdens of war'.\(^2\) Churchmen contributed to the unanimity.

Churchmen remained passive before the inexorable march of events because they believed that all things came from the hands of a benevolent God. Archbishop Kelly said that if war came it should be seen as a 'chastisement from God for abandoning the true principles of righteousness and religion'.\(^3\) Archbishop Duhig catalogued the crimes committed against the church in France and Portugal and told his congregation not to wonder if God should seek vengeance for them.\(^4\) He concluded that 'if nations flew in the face of blessings received from Almighty God...they had to suffer losses of life and territory'.\(^5\)

Most preachers were confident that if war came the Christian people would know their duty and would do it. Firstly, they would pray. Preachers also exhorted their

---

\(^1\) For an account of the strength of the anti-war movement within the British Cabinet see Cameron Hazlehurst, *Politicians at War July 1914 to May 1915, A prologue to the triumph of Lloyd George*, London, 1971, pp.49-53.

\(^2\) Scott, *Australia*, p.23.

\(^3\) *FJ*, 6 August 1914.

\(^4\) *Brisbane Courier*, 3 August 1914.

\(^5\) Ibid.
charges to show the Christian and civic virtues. Archbishop Clarke, who was also a vice-president of an international society to foster friendly relations with Germany, stressed the need for patience, reserve, humility and patriotism.\(^1\) Dean Talbot agreed on the necessity of patriotism and showed how, ideally, it grew from true religion. Talbot appeared to equate patriotism with the acceptance of government decisions; he told his congregation that if war came Christians must accept it and be prepared to make sacrifices for their country.\(^2\) Bishop Long asserted that if Britain went to war Christians must 'irrespective of terrible suffering, give of our best and respond to the assistance [sic] of England'.\(^3\) The Rev. Horace Crotty concentrated on the duty of the church in time of war. He believed that at such times men looked to religion for explanation and interpretation and that the churches must provide what men sought.\(^4\) Crotty wanted churchmen to stress the principles involved in the decision for war but his was a lone voice. Most concentrated on the immediate, practical response.

Some churchmen looked beyond war and sought other methods of settling international disputes. Archbishop Kelly regretted that the pope had lost his status and power as the international arbiter in times of crisis.\(^5\) Bishop Riley pointed out that Christians, as an interest group, were as powerless to prevent war as other interest groups such as employers and financiers. He hoped that in future an International Congress of Workmen might be able to stop war because the worker suffered so much from it.\(^6\)

Despite these hopes for the eventual replacement of war by more civilised methods of arbitration and Long's assurance that the war, when it came, would be short, Christians went home

\(^1\)\textit{CS}, 7 August 1914.
\(^2\)\textit{Daily Telegraph}, 3 August 1914.
\(^3\)Ibid., 4 August 1914.
\(^4\)Ibid., 3 August 1914.
\(^5\)\textit{FJ}, 6 August 1914.
\(^6\)\textit{West Australian}, 3 August 1914.
from these services with heavy hearts. The church leaders had uniformly emphasised what a ghastly business war was and had shown themselves acquiescent in Australia's participation. Instead, they exhorted their congregations to pray for peace. While praying that war might not come, no church leader was prepared to condemn war if it did come, or argue the case against war at all. Churchmen rarely discussed the causes of the threat to peace and then only in simplistic terms like Long who said the war was caused by the 'wickedness' of Austria/Hungary. The preachers on this first Sunday in August treated war as a fact to which the Christian's response was simple; he must do his duty. They coupled war with the drought and spoke of both as a natural calamity.

When, on 4 August, the threat of war was replaced by the fact, church leaders summoned their people to prayer. As the nation mobilised its forces so the churches mobilised theirs. Various churchmen organised intercession services which dealt specifically with the war. The first such service was conducted in Adelaide by the Methodist, Henry Howard, who saw the war as an opportunity for spiritual renewal; it was not, therefore, completely unwelcome to him. He believed that 'any discipline, whether of war or pestilence, of famine or fire, of drought or flood, that can break down our trust in the material and strengthen our faith in the spiritual...is a discipline that should be welcomed and acquiesced in rather than deplored'. Howard regretted aspects of Australian life; he spoke of its 'intemperance, uncleanness, mutual distrust, commercial dishonesty, political chicanery' and hoped that war could remove some of these ills. His call to prayer was prompted by a concern for the moral welfare of the nation and involved more than prayers for peace. Already ministers regarded the war as an opportunity for national renewal.

---

1Daily Telegraph, 4 August 1914.

2Adelaide Advertiser, 4 August 1914.

3Ibid. Howard had a high estimate of the value of treaties between nations: it was 'an obligation so sacredly binding that there are no words sufficiently strong in which to reprobate so black a scandal as its violation would be'.
Sydney clergymen arranged for daily, united services of intercession to be held in turn at the different city churches.  

The principal of the Presbyterian theological hall in Sydney, the Rev. Andrew Harper, struck an optimistic note at the first service. He believed that war might not be a bad thing: 'it might be that God saw for the welfare of mankind a great destruction was the only means whereby faith in the living God could be kept alive, and men taught not to trust themselves'. Harper showed that suffering and death were not the ultimate evils in the Christian world-view; the example of Christ encouraged Christians to accept them as a means towards renewal.

In Brisbane the leading Protestant and Anglican clergymen met to discuss the war and issued a joint manifesto for the guidance of their people. The clergymen first asked why Britain was at war and answered that she fought for 'the security of neutral Powers and the safety of the Empire'. These, they said, were honorable and righteous aims. The manifesto marked the first attempt to discuss the causes of the war. Other clergymen had implicitly rejected, at this stage, the traditional theory that war could only be justified by an examination of the causes and probable effects; they had ignored the causes. The Brisbane clergymen made a second advance when they called on the people to pray for peace and 'meantime the success of our arms'. Initially most clergymen were reluctant to ask for prayers for victory and debated whether they could do so. Subsequently most agreed that such

---

1The Catholics took no part in these arrangements. In November Bishop Thomas in Adelaide asked Archbishop O'Reily to join with him in calling the people to prayer. O'Reily replied: 'I should not wish it to be announced that I had entered into agreement with other religious bodies in this matter; such an announcement would be misread by our people.' O'Reily to Thomas, 20 November 1914. O'Reily/Spence Papers, Catholic Church Office, Adelaide. Letter-book untitled. [No.6.]

2Daily Telegraph, 6 August 1914.

3Brisbane Courier, 7 August 1914.

4Ibid.

5The Melbourne Herald interviewed J.L. Rentoul to ask if Christians could pray for victory. Rentoul gave many arguments to show why they could not. The interview was reprinted in the ACW, 4 September 1914.
prayers were justified. The manifesto also asked the people to show the spirit of Christianity and patriotism, unity and loyalty, and reminded Christians that morality must apply in war as in peace. Finally, the Brisbane clergymen exhorted their people to live in peace with their German/Australian neighbours and to show them the courtesy that Christian toleration demanded.¹

It is a fair assumption that every clergyman preached on or at least mentioned the war in the course of his sermon on Sunday 9 August 1914. In these sermons churchmen showed what preconceptions they held about war and about the role of the church in Australian society. Nevertheless the sermons formed part of a religious service so that the purpose was not necessarily to argue a case or even to pass on information but to help the congregation to worship God. Furthermore the sermon had a different function within each denomination. A Catholic congregation listened to the priest with respect but the sermon was an insignificant aspect of Sunday worship. On the other hand, Presbyterians regarded the sermon as the central part of the service but accepted the preacher’s exposition as subject matter for debate rather than the last word.² Only a fraction of the sermons preached on that first Sunday of the war have survived in newspaper reports and of these the sermons of church leaders predominate, but doubtless the ordinary church-goer received much the same message as the worshipper at the cathedral. As any startling divergence from the accepted ‘line’ would have been mentioned in some newspaper the absence of such reports indicates that churchmen achieved a measure of spontaneous agreement on that day. The historian can only guess how the sermons were received in the pews. Apart from rare reports that, for example, the congregation

¹Brisbane Courier, 7 August 1914.
²Samuel Angus described the traditional Presbyterian attitude to the sermon when he wrote of the Irish Presbyterian peasants of his boyhood that ‘they would not permit even the minister from the pulpit to dictate their decisions...they would praise his sermons when he could not hear their praise, but I noticed that when he was present they were more ready to raise questions’. Samuel Angus, Alms for Oblivion, Chapters from a Heretic’s Life, Sydney, 1943, p.55.
listened to the sermon with serious attention, newspapermen made little effort to gauge a congregation's response. It was possible that a congregation listened to a jingoistic sermon with seething resentment, although it was unlikely. We now have no way of knowing but it seems reasonable to assume that the sermons of the church leaders represented, by and large, the thought not only of the clergy but also of the laity.

When Lowther Clarke climbed into the cathedral pulpit in Melbourne he saw before him the Governor-General, the State Governor, the Lord Mayor and other leading officials and citizens. Other preachers placed their thoughts before more humble congregations but regardless of these differences the message which came from the various pulpits was substantially the same. Preachers for once seemed to have absorbed the Pauline injunction to all say the same thing in the Lord, and differences of a denominational, regional or personal basis were slight in comparison with this measure of agreement.

Preachers agreed, firstly, that Britain, and therefore Australia, had decided correctly for war. In reaching this conclusion preachers followed the reasoning of the politicians and the press. They said that Britain must honour her pledged word, must protect her weak neighbours and must not jeopardise the security of the Empire. Dr Marshall at Scots Church, Melbourne, said that the war was 'the inevitable price of fidelity to our international obligations' and that he preferred to bear the sacrifices required than to suffer the moral undoing of abandoning a pledge. Dean Talbot explained to the 20,000 people who attended a united service in Sydney's Domain that Britain had been forced into the war by the pride and arrogance of a potentate. At the evening service at the cathedral the Dean expanded on this theme saying that Britain had obeyed the commands of God by choosing honour rather than dishonour. Archbishop Wright claimed that the Empire had entered the conflict not from a spirit of aggrandisement or from a love of war but because 'we stand for our plighted word

---

1*Argus*, 10 August 1914.
2*Daily Telegraph*, 10 August 1914.
3Ibid.
[and] for the defence of weaker nations'. Thus those preachers who sought to explain why the Empire was at war contented themselves with the conventional moralities and the platitudes of the press. Other preachers avoided any discussion of the causes of the war and still others were happy to applaud Britain's action rather than to justify it. Thus a Perth Methodist minister, the Rev. Brian Wibberley, described Britain's decision as characterised by 'a remarkable restraint, a high sense of honour, and a fine spirit of chivalry'. It is only fair to add that probably very few clergymen had any clear idea of the causes of the war. The sources of information were scant.

Preachers also gave evidence of a large measure of agreement when they explained what a Christian must do about the war. They sounded the call to arms and the call to prayer. Archbishop Clarke exhorted his congregation to march to the duties before them, whether of action or of suffering. Preachers assumed that few Australians would be called to action and that the suffering would be limited to the disruption of trade and the distress involved in the shortage of goods and rising prices. Churchmen also emphasised that a Christian must think well of his enemies and extend courtesy and consideration to people of German origin within the community. Clarke stressed that the German people, although loyal to the land of their adoption, would have a lingering affection for the home of their fathers. He asked Christians to sympathise with this tension.

The third strand of agreement amongst preachers was the optimistic belief that the war would be the cause of renewal and reform in the lives of the participating nations. Dean Mercer of Perth summarised this aspect of clerical reaction to the war when he said he would much rather mount a war-horse than a race-horse. He explained that nations achieved great things

---

1Ibid.
2West Australian, 10 August 1914.
3CM, 14 August 1914.
4Ibid.
5West Australian, 10 August 1914.
after periods of crisis while long periods of ease were always followed by decay. The nation could anticipate a period of renewal and achievement once it was purged by war. The highly-regarded Presbyterian minister of Ballarat, John Walker, envisaged a 'fire-purged civilisation, [in] which the King of Kings and Lord of Lords shall rule and in which the Cross shall be the inspiring symbol among all classes of a higher and holier civilisation'. In declaring that good would come from the war preachers indicated their eagerness to make it more acceptable to the people and also the strength of their faith in a God who could turn evil into good. Furthermore, the optimism showed how compatible was the ethos of war with a current interpretation of the doctrines of Christianity. In preaching that the world would be remade and renewed by suffering and agony they drew on the Christian mystery expressed in Christ and by him when he stated that unless a grain of wheat die it must remain unproductive and sterile. Allied with this belief in God's oversight of the world and interference in its workings was the commonly-expressed view that since the Empire's cause was just God must be on the Empire's side. Talbot said that God was on the side of right and therefore with the Empire. He expressed the general viewpoint. Only John Walker disagreed when he said that God could not be partisan and did not support any nation. Such disagreement was rare on this day of unanimity.

Catholic preachers agreed with their Protestant counterparts that the war was just, that Christians must serve their country and that God would make the conflict work for good. Within these areas of agreement, however, they displayed a subtle difference which separated them, even at this stage of the war, from the Protestants. In declaring that the war was

---

1 **PM**, 28 August 1914. The report of his sermon, preached on 9 August, was delayed.

2 Archbishop Wright stated that 'it is a mystery that the future generations are to be established by the sufferings of the present, but such has ever been the course of history which is indication of the Will of God'. *Sydney Diocesan Magazine*, October 1914 (hereafter cited as *SDM*).

3 **Daily Telegraph**, 10 August 1914.

4 **PM**, 28 August 1914.
just Catholics relied on the conditions laid down by the traditional Catholic theologians. Archbishop Kelly explained the conditions to his congregation: the war must be proclaimed by a public authority, it must be fought for a just cause and those who fought must be motivated by an upright intention. If the conditions were fulfilled then the war 'would be blessed by God'. Carr urged Catholics to do their duty but emphasised how Catholics regarded themselves as a slightly alien section of the community. He advised his congregation to 'join heartily with [their] fellow citizens in defence of the mother country' because 'religious principles, loyalty and interests' suggested it. Carr apparently saw Catholics as a special group whose welfare depended on their own exertions and was not identified with the general community welfare. Finally, Catholic preachers differed from Protestants in the expectations they held of the war. They did not believe that the war necessarily would improve the moral condition of the nations; instead they looked for concrete practical benefits. Almost every Catholic preacher expressed the hope that Britain would grant Ireland home rule in appreciation of loyal service in time of crisis. Some preachers, including Archbishop Kelly, expected that the war would draw all citizens closer together, reduce sectarianism and open people's eyes to the justice of Catholic educational claims. Kelly believed that as a result of the war 'there would be no more disabilities put upon their schools, and the question would not be asked with regard to their public work whether a person was a Catholic or not'. Archbishop Carr mentioned the war in the course of his sermon on this day but the bulk of his text dealt with the education question which he said was 'the main anxiety'. Catholics hoped to advance their integration with the wider community through loyal participation in the war.

No-one could doubt the sincerity of most preachers' sentiments on this great day; some clergymen even decorated their churches to add to the impact of the message. Thus the

1 *FJ*, 13 August 1914.
2 *Advocate*, 15 August 1914.
3 *FJ*, 13 August 1914.
4 *Advocate*, 15 August 1914.
Rev. G.E. Rowe draped the pulpit of the Albert St Methodist Church, Brisbane, with the Union Jack as well as the Australian, Scottish, Irish, French, Belgian and Russian flags.\(^1\) Rowe also cancelled the remaining lectures in the series 'Romanism and Protestantism'.\(^2\) Such enthusiasms, however, were not always based on a clear understanding of the situation. Archbishop Wright warned his people not to succumb to 'over-elation' when definite news of victory came.\(^3\) While most preachers paid lip-service to General Sherman's aphorism that 'war is hell', they seemed not to understand the hell that modern weapons could create. Archbishop Kelly asked his people to pray for the soldiers who would be sent to judgment in their hundreds.\(^4\) Such views were soon seen to be naively optimistic; churchmen derived their optimism from their common Christianity and from their common reliance on newspapers for information. Only Fr Verling of Perth suggested that churchmen should withhold judgment about the war until they knew the full facts and complained that he knew little because of the stringent press censorship.\(^5\)

Despite the measure of agreement differing denominational traditions led preachers to view the war in slightly different ways. The Catholic approach, with its emphasis on the need to relate all questions to the welfare of the church and to distinguish between the interests of the church and the interests of the nation, was substantially different from the Protestant although at this stage the difference was barely perceptible to observers. The most important difference amongst Protestant denominations was the Methodist concern for the effect of war on the morality of the nations and individuals. However, the sermons of this first Sunday of the

\(^1\) Brisbane Courier, 10 August 1914. The pulpit was in fact a platform some 10 feet wide as is found in the larger Methodist churches. Each flag would have been distinctive and clearly visible.

\(^2\) Brisbane Courier, 10 August 1914.

\(^3\) Daily Telegraph, 10 August 1914.

\(^4\) FJ, 20 August 1914.

\(^5\) West Australian, 10 August 1914.
war showed that Australian churchmen possessed a deep faith in the relevance of their Christianity to world problems, a strong certainty in their ability to understand those problems and apply the principles of Christianity to them, and a larger area of common ground in appreciating the problem and applying the solution than even the churchmen themselves would have admitted. They followed a dangerous course in these early days of the war when, on a very slight understanding of the issues involved and the nature of modern warfare, they committed themselves to the nation's cause. Because they adopted an extreme position so early would they be obliged to maintain that position for as long as the war lasted? Few, if any, clergymen saw that as a danger. They believed that they supported a war that would end with one decisive battle after a few weeks. Furthermore, the atmosphere in Australia in those first days of August was not conducive to deliberation and calm judgment. Churchmen fell victim to the euphoria as did their fellow citizens.¹

Immediately after this first Sunday churchmen maintained a high level of activity in connection with the war. In Perth the Anglicans set aside Monday, 10 August, as a special day of humiliation and prayer. They held five separate services at St George's Cathedral throughout the day; the bishop preached on the efficacy of prayer at the last service.² In Sydney the united services of intercession continued daily. The Adelaide Council of Churches decided to hold a united prayer meeting in the Town Hall each day. The Lord Mayor readily agreed.³ The Council also sent a deputation to the government to seek a reduction in hotel opening hours.⁴ In Brisbane churchmen decreed that the following Sunday should be observed as a special day of prayer to ask for peace 'and for the Divine blessing to rest upon the cause on behalf of which the British Empire and the Allies are now engaged in war'.⁵

²West Australian, 11 August 1914.
³Adelaide Advertiser, 12 August 1914.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Brisbane Courier, 14 August 1914.
On that Sunday, the second of the war, preachers spoke of the crisis in similar terms to those of the previous week but the concentration of attention was less intense. In the main Melbourne churches preachers forgot the war and discussed instead the relationship between religion and science, to coincide with the visit of the British Association. In Adelaide the religious event of the day was the consecration of the Rev. Dr Spence, O.P., as the coadjutor Catholic archbishop. Many members of the Australian hierarchy attended the ceremony and the preacher, the Rev. John Ryan, the provincial-superior of the Jesuits, made only passing reference to the war.¹ In Melbourne in the absence of two archbishops, the Advocate reported the sermon of Dr Kelly, the parish priest of North Fitzroy. He displayed many of the characteristic features of the Catholic sermon of the time. He said that God sent the war to punish the nations which had persecuted the church, he protested against the hoodlums who molested people with German names and he asked people to pray for peace and that the war would benefit the church.² The editor congratulated Dr Kelly for striking the truly Christian note and contrasted his performance with that of a Victorian country vicar who wore his medals in the pulpit and delivered a sermon on the virtues of the Anglo-Saxon race.³ An article in the Methodist gave an account of another country service at Uralla, a small town eight miles south of Armidale in New South Wales.

The church was crowded and extra seating accommodation had to be provided. Members of the Giswych Shire Council and the Uralla Municipal Council were present officially. A church parade of the Commonwealth forces and the rifle club was held, and led by the local Salvation Army band, the troops marched to the church. The Rev. J.W. Dains preached from the text 'the ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly'. The church was decorated with flags of our Nation, and a reverent

¹Southern Cross, 21 August 1914.
²Advocate, 22 August 1914.
³Ibid.
and attentive congregation followed the discourse. The service closed with the hymn 'God bless our native land'.

This form of church activity soon became known as a 'patriotic service'.

After the first exciting days public interest in churchmen's views on the war waned. Editors of the daily newspapers gave considerable space to reports of the first sermons about the war; subsequent sermons were barely reported. Soon the special daily intercession services lapsed; weekly services replaced them. Perhaps clergymen experienced difficulty in finding something new to say about the war each day. The early flurry subsided and churchmen settled into an appropriate pattern of conduct.

Few church governing bodies met during August 1914 so that a churchman's view, as it came from the pulpit, was the private opinion of the preacher unsupported by the backing of the official bodies of the churches. This made the general unanimity of opinion even more remarkable. However some councils of the various churches did meet in August and they endorsed the efforts of their ministers. The Presbytery of Sydney expressed its 'profound sense of the seriousness of the war' and called on ministers, office-bearers and people to pray for a satisfactory and lasting peace and rejoiced at the unity and loyalty of Australia and the Empire. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Western Australia expressed intense loyalty to the King and the hope that the war would be the last to disrupt the world. The Wangaratta

1Methodist, 22 August 1914. Despite confident predictions to the contrary the country press proved a disappointing source of sermons. I read 17 country newspapers from all states except Queensland and Tasmania for August 1914 and only three reported sermons. Others gave some account of various patriotic meetings organised in the early days of the war in which churchmen of all denominations played a prominent part.

2Church bodies met at a pre-determined time each year and were not summoned on an ad hoc basis to discuss crises as they arose.

3PM, 28 August 1914.

4West Australian, 6 August 1914.
diocesan synod began its deliberations on 3 August but made no mention of the war.¹

Anglican leaders, however, guided the thoughts of the clergy and laity through the pastoral letters they wrote in the early weeks of the war. The four bishops of the Victorian province showed how acquiescent they were in the decisions of the government by beginning a letter which they published on 14 August with the observation that 'into the causes which have plunged our own Empire and the greater part of the civilised world into war, we need not enquire, but we feel the justice of our Empire's cause'.² They exhorted the people to accept whatever suffering might be necessary to assist the Empire and asked them to co-operate to the fullest extent with the State and Commonwealth authorities, to respond to every call of duty and to support relief appeals as they sprang up. The bishops directed the clergy to call the people to prayer and warned them against 'all boastfulness of power or pride' in their sermons.³ They asked clergy and laity to continue to support the church and all its works and suggested that thoughts of passion or vindictiveness towards the enemy were inappropriate for Christian people. Finally, the bishops commended their charges to the care of God.⁴ By refusing to discuss the causes of the war the bishops rejected the view that the church should scrutinise the actions of governments in the light of Christian principles. Instead they showed Christians how to apply those principles in the situation of war. Bishop Thomas of Adelaide went further when he wrote that war had erupted 'in the mysterious providence of God'.⁵ In this way he relieved himself of the duty of assessing the causes of the war and appealed instead to his people to approach God in prayer and penitence.

¹Argus, 4 August 1914.
²CM, 14 August 1914.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Adelaide Advertiser, 19 August 1914.
The editors of the church newspapers unanimously supported the war and reinforced the arguments of the church leaders. While acknowledging that war was a great evil editors agreed that Britain must do her duty and honour her pledges at whatever cost. Britain must not 'barter her soul', seek peace 'at the price of loss of national prestige' or 'surrender the prestige of the British flag to militarism and absolutism'. Editors believed that they knew how the war erupted and why. Germany stood revealed as ambitious and aggressive, a power who would break her word to impose militarism in Europe. Britain had worked valiantly for peace, only declaring war when a diplomatic solution became impossible. However Britain could not allow Germany to trample underfoot 'progress and liberty', 'the basic principles of European Christendom', or 'the principles that affect powerfully every interest of our modern civilisation'. Britain vindicated these principles and virtues, the editors wrote, when she went to the rescue of poor, weak Belgium. They also agreed that the Germans as a whole had not wished to go to war. Readers learnt that there were two Germanies. The majority of the people were peace-loving and industrious and had lifted Germany to pre-eminence in thought and research. However the Prussian war-lords dominated these people and imposed their love of war on them. The editor of the Church Standard hoped that one result of the war would be the discrediting of the war-lords, allowing the peace-loving section of the people to direct national policy. However, the editor of the Church Messenger blamed the German theologians as well as the war-lords. The theologians undermined the

1CM. 14 August 1914.
2Advocate. 8 August 1914.
3Methodist. 22 August 1914.
4CM. 14 August 1914.
5CS. 14 August 1914.
6Methodist. 22 August 1914.
7CS. 14 August 1914.
Christian faith so that the people were defenceless against the suggestions of the war-party.  

The editors were in agreement, too, when they discussed how Christians should react to the situation. Christ preached peace on earth and, as God ruled over all, Christian people should pray that peace would be restored. The editor of the Church Standard argued that because the conflict did not violate the demands of the Christian conscience, Christians might also pray for victory. Nor should eligible Christians hesitate to fight. An article in the Presbyterian Messenger discussed the question of pacifism and showed that a close reading of the Bible supported the doctrine of resistance. In any case, the writer noted, pacifism would lead to anarchy. Only J.C. Carruthers in the Methodist worried about the consequences of war for religious belief. He disputed that war indicated the failure of Christianity; rather it indicated the failure of the nations to embrace Christianity. God alone could give peace and he would do so when the nations accepted Christianity wholeheartedly.

The Catholic newspapers diverged only slightly from this norm. They aired their Australian nationalism by showing a greater concern about the effect of the war on Australia. A writer in the Freeman's Journal feared that Australia would be absorbed within the German empire should Germany win. The Catholic newspapers also concentrated on Ireland's reaction to the war noting how close was the co-operation between Great Britain and Ireland. Articles boasted of the bravery and

---

1 CM, 28 August 1914.
2 CS, 14 August 1914.
3 PM, 28 August 1914.
4 Methodist, 22 August 1914.
5 The editor of the Brisbane Age believed that 'if there is to be a patriotic movement on Australia's part at the present juncture, let it take the shape of a genuine scheme of Australian national defence'. 8 August 1914.
6 FJ, 6 August 1914.
7 Advocate, 15 August 1914.
loyalty of the Irish soldiers while others pointed out that the Empire fought to defend Catholic Belgium and Catholic France.¹ One of the most rabid pro-Irish Catholic papers in Australia, the Melbourne Tribune, saw support for Britain as the lesser of two evils: 'it is not perhaps that we love England with her Irish oppression more. But we in Australia would like her enemies less'.² In their interest in Ireland and the Catholic countries of Europe Catholic editors showed that their aspirations were different from those of the Protestants. However, Catholic and Protestant alike gave loyal support to the war effort.

Church editors discussed the war in much the same terms as secular editors. No editor wrote at length about the problem war raised for Christianity or the merits of the case for the present war. Instead they chose an uncritical acquiescence in the decisions of the British and Australian governments. There was no evidence that readers regretted this approach. In these early days no correspondent in any church newspaper argued that his church should adopt a different position in relation to the war. In many respects, so far as the war was concerned, church papers seemed to be merely smaller and less immediate versions of the daily papers. However church editors lacked the resources of their secular colleagues and were not well situated for their self-appointed role as war correspondents. The editor of the Presbyterian Messenger predicted that the war would be horrendous and pictured Germany friendlessly facing the Allies, Britain, France and Austria [sic].³ T.C. Brennan in the Advocate wrote of the war as a conflict between the Slavic and Teutonic races.⁴

---

¹The editor of the Southern Cross was enthusiastically pro-Belgium. He wrote that 'the magnificent fight put up by heroic little Belgium is an object lesson in what a united Catholic monarch, Government, and people can do. Catholics have always been proud of Belgium as the model Catholic country of modern times.' 14 August 1914.

²Tribune, 8 August 1914.

³PM, 14 August 1914.

⁴Advocate, 8 August 1914.
By the end of August churchmen had established the outlines of their reaction to the war. Their religious convictions and their theology allowed them to accept war as part of God's providential plan for the world by which he would lead men to a better understanding of the purpose of life. Churchmen modified their initial reactions as the circumstances of the war changed but adhered to these fundamental beliefs for the entire war period.

Even as the novelty of war lessened preachers continued to devote much of their attention to it; one minister complained: 'I can't keep the war out of my sermons'.\(^1\) Despite the increasingly gloomy news from the battlefield churchmen remained optimistic. Wright suggested that the fall of Antwerp, supposedly defended by an impregnable fort, was a 'victory of machiavellian policy on the part of our astute allies'.\(^2\) A Catholic priest, Edward Le Maitre, reassured an audience that 'the German tactics of hurling huge, overwhelming, compact masses against them might inflict a few insignificant reverses at first' but the Allies would triumph in the end 'under the leadership of brilliant, veteran generals'.\(^3\)

Churchmen found difficulty in advocating toleration and respect for Germans as the stories of atrocities became more frequent and more compelling. Their reaction to these stories showed how difficult it was for a Christian to retain his balance about the war. On the one hand he must reject the spirit of hate shown by the Melbourne Argus which announced 'A Good Day - Slaughter of 3000 Germans in Ten Minutes' and on the other he must not condone what he believed to be atrocities.\(^4\) At this early stage of the war most churchmen warned their congregations to treat the stories with a good deal of scepticism. The editress of the Ladies Page of the Presbyterian Messenger explained that 'nothing shall be stated here, and no incident, however tempting, used to support an

\(^1\)PM, 4 September 1914. The minister did not identify himself.  
\(^2\)SDM, November 1914.  
\(^3\)Austral Light, October 1914.  
\(^4\)Commented upon unfavourable in Australian Christian World, 27 November 1914 (hereafter cited as ACW).
argument, or help make a case, proofs of which I cannot produce'. Yet only a month before the editor of the same paper had written that the German empire had set itself deliberately 'on the side of the devil' and argued that the Allies should adopt 'delenda est Germania' as their motto. Nor, as the months passed, did churchmen extend much toleration to those whom they thought were 'soft' on the war. Thus, when a Methodist attempted to modify his synod's war resolution Carruthers wrote that such views 'would have rejoiced the heart of the Kaiser and his friends'. Sir William Cullen, the Chief Justice of New South Wales, warned churchmen not to equivocate about the war and the Germans. He asked them not to preach sermons 'directed towards modifying any spirit of resentment' because such sermons wasted the congregations' time and took 'the fibre out of the men who could help us if they threw their whole heart and soul into the work'. He expected churchmen to modify their principles rather than retard the nation's cause. Sensitive clergymen appreciated the difficulty involved in walking such a tight-rope.

In the face of such dangers churchmen sustained themselves by the hope that war would wean men and nations from their materialism and lead them to a more generous acceptance of Christianity. Wright stated that the church must educate the soul while it was responsive; he believed that the war would force men to think about eternal things, thus preparing them for a religious message. Australian Catholics discovered a

1PM, 27 November 1914.
2PM, 23 October 1914.
3Methodist, 7 November 1914. The motion was hardly bellicose by later standards. It included horror of war as unsocial, inhuman and unchristian on the part of those who provoked it, admiration for the self-sacrificing spirit of the Empire and commendation of Australian soldiers to God's care.
4Daily Telegraph, 12 December 1914. Sir William was addressing the Sydney University Evening Student's at their annual dinner.
5Church of England, Diocese of Sydney, Proceedings of the Third Session of the Sixteenth Synod, Diocese of Sydney, September 28th to October 1st 1914, Sydney, 1914, p.35.
spiritual renewal in France soon after the war began. Stories of the return of the French people to the church proliferated in Catholic newspapers as did accounts of the gallantry of the Catholic priests and brothers who were compelled to take their place in the army. Catholics felt that they had a real stake in a war which was fought on Catholic soil and whose victims were largely Catholic.

As the war progressed churchmen assumed the duty of encouraging men to join the Australian forces. Archbishop Donaldson advocated increased enlistment in a pastoral letter he wrote soon after his return from England. He argued that victory would come to the side which placed the greatest number of trained men in the field. Two Australian contingents formed an insufficient contribution. He believed that God had given a special commission to the British Empire to promote freedom, justice and a sympathy with the native races of the world. Were God to revoke the commission the Empire would obey. However, when another nation tried to interfere the Empire must resist or be guilty of rebellion against God's plans. So Donaldson prayed 'that no single man of British blood, no single Australian of fighting age, will be backward to take the sword'.

The church papers, too, began to plead for recruits. By November a writer in the Presbyterian Messenger remarked that any single, fit young man who had not enlisted was either a

---

1 An editorial in the Freeman's Journal, 'War-like Sons of the Church', celebrated the 20,000 French soldier-priests. The writer believed the priests had no reason to support the French government which, in the past, had proved itself an ardent foe of the church. The priests fought because they loved their country and because patriotism was a religious duty. They took up arms in a sacred cause following the tradition of those popes who rode at the head of armies to prevent the conquest of Europe by infidels. FJ, 10 September 1914.

2 Typical of the 'Catholic interest' approach to war news was the page 'European War' in the Advocate, 28 November 1914. The paragraph headings were: 'Irish Volunteers', 'The Priest and the Cross', 'Viaticum by Aeroplane', 'From an Anglican Vicar at the Front', 'A Nun's Heroism', 'Chaplain's Touching Story', 'The Rosary in the Trenches', 'A Pathetic Incident' in which a man and his mother were killed by a bomb as they walked to Mass.

3 CS, 27 November 1914.
shirker or a coward. Some clergymen recognised the limitation of their right to advise others to fight. Thus, when the Rev. Charles Perry moved at the Melbourne Anglican Synod in November that 'recognising the exceptional opportunities of the Parochial Clergy to encourage the enlistment of men for active service in the war, [we suggest] they avail themselves of them', several members of the synod spoke in opposition to the motion. One suggested that recruiting was proceeding satisfactorily, another remarked that Anglican parishes had already sent a generous quota of young men. The Rev. J.T. Baglin disputed the right of synod to direct a minister to preach on a specific topic and said he would disobey any such directive. Perry withdrew the motion when he saw that it would not attract unanimous support. The interest churchmen showed in recruiting indicated the danger of unreality in their view of the war. At that early stage there was no lack of volunteers; in fact, the Defence department was unable to accommodate all who applied. Because churchmen looked at war from the point of view of their religion they were tempted to concern themselves more with the religious consequences of participation and victory than with the practical or political consequences. After all, the nations fought to conquer rather than to experience Christian renewal.

In their initial reaction to the war churchmen committed themselves to an attitude which most retained for four and a half years. Of course, when war broke out they had no suspicion that it would last so long. They showed that their opinions were much influenced by the society in which they lived. All Australian spokesmen in the early days of the war displayed the effect of their remoteness from the centre of things and their inexperience of all forms of organised conflict.

---

1PM, 20 November 1914.
2CM, 18 December 1914.
3Ibid.
4Ibid.
5Scott, Australia, p.208 and p.209, footnote 30, where T.W. Heney vividly recorded the rush to enlist.
There was no tradition of dissent within the Australian community so the few dissenters received little toleration. Nor were the Australian leaders, on the whole, educated men who could examine a question dispassionately. Because of these shortcomings, historians, particularly Ernest Scott, have emphasised the unanimity of Australians when war broke out.\(^1\) Such unanimity was not well based and was quickly blown away when matters of local interest intruded on the loyalty of Australians. Churchmen, too, mistook this unanimity and were encouraged by it to give wholehearted support to the war effort. They used such Christian theology as they knew to make their support more respectable. Initially churchmen adhered to the Christian precepts of love for one's enemies, of justice and of toleration but within a few months they found themselves caught by the war machine and some began to discard these virtues. Churchmen, who in August had accepted war happily, understood by December that war was a demanding god.

\(^1\)Scott, Australia, p.23. See also Dan Coward, 'The Impact of War on New South Wales', Ph.D. Thesis, A.N.U., 1974, Chapter 2, pp.33-72, where he throws considerable doubt on the extent of the unanimity.
Chapter 3

THE CHAPLAINS AND THE A.I.F.

It is worth leaving even Collingwood for this.

Chaplain Gault, *Methodist*,
6 November 1915
So far much was rhetoric. Clergymen, however, soon demonstrated their concern for the troops and for the cause they preached about by their readiness to enlist in the A.I.F. Some believed that it was their duty to serve in the ranks, others sought to minister as chaplains to the spiritual needs of the troops.\(^1\) Traditionally priests had an honoured role in the army.\(^2\) The Australian army accepted this tradition and made provision for clergymen to serve in the training camps in Australia and to accompany the troops when they fought overseas. The first Australian chaplains to see active service worked with the Australians who fought against the Boers in South Africa.\(^3\)

In 1913 the Defence department initiated a reorganisation of the chaplaincy and conferred with representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist churches at one meeting and with representatives of the Catholic church at another.\(^4\) The representatives accepted the proposals put before them. Each of the four denominations agreed to appoint a chaplain-general who was to arrange all administrative matters between his church and the army. The chaplains-general selected all chaplains; the army had no control over such appointments. At these conferences the churchmen agreed that each church should be represented by an equal number of chaplains.\(^5\) The smaller Protestant bodies resented their exclusion from the chaplaincy and during the course of the following year the Defence

---

\(^1\)Churchmen debated the propriety of ordained men serving in the ranks. This debate and the experiences of those who enlisted are discussed in chapter six.


\(^3\)Australia, Defence Department, *Official Records of the Australian Military Contingents to the War in South Africa*, compiled and edited for the Department by Lieut.-Colonel P.L. Murray, Melbourne, n.d. [1912], passim. Seventeen chaplains left Australia for South Africa.

\(^4\)Defence Dept, A.I.F. 1914-1917, MP 133/1, 82/1/24 and MP 133/2, 82/1/24, AA, Melbourne.

\(^5\)Ibid.
department made some provision for them. When war broke out
departmental officials decided, apparently on their own
initiative, that it would be unfair to allow each denomination
the same number of chaplains and decided to use the figures of
religious adherence in the 1911 census as a means of
determining the proportion for each denomination. The
officials assumed that the men of each church would enlist in
proportion to the denomination's strength and expected to find
that, for example, 39.40 per cent of the A.I.F. were Anglicans.
Churchmen of the various denominations boasted that their men
had enlisted in numbers in excess of the denominational
proportion and badgered the department to allow them to recruit
additional chaplains. Archbishop Donaldson was convinced that
the Anglicans were under-represented and persuaded the Defence
department to allow clergymen to work on the transports as
honorary chaplains, without pay or rank.

The chaplains-general selected men to serve either
continuously, which meant they must spend at least a year on
active service, or for 'the voyage only' where they were
required to accompany a troopship to England or Egypt and
return to Australia, as soon as possible, with a hospital ship.
While the Defence department imposed age limits of 30 to 48
continuous service and 30 to 52 for the 'voyage only', these
were not always observed. The department rejected
Ashley-Brown's application because he was 15 months under age

---

1 See, for example, the request of the Salvation Army to be
included in the chaplaincy. Defence Dept, A.I.F. 1914-1917,
MP 133/2, 82/1/109, AA, Melbourne.

2 In a letter, 12 July 1915, the Adjutant-General, Lt. Col.
T.H. Dodds reminded Chaplain-General Riley that there had been
no suggestion at the 1913 conferences that chaplains should be
allotted in proportion to the census returns. He then gave
the census figures and said that chaplains were allotted in
proportion to the denomination's strength. Defence Dept,
General Correspondence 1917/29, MP 367, 431/8/1674, AA,
Melbourne.

3 Ibid. Dodds' letter was a reply to such badgering.

4 Defence Dept, MP 943/5, 82/1/570, AA, Melbourne.

5 Defence Dept, General Correspondence 1917/29, MP 367,
431/8/41, AA, Melbourne.
but accepted Hearn's although he was over 60. Many of the 'voyage only' chaplains had little real contact with the troops and minimal experience of the war and returned to Australia with ill-informed impressions of the nature and progress of the fighting and of the thinking of the troops. Chaplains for continuous service fitted into the structure of the A.I.F. and gained a more intimate understanding of the men and the war. Each continuous chaplain was assigned to a brigade in such a way that each brigade, which consisted of four battalions or four thousand men, had four chaplains, two Anglican, one Catholic and one Protestant. The chaplain lived with a particular battalion and naturally became more closely associated with it but he was expected to minister to all the members of his denomination in the brigade. Thus the Catholic chaplain ministered, ideally, to 800 men; in fact the number of Catholics in the brigade may have been well above or well below this number. Chaplains also worked with the support units, at the hospitals and in the base camps in Egypt, France and England; again Army commanders assigned them to their tasks with some pretence of mathematical precision. No more than one hundred chaplains served at any one time because even at its peak the A.I.F. consisted of only sixty battalions. The A.I.F. reached full strength in the later years of the war so that in the early days considerably less than one hundred chaplains worked with the Army. Because the Defence department decided in August 1915 that 'continuous' chaplains need serve only for one year there was considerable movement among chaplains as one resigned and another arrived to take his place. The freedom involved in resigning at will gave a chaplain a different perspective from the troops who were committed to the A.I.F. until the fighting ceased or injury or death intervened.

---

1 *CS*, 10 September 1915 and *Advocate*, 1 April 1916.

2 F.H. Durnford letter, 17 May 1922, to Director, AWM, Canberra, Uncat. MS. According to the late A.W. Bazley, Bean hoped to include a book on the chaplains in his *Official History* and contacted many of the chaplains who, in the early 1920s, sent him their reminiscences and reflections. The planned book was later abandoned but the reminiscences remain at the War Memorial.
During the four years of war 414 clergymen served as chaplains with the A.I.F.\textsuperscript{1} Of these there were 175 Anglicans (42.27 per cent), 86 Catholics (20.77 per cent), 70 Presbyterians (16.90 per cent), 54 Methodists (13.04 per cent) and 27 'Other Protestant Denominations' (6.52 per cent).\textsuperscript{2} It is not surprising that OPDs were under-represented in the A.I.F. because it was not possible to allot the representatives of very small sects on the brigade basis. The Jewish chaplain, for example, was given a roving commission within the A.I.F. because he never found sufficient adherents to justify his attachment to one brigade.\textsuperscript{3} The under-representation of the Catholics may have been due to the difficulty Catholics experienced in choosing between the parish ministry and work among the soldiers. There were often vacancies for Catholic chaplains; this never occurred amongst the Protestants.\textsuperscript{4}

The statistics also give some idea of the type of clergymen who became a chaplain. In general, chaplains came from all Australian states, were between thirty and forty years of age, that is, younger than most of their fellow clergymen and older than most soldiers, and a significant number were neither born nor educated in Australia. Of the 147 of the 175 Anglican chaplains for whom information is available most had some, but few had lengthy, pastoral experience. There were instances of men who were ordained to fill a vacant chaplaincy. Fifty-eight of the chaplains received ordination after 1910, forty-six between 1900 and 1910 and

\textsuperscript{1}The Defence department did not publish a list of chaplains either during or after the war. I found the names of these 414 men by checking the monthly gradation lists of new officers and cross-checking with church newspapers and other sources. A private statistical record book of the Defence department shows that 424 chaplains left Australia but some chaplains sailed twice.

\textsuperscript{2}The gradation lists give the denomination of each chaplain.

\textsuperscript{3}The Jews accounted for 0.40 per cent of the population in the 1911 census. Commonwealth of Australia, Census, vol.1, part 1, April 1911, p.201.

\textsuperscript{4}On 27 February 1917 the Defence department received a message from A.I.F. headquarters in London: 'absolutely necessary for 1 Roman Catholic chaplain to be with each Brigade. Total number required is 47 and 11 still required'. Defence Dept, MP 943/5, 62/2/1044, AA, Melbourne.
twenty-three before 1900; forty-seven of the chaplains were English. Men enlisted fairly equally from amongst the dioceses. The biggest dioceses, Sydney and Melbourne, sent eighteen and nineteen men apiece, the medium sized ones sent between six and ten men and the small country dioceses usually released three men for the work. The diocese of Ballarat departed from this general picture by allowing seventeen men to go to the front as chaplains. The diocese lacked a bishop between 1915 and 1917 and this may have given the clergy more freedom. ¹ Catholic chaplains were drawn evenly in proportion to the strength of the various dioceses. Archbishop Kelly released only five of his priests for the work and made up the numbers with ten religious priests who were not normally in the front line of parochial work. Only another ten religious were recruited from the rest of Australia. Catholic chaplains were in the forty-five to fifty age group and thus were slightly older than the Anglicans. ² All but nine of the seventy Presbyterians came from Victoria and New South Wales, but, as we have seen, Presbyterianism was spread thinly in the four smaller states. The majority of Presbyterian chaplains began their ministry in the church between 1900 and 1910; nineteen began before 1900 and eighteen after 1910. ³ Methodist chaplains conformed to this age pattern and enlisted in almost equal numbers from New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia where Methodism was strongest.⁴

A chaplain entered the army when he received his commission from the Governor-General. The commission emphasised that the chaplain was a part of the A.I.F. and that his function was to assist the well-being of the whole. He now

¹These figures are drawn from the biographical information in Crockford's Clerical Directory, London, 1915.
³Information drawn from Presbyterian Church of Australia, Yearbook of the Presbyterian Church of Australia for 1915, Melbourne, 1915.
⁴Information drawn from William Hunt (ed.), Methodist Ministerial Index for Australasia and New Zealand, Being a Record of Methodist Ministers in Active Service and Supernumeraries, Fifth edition revised to 1914, Melbourne, 1914.
divided his allegiance between his church and the A.I.F. The commission required the chaplain to perform his duty 'carefully and diligently'; he was to 'exercise and well discipline...both the inferior officers and the men serving under [him]'; they must obey him 'as their superior officer' and he must 'observe...such orders' as he received from his superior officers.¹

Most of the clergymen who applied found difficulty in securing a chaplaincy; applications greatly exceeded vacancies. Churchmen volunteered for many different reasons. Murphy, a Catholic priest, asked his bishop for permission to volunteer because he could not tolerate the thought of the boys dying at the front without the consolations of a priest.² McAuliffe, another Catholic, saw himself not as a priest but as 'a member of the Expeditionary Force which has been formed to help in the defence of the British Empire'.³ He fought for the Empire in the only way open to him as a priest. Gault, a Methodist, wanted to serve 'Australia's best manhood' which he had watched pour from Australia in the interests of king and country.⁴ Others enlisted for family reasons. Dow, a Presbyterian, said that as two of his wife's brothers had been killed at the front he could not look her in the face again if he stayed at home.⁵ Gribble lost his two sons in the fighting and went to continue their work.⁶ Stewart was interested to explore the effect of war on his personality and faith: 'I went away in this great quest for something for myself...I wanted to see if my lot cast in pleasant places would have a faith that would stand up in

¹CM, 28 August 1914.
³FJ, 17 September 1914.
⁴Spectator, 9 July 1915.
⁵PM, 21 June 1918.
⁶CS, 26 October 1917. Gribble was the Anglican rector of Coonamble.
the midst of the realities of the lot of the camp'.\(^1\) Cyril Golding-Bird, the newly installed bishop of the Goldfields, volunteered because he must go to England anyway and he thought he could be useful on the trip. He looked forward to sharing 'in some of our men's hardships, and perhaps in some small way [helping] the wounded and dying'.\(^2\) Although appointed for continuous service the bishop journeyed on to England when the troops unexpectedly landed in Egypt and saw no more of them.\(^3\)

While Protestant clergymen swamped their chaplains-general with applications for the few positions available, Archbishop Carr, the Catholic chaplain-general, experienced difficulty, from the beginning, in finding enough chaplains. Catholic bishops and priests wished to maintain the highest level of parochial efficiency. They resolved that the work of the church in Australia should not be an early casualty of the war. On 11 October 1914 Carr asked O'Reily to provide one of the two priests required for the second contingent.\(^4\) O'Reily replied on 20 October that although he had spared no pains he had been unable to find the right man: 'some are too weakly, some are unsuitable, others are unwilling to go'.\(^5\) The archbishop turned from his own men to the religious priests of the diocese and discovered two who were prepared to volunteer. He asked the priests' overseas superiors to release them but 'a cable message to each Provincial brought back a direct refusal'.\(^6\) However by 24 October o'Reily reported that he had accepted the offer of one of his own priests who had volunteered earlier. He had rejected the man's offer at first because he served a large, country parish and there was no one

---

1PM (V), 17 November 1916. Macrae Stewart was born in Scotland in 1862 and had been minister at Malvern, Victoria, since 1903. On his return to Australia he was elected Moderator of the Victorian Presbyterian Church. Who's Who, 1922, p.261.

2CS, 18 September 1914.

3Defence Dept, MP 943/5, 82/1/214 and 82/1/217, AA, Melbourne.

4Carr to O'Reily, 11 October 1914, O'Reily/Spence Papers, Catholic Church Office, Adelaide. Untitled letterbook [No. 6].

5O'Reily to Carr, 20 October 1914, O'Reily/Spence Papers, Catholic Church Office, Adelaide, File, '1914'.

6Ibid.
O'Reily's inability to secure anyone else forced him to fall back on this priest, McGrath, whom he described as conscientious, fit and forty, and a good speaker. Other bishops experienced similar difficulties and the Catholic chaplaincy was often below its authorised strength. Nor were all Catholic chaplains volunteers in the strict sense. Mullins opened his war diary with the observation that he was surprised when his bishop asked him to go to the front; but 'after quite an anxious time...[he] decided to accede to the request of the Bishop'. Because of the suspicions aroused about Catholic loyalty after the conscription debate one priest, at least, experienced difficulty in taking his place in the A.I.F. On the appointment of W.A. Ryan of Camperdown the department of Defence received a message from another Camperdown resident that Ryan was disloyal. Although Carr protested at the imputation the Director-General of Recruiting interviewed Ryan before allowing him to embark.

When a chaplain cleared the initial hurdle and gained admission to the A.I.F. he underwent an enormous change in life-style. Where he had been accustomed to a quiet, regular life of study, parlour and pulpit, on joining the A.I.F. he found himself in harsh and primitive surroundings, uncomfortable and often dangerous. He exchanged an orderly and ordered life-style for an unconventional and irregular one. He expected deference and respect from his flock; he found that in the A.I.F. his authority derived not from his position in the church but from what he was within himself. A chaplain

---

1O'Reily to Carr, 20 October 1914, O'Reily/Spence Papers, Catholic Church Office, Adelaide, File '1914'. McGrath might, in fact, have been a conscript because O'Reily wrote to him 20 October: 'what do you think of offering your services? The troops cannot be left without spiritual help.' There is no hint that O'Reily was acting on McGrath's prior offer. O'Reily to McGrath, 20 October 1914.

2See footnote 4, p.57.

3'Diary of Chaplain the Rev. T. Mullins (M.C.)', AWM, File number L/12/11/1436, p.I. Mullins was parish priest of Ardelethan, New South Wales, and had been born in Limerick, Ireland, in 1877. He became senior Catholic chaplain in Egypt in 1917.

4Defence Dept, MP 943/5, 82/2/997, AA, Melbourne.
received no training when he came to his new work, nor did he have much time to acquaint himself with army customs. Canon Cue observed that many of the criticisms of chaplains should be tempered by an appreciation of these initial difficulties. After the war chaplains lamented that they had not been given some form of induction and training before they began their work. South Australian district headquarters referred Chaplain Moody to a firm of Adelaide tailors for advice about whether he should wear breeches or slacks. Racklyeft received instructions of a rudimentary kind; a warrant officer told him that his duties were 'to do everything well out of the colonel's sight', 'or just fit in as you can', 'you wear slacks instead of breeches...'. Armed with these instructions - and not knowing a regular staff sergeant from a colonel, and further not knowing anything about the wearing of military dress...the Chaplain was left to his own knowledge and sense of fitness.' Some chaplains met their charges for the first time when they boarded the troopship. This first encounter frightened Chaplain Blackwood because many of the soldiers were inebriated by the time they arrived at the wharf having drunk freely on the march. Some were so drunk they had to be carried aboard. Blackwood's 'first feelings were that I should shut myself up in my cabin. Even there I would not find any refuge. From outside my cabin floated in the most fearful language I had ever heard.'

Despite such early misgivings most chaplains enjoyed their ten weeks or so aboard the troopship and found that the voyage offered great opportunities for spiritual work. An elderly

---

1 John A. Cue to Director, AWM, undated, AWM Uncat. MS.
2 W.A. Moody, 'Experiences as a Chaplain in the AIF', AWM, Uncat. MS.
3 R.C. Racklyeft, 'Notes on Chaplaincy Work with the AIF', 10 December 1921, AWM, Uncat. MS.
4 D.B. Blackwood, 'Experiences of Revd. Donald B. Blackwood, M.C., M.A., Th. Schol., as Chaplain in the A.I.F. October 1915 to February 1919, and Impressions gained as Chaplain', written 20 January 1922, AWM, Uncat., MS. Blackwood later became bishop of Bendigo. A number of his letters from the front are held by Tasmanian Archives. I have not had an opportunity to consult them.
minister wrote enthusiastically of this time: 'suffice to say that I have enjoyed every minute of the voyage, and have not missed a single meal, afternoon tea included'.\(^1\) Others wrote of what they believed were the spiritual benefits and opportunities. Wilson Smith noted that his A.I.F. congregation would fill his parish church four times over\(^2\) while Bossence, a Catholic, observed that the war was doing the work of a world-wide mission. He found that a small number of the 314 Catholics on board knew nothing of their religion while thirty others had been out of touch with the church for over a decade; two Catholics wore Anglican discs to escape the attention of the priest. Bossence rounded them all up and, together with seven converts, gave them instruction so that by the end of the voyage all were 'safe in Mother Church'.\(^3\) Blackwood recovered and found that 'there never was presented to an earnest man greater opportunity for spiritual work'.\(^4\) Because of this, many chaplains felt very happy in their first contact with the men of the A.I.F. Hennessy wrote that he experienced 'the happiest days of [his] life as well as the most fruitful of [his] ministry' on the troopship.\(^5\) Buckley described an occasion on which he held a Men's Rally as 'one of the greatest and happiest of [his] life' and added 'I am more than glad I came'.\(^6\)

A chaplain's only official duty on board the troopship was to hold a church parade each Sunday but most chaplains also arranged Bible classes, confirmation classes (if Anglican or Catholic), meetings, voluntary services and song services. In addition the chaplains were usually appointed to the sport and entertainment committees and became censors of the mail. This

\(^1\) John Kemp Bruce in \textit{PM}, 16 March 1916. Bruce was ordained in 1880, minister of Wahroonga 1898-1918, died on active service 9 February 1918. Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, \textit{Minutes of Assembly}, 1918, p.21.

\(^2\) \textit{PM}, 23 March 1917.

\(^3\) \textit{Advocate}, 20 January 1917.

\(^4\) \textit{CS}, 28 January 1916.

\(^5\) J.F. Hennessy, 'My experiences as a chaplain with the AIF', [undated], AWM, Uncat. MS.

\(^6\) \textit{CM}, 10 August 1917.
last job, McLean reported, involved a tremendous amount of work but the men wanted the chaplain to do it because they felt they could trust his discretion. Chaplains also visited the ships' hospitals and mixed with the men on the decks. Some chaplains undertook special work. C.F. Brown made the elimination of 'filthy talk' his chief occupation during the voyage. He called on each mess table in turn and asked every man to sign a pledge against the use of bad language. 'They received me well', he claimed, 'and now little of that stuff is heard on board.' In spite of Brown's hard work, G.R.S. Reid warned people not to judge soldiers by appearances: 'beneath rough language and even foul talk there may lie good fighting qualities'. Often troopships carried more than one Protestant chaplain and in most cases members of the different denominations were happy to join in a united church parade. Buckley boasted that he and the Presbyterian, Goller, preached alternately at the united parade while Clark went a step further and held united Bible classes with the Anglicans. In some cases the officer commanding the troopship insisted that the church parade be united. E. Jellicoe Rogers resented this form of interference in church affairs. His superior officer directed a Presbyterian, as senior chaplain, to conduct the united parade. When Rogers explained that over half the men on board were Anglicans the officer permitted him to conduct an Anglican service once every three weeks.

Chaplains received indications of the success of their troopship work by counting the numbers of men who attended the various voluntary services. On the troopship chaplains were able to organise these services to coincide with the men's free time and so those who did not attend chose not to do so.

1 *Presbyterian Banner* (South Australia), November 1915.
2 *SDM*, December 1918.
3 *PM*, 13 April 1917.
4 *CM*, 13 July 1917. Buckley was an Anglican.
5 *PM*, 4 May 1917. Clark was a Presbyterian.
6 E. Jellicoe Rogers letter to the Director, *AWM*, 5 December 1921, *AWM*, Uncat. MS.
Troopships carried between 1,200 and 2,000 men and chaplains attracted remarkably few of these men to their services. At the beginning of his journey Garland mustered only twelve men for communion and increased this to fifty by the end of the journey. He was dissatisfied and commented that 'we have failed to give our men church teaching'. Another chaplain reported that he had prepared fifteen men for confirmation by the end of the voyage; a Methodist wrote that 1,000 men attended the compulsory church parade, 400 the voluntary service, 40 attended Sunday communion and between 60 and 70 professed conversion. Dains, another Methodist, gave similar figures. His troopship, A17, carried 1,200 men thirty of whom regularly attended Bible classes while fifty took decision-for-Christ cards from him. Burvill, an Anglican, suggested that by the end of the voyage twelve per cent of the troops had made one communion. However, the men gave 'miraculous reverence and attention' to his message at church parade. The most successful Protestant chaplain, in terms of numbers, was Buckley who persuaded 250 men to join the Church of England Men's Society. Catholic chaplains, on the other hand, apparently had little difficulty with their men. McAuliffe, one of the first Catholic chaplains appointed, reported that of the 200 men under his care half had been to confession and the other half would be shriven before the end of the voyage. Hennessy stated that a 'large percentage' of the 1,700 men on his transport were Catholic and that every one of them received communion at midnight Mass on Christmas day. His transport left Sydney on 9 November 1917. Mullins noted that every

1 CS, 22 February 1918.
2 Bush Brother (Anglican), August 1917.
4 Methodist, 15 January 1916.
5 CM, 5 November 1915.
6 CM, 13 July 1917.
7 FJ, 7 January 1915.
8 J.F. Hennessy, 'My experiences as a chaplain with the AIF', [undated], AWM, Uncat. MS.
Catholic 'went to his duty' during the voyage.\(^1\) Even Bossence, who admitted to a few backsliders, boasted of universal observance by the end of the voyage.\(^2\)

The first contingent of Australians landed in Egypt, not in England as had been anticipated. The men settled into a routine and most chaplains took the opportunity to become acquainted with the A.I.F. and the men individually. This was not an easy task. Green wrote that he was the only Methodist minister in a camp of 15,000 men. However he believed he was making an impact because 1,500 men regularly attended his church parade although only 700 in the camp described themselves as Methodists.\(^3\) In some cases the united church parade again caused trouble. Tubman complained that 'at the express request of General Birdwood' he conducted a united parade on Easter Sunday. Tubman 'entered the strongest protest any officer can make' because he saw the service as an attempt 'to unchurch the Church of England'.\(^4\) When Plane and Merrington tried to organise a united parade G. Green, an Anglican, refused to co-operate and so earned the ire of officers and men.\(^5\)

While in Egypt the Australians achieved more notoriety for their leisure activities than for their precision at drill or their eagerness to reach the front. Reports of drunkenness, rioting, looting and vice horrified those Australians who followed the progress of the troops through the daily newspapers.\(^6\) The chaplains told a different story in the

---

\(^1\)Rev. T. Mullins, Diary, p.7.

\(^2\)\textit{Advocate}, 20 January 1917.

\(^3\)\textit{Methodist}, 27 March 1915. James Green was the first Methodist chaplain appointed to the AIF. He was born in England in 1865 and arrived in Australia in 1886. He served as a chaplain with the 1st NSW Bushmen's Contingent in South Africa. On his return from the front in 1917 he became President of the Methodist Conference in NSW. \textit{Who's Who}, 1922, p.112.

\(^4\)\textit{C.S.}, 28 May 1915.

\(^5\)E.N. Merrington was born in New South Wales and ordained to the Presbyterian ministry in 1902. He transferred to Brisbane in 1910, left with the troops in 1914 and was elected Moderator of the Queensland church in 1916. \textit{Who's Who}, 1922, p.191.

newspapers. Chaplains avoided the embargo that was placed on members of the A.I.F. communicating directly with the newspapers and sent detailed accounts of their experiences to church editors. Readers of church newspapers probably had a more intimate understanding of the A.I.F. than any other class of Australians; correspondents in the secular press concentrated on battles and manoeuvres and rarely achieved the human touch that characterised the chaplains' reports. It became clear that one of the most important of the chaplain's functions was to act as an unofficial liaison officer between the troops and the people at home. Furthermore, chaplains frequently wrote to the relatives of the men they met to assure them that all was well. Chaplains invariably sent optimistic accounts back to Australia. J. Green, for example, claimed that there was less drinking among Australians in Cairo than among a comparable group in Australia and that fewer A.I.F. men contracted a venereal disease than did their peers at home.\(^1\) Green believed that the men could be relied upon to give a good account of themselves when they saw action. Green found his Methodist charges even more impressive; late in January and again in February 1915 he wrote that he had not yet found a Methodist in the guard tent.\(^2\) Tubman wrote to Australia with the specific intention of calming public opinion in relation to the Cairo riots. He stated that the reports of misbehaviour were exaggerated. He agreed that some undesirables had found their way into the A.I.F. but contended that they made up no more than 3 per cent of the total. In the same letter Tubman argued for a more equitable distribution of vacant chaplaincies; he claimed that Anglicans and Catholics were not given sufficient chaplains.\(^3\) Chaplains also endeavoured to impress upon their readers how much care the army showed for the troops. Nye described the attention a pneumonia patient received at the 1st Australian General Hospital at Heliopolis. The lad had a special nurse beside him day and night who watched over him with a mother's care. Men on active service had never been

---

\(^1\) *Methodist*, 10 April 1915.  
\(^2\) *Methodist*, 6 March 1915 and 27 March 1915.  
\(^3\) *CS*, 28 May 1915.
treated so well before.\(^1\) Such optimistic accounts relieved the anxiety many Australian mothers felt for their sons; the chaplains performed useful work. In Egypt, however, they realised that they lived on borrowed time: 'our real work will begin when we get into the firing line', Plane wrote cheerfully.\(^2\)

As the destroyers carrying the Australian troops glided towards Gallipoli on 24 April 1915 the chaplains led pre-battle services. The men were subdued and serious, apprehensive of the awful task before them. The chaplains tried to build up the men's confidence. J. Green preached from the text 'sanctify yourselves for tomorrow the Lord will do wonders among you'. He asked the men to consecrate all their powers to God, to be loyal to their comrades and to accept Christ as Lord.\(^3\) Plane assured the men that Christ would always be with them.\(^4\) Fahey reported that every Catholic of the 11th Battalion went to confession in those few hours before the landing.\(^5\) Orders stated that the chaplains must not accompany the troops into action and so they watched from the destroyers as the Australians made their heroic assault on the cliffs of Gallipoli.\(^6\) Only John Fahey managed to evade the order. He felt bound to go wherever his men went and was the only chaplain to take part in the landing.\(^7\)

\(^1\) Methodist, 10 April 1915.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Methodist, 3 July 1915.
\(^4\) Methodist, 31 July 1915.
\(^5\) Advocate, 17 July 1915.
\(^6\) Diary of the Rev. W.E. Dexter in the possession of Mr David Dexter, A.N.U. Entry for 26 April 1915: '4 days ago the Major told me I could not go [with the first troops] as they wanted every rifle they could possibly get into the boats. I felt awfully upset about it.'
\(^7\) When Fahey was told he was not to accompany the troops he is reported to have said, 'No, he would go into the trenches with his men' and was in one of the first tows ashore. Letter to Archbishop Clune from an officer at Gallipoli published in the Advocate, 17 July 1915.
Fahey wrote his account of the landing less than three weeks after the event while he was still cooped up in the hills his comrades had died to gain. At 11 p.m. on 24 April his battalion left Imbros aboard two destroyers. At 3 a.m. they came into line with the other destroyers stationed off Gallipoli. Each destroyer carried six boats in which the men were to approach the shore. No-one spoke or moved as they were towed to the shore; not a shot was to be fired until they landed. They aimed to drive the Turks two or three miles inland from the beach so that the main body of the troops could land in safety. Everything depended on the success of the first thrust; if these men failed the whole enterprise failed. As troops and chaplain glided towards the beach they saw the first light of dawn. Suddenly the heavens opened and from the hills there poured forth a murderous hail of bullets from machine guns and rifles. Each boat carried fifty men and the last 150 yards of the journey stretched nerves to breaking point:

it seemed ages while we were getting there. The sailor in the stern was hit first, then another fell across me; then an oarsman dropped his oar and fell to the bottom of the boat...it was horrible. You could see no enemy. You could not return the fire. You could not take cover...you just had to sit there and wait for your bullet.¹

Fahey felt as if he could stretch out his hand and grab a fistful of bullets: they were everywhere. Despite the horror no man quailed. As soon as the boat struck land the men leapt out, their one wish to rush for the enemy. As Fahey straddled the gunwale a bullet passed between his knees. He scrambled through the water carrying his heavy pack and fearing all the time that he would drown. On reaching the beach he collapsed, exhausted. The hail of bullets continued so he dragged himself further up the beach to a small bank. He tore at the ground

¹Advocate, 31 July 1915. Fahey's name became a household word amongst Australian Catholics as this and subsequent letters were published in almost every Australian Catholic newspaper. John Fahey was a Perth priest born in Ireland. Before the war he worked in a timber-mill district and shared a house with the local Anglican clergyman. He won the DSO at Gallipoli and received it from the King at Buckingham Palace. He was the first president of the Returned Soldiers' League in Western Australia. McMahon, College, Campus, Cloister, pp.234-6.
with his hands to dig cover for his head. Both men beside him were killed. As the battalion reformed Fahey felt a wild desire to grab a dead comrade's rifle and join the charge: 'there seemed to be nothing else to do'. Despite the seeming impossibility of the task the Anzacs drove the Turks from the hill above the beach and secured the position. However the cost was great and Fahey soon found plenty of work comforting the wounded and saying a prayer over the dead. The following days and nights brought no improvement in conditions. In three weeks Fahey shaved once, washed twice and had no change of clothes. He was unable to say Mass. He had some marvellous escapes:

I had four shrapnel bullets through my haversack... I was shot twice through my overcoat without the skin being touched. I had a book shot out of my hand, the jam tin I was eating out of was shot through, a tobacco tin riddled...four shells burst in my dug-out and rattled me...a shell burst over a dug-out and buried me in clay.

The landing taught Fahey a new respect for the Australian soldier: 'if Kitchener had a million of such men, he would clear the Germans out of France and Belgium in no time'.

Other chaplains began to arrive after the middle of May when conditions had improved, but not markedly. The experience at Gallipoli tested the chaplains, some beyond endurance. Murphy noted that two of his fellow brigade chaplains left, one after two weeks; the other lasted a little longer: the rough life was not to their liking. Illness struck the chaplains as it did the troops. In December McAuliffe reported that four Catholic chaplains were away sick, two were injured and four remained to carry on the work. Chaplains shared the common dangers, too, as there were few safe billets at Gallipoli. The sudden acts of bravery that were demanded of chaplains increased the strain. When, for example, Hearn was called to an injured man he had to run a mile ducking and weaving to avoid

---

1 Advocate, 7 August 1915.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Advocate, 15 January 1916.
5 Advocate, 12 February 1916.
bullets and bombs. He endured the same anguish on the return journey and 'received a great ovation from officers and men' for his performance as he was over sixty years old.¹ Chaplains at Gallipoli devoted much of their time to burying the dead. They held the services at night to lessen the chance of injury to the burial party; depending on the number of dead a chaplain could be up most of the night. McPhee conducted a burial party that finished at 3 a.m., he was up again at 5 a.m.² Merrington kept a diary while he was on the Peninsula which records his mounting grief as the numbers of dead grew. He wrote of feeling 'strange and deep thoughts about war and life and mortality'. He exclaimed 'oh my God, what a price we are paying for liberty!'.³ As the numbers of dead in no man's land increased so did the risk to the health of the opposing armies. Eventually a truce was arranged to allow burial parties to work undisturbed. McPhee buried eleven Australians on that occasion and saw things that were 'gruesome and horrible beyond all imagination'.⁴ Dexter gave a graphic account of what he saw: 'the bodies were horrible to look at being black and swelled up stretching out the clothing and in many cases when they were touched falling to pieces'.⁵ Such sights remained with men beyond that dreadful day. Plane suffered a nervous breakdown at Gallipoli and McPhee, although honoured by his church on his return to Australia, took a year's leave of absence to re-establish his equilibrium.⁶

¹Advocate, 1 April 1916.
²Presbyterian Banner, August 1915.
³Narrative of the Rev. E.N. Merrington, 'With the Anzacs, 1914-1915. Written at Therin, Belgium, when I was stationed there in 1918.' [The narrative was based on Merrington's diary as a footnote on p.6 shows], AWM, MS. 3DRL3237, p.143.
⁴Presbyterian Banner, August 1915.
⁵W.E. Dexter, Diary, entry for 24 May 1915.
⁶A.C. Plane, a Methodist minister from Brisbane, reported that the sights he had seen at Gallipoli 'got on my brain' and he could not sleep. Methodist, 18 September 1915. In May 1917 he stood as a Nationalist candidate against the sitting Labor member for Brisbane, and energetic Methodist laymen, W.E. Finlayson. Plane lost by 15 votes. ACW, 6 July 1917. In December the Methodist reported that Plane still suffered from nervous affection and needed rest and change. Methodist, 8 December 1917. McPhee resigned his pastoral charge in December 1916 although he was at the time South Australian Moderator. Presbyterian Banner, January 1917.
Chaplains suffered a greater strain because they were forbidden, under the rules of war and in conformity with accepted standards, to take part in the fighting. A man who saw his mate killed could release his anger and frustration by brave or foolhardy acts or by promises of revenge. A chaplain had no such release although he knew the temptation. Fahey felt impelled to join in the fight on the first morning, but resisted. Nevertheless stories circulated in Australia that he and other chaplains had led charges and rallied the men.  

Dexter laughed at such stories and showed how carefully a chaplain avoided taking any part in the fighting. He visited the front line on one occasion when the men were examining a new trench mortar:

they gave me the string to pull. Unthinkingly I had almost done so when it struck me what I was doing and so I refrained. I have all along refrained from handling any arms. I am not here for that.  

The chaplains showed courage by resisting the temptation to join in the fighting.

As the campaign at Gallipoli settled down to the monotony of trench warfare life became more bearable for the chaplains. Commanding officers at last allowed church parades to be held and the chaplains drew much comfort from them. McGrath commented that he had never felt so happy in his life as when he was saying Mass at Gallipoli. Green and Talbot conducted a united communion service, a very rare occurrence because communion was reckoned as a sign of membership of a particular church. The service symbolised the practical unity at Gallipoli and moved Green who wrote:

between the opening of the hills we caught a glimpse of the beautiful sunset over Imbros. A destroyer was steaming down to her position opposite Gaba Tepe to guard our right flank during the night. A few enemy shells soared overhead occasionally, but unmindful of these

---

1 See, for example, the Advocate which published a story told by a medical officer at the Cairo Hospital[?]. 'Rev. Fr. J. Fahey...worked like a hero in the firing line. When no officers were left he took a rifle and shouted "Come on boys, at 'em." Advocate, 3 July 1915.

2 W.E. Dexter, Diary, entry for 27 July 1915.

3 Advocate, 15 January 1916.
circumstances, the men in large numbers came up to the improvised communion table fifteen at a time, and knelt to receive the emblems of salvation.\textsuperscript{1}

The chaplains settled into a routine. They buried the dead, held services when possible, consoled the injured and generally encouraged the men. They soon learnt to love the men they served and most chaplains acquired a fierce loyalty for their own 'boys'. Few chaplains bothered to ask if their charges were deepening their spiritual awareness and understanding. Instead they noted the heroism, unselfishness, cheerfulness, patience and devotion of the men and later, perhaps, sought to explain to themselves and others the Christian bases of these virtues. Gillison, who was himself killed while trying to bring an injured Australian to safety, wrote of the 'pluck and dauntless courage' of the men. He particularly admired the generosity and cheerfulness of the wounded.\textsuperscript{2} Kendrew believed it was one of the greatest honours of his life to be serving men who, when injured, only thought of others less fortunate than themselves.\textsuperscript{3} Wray remarked on the men's courage saying it was an unspeakable honour to be connected with them.\textsuperscript{4} Other testimonies abounded.

While the campaign became more settled, the sense of futility grew amongst many of the soldiers whose enthusiasm had waned and whose spirit had been broken.\textsuperscript{5} Chaplains, on the whole, seem not to have shared this depression. Talbot summarised the spirit that sustained the chaplains: 'war, as we see it at the Front, is a terrible thing and nothing could, I believe, justify it to the Christian mind except the firm conviction that we are fighting in defence of great and high

\textsuperscript{1}Methodist, 14 August 1915.

\textsuperscript{2}"Diary of Captain Chaplain A. Gillison 14th Bn. and 4th A.I. Brigade 1.11.1914 to August 1915." AWM, MS. 2DRL843, entry for 18 May 1915, p.58.

\textsuperscript{3}Spectator, 9 July 1915.

\textsuperscript{4}CM, 30 July 1915.

\textsuperscript{5}Bill Gammage, The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War, Canberra, 1974, p.78.
international principles'. In a similar vein Merrington spoke of the dead as 'those who had given their all for the future of the world'. Their love for the men demanded that chaplains ennoble the cause for which they died. An esprit-de-corps grew up amongst the chaplains at Gallipoli and all grieved when one of their number died or was injured. In July Green, a Methodist, Richards, an Anglican, and Hearn, a Jesuit, went to Alexandria to visit hospitals and to arrange for 'comforts'. On the voyage the three gathered around the piano and sang hymns: 'they were the same grand old tunes, and although once or twice I noticed Father Hearn's words were different, we had communion in worship and praise'. This typified the chaplains' spirit at Gallipoli. As Tolhurst put it, he left Gallipoli with 'good health, a wonderful experience, the affection of my men, and a thankful and rejoicing spirit'.

In France conditions for chaplains differed markedly from those which had prevailed at Gallipoli. Chaplains lived as GHQ officers, apart from the men, and away from the front line. They could choose how they wished to serve the men and chaplains used this freedom in different ways. The more routine conditions provided opportunities for entertainments and recreations which were impossible at Gallipoli. Chaplains initiated or joined in these as they chose. Thus each chaplain needed to rethink his contribution to the A.I.F. in the light of the altered circumstances and had to determine how much of his time would be devoted to the spiritual needs of the troops and what proportion to their material well-being and comfort. Henderson complained that a chaplain 'was thrown into a new world where he had to make his own job without precedents, without orders and without co-operation and moral support from

---

1 SDM, September 1915.
2 E.N. Merrington, 'With the Anzacs', p.247.
3 J. Green in the Methodist, 25 September 1915.
4 PM, 24 March 1916.
authorities'. In making his decision each chaplain implicitly commented on what he understood the value of religion to be and how he thought a minister should present it.

Despite the changes those chaplains who travelled from Gallipoli to France noted the similarities: the war was basically the same. If anything they found it more horrifying in France than at Gallipoli because the scale was so much larger. Fahey observed that he knew nothing of the horrors of war until he participated in the battle of the Somme. The might of the artillery overawed Green and Fahey, the two most experienced chaplains. Fahey found it impossible to describe the intensity of an artillery bombardment; it was, he said, groping for words, 'appalling' and 'diabolical'. Green was more graphic:

the whole region seemed to rock with the bursting of huge shells, and as there were several batteries around the dressing station, we had to put wool in our ears to prevent deafness...we had more cases of hysteria than I saw at Gallipoli in twelve weeks.

In France, however, the men earned rest periods after a spell at the front and were able to travel far from the noise of the guns. This had not been possible at Gallipoli. Fahey discovered that the altered circumstances of the war had not changed the spirit of the troops. In fact they relished the chance to tangle with the Germans whom they regarded as the real enemy.

In France there emerged two different ideas of how a chaplain should work. Some chaplains determined to minister to the material needs of the men and thus either bear witness to Christian charity or so prepare the soil that the men would

---

1 K.T. Henderson to the Director AWM, 14 January 1922, AWM, Uncat. MS. Henderson was the young clergyman referred to by W.K. Hancock who learnt, while taking an English class, that his two brothers had been killed at Gallipoli. W.K. Hancock, Country and Calling, p.64.

2 Advocate, 14 October 1916.

3 Ibid.

4 Methodist, 25 November 1916.

5 Advocate, 14 October 1916.
respond readily to the message of Christ. These chaplains organised sports, concerts, entertainments, coffee stalls, 'comforts' of all kinds. They justified their place in the A.I.F. by doing 'good works'. Sometimes superior officers imposed such works upon them. Headquarters released Ward from normal duty to free him to lecture on the advantages of sexual purity\(^1\) and Long, a bishop sent specifically from Australia to conduct confirmations, was placed in charge of the A.I.F. education scheme.\(^2\) Commanding officers deputed chaplains to censor the mail. Tange boasted that he read 100,000 letters during his time with the A.I.F. and rejected only six as being filthy or over-informative.\(^3\) Rettie claimed that the chaplain was the 'handyman' at the front to whom all the odd jobs fell; the general asked him to help with the canteen stores.\(^4\) More usually, however, those who favoured the 'good works' approach undertook additional duties voluntarily. Rolland drew up a list of things a chaplain might do; he did not mention religious duties as such. First he suggested that the chaplain should 'keep alive the Faith in their cause that the men came away with'; this was not religious faith. From this premise all Rolland's other suggestions flowed: 'provide for the intellectual, social and musical needs of the troops', 'by personal influence save men from going AWL', 'attend to the physical comforts of the men', 'organise the sports and games of the men when resting'. Rolland concluded his catalogue with the observation that with regard to 'the especial work he is sent to do - that part which is meant to feed men's souls, I can only say it is difficult in the Army'.\(^5\) Other chaplains of this school drew up similar lists. Chaplain Gault described his 'good works' method in a book of his experiences as an

\(^1\)CS, 12 April 1918. His lectures were published later. See W. Ward, To the A.I.F. An Address by Ven. Archdeacon Ward with a Foreword by Lieut. Gen. Sir W.R. Birdwood, London [n.d.].


\(^3\)A.W. Tange to Director AWM, 11 December 1921, AWM, Uncat. MS.

\(^4\)Southern Churchman, July 1917.

\(^5\)F.W. Rolland to Director AWM [undated], AWM, Uncat. MS.
entrepreneur with the A.I.F. Initially he tried to counteract the temptations of Cairo by reading aloud from W.H. Fitchett's books. On week-days he read the men *Deeds that Won the Empire* and *The Story of the Egyptian Campaign* and on Sundays he turned to *The Unrealized Logic of Religion*. In France Gault's 'fun nights' became more elaborate as for an hour or two the genial chaplain diverted men's thoughts from the horrors of war by using the parlour games of their childhood. He encouraged the men to make as much noise as possible during the first competition of the evening to attract others. He then continued with drawing and listing competitions, twisted proverbs, poetry, charades and so on. A memorable limerick competition attracted 2,000 men. Gault regarded these 'stunts' as the 'handmaid of religion' and always closed each night's entertainment with a short talk on a religious topic and a prayer. Usually about two-thirds of the men remained for the last part of the program.

Not all chaplains favoured these methods. Catholic chaplains concentrated on ensuring that every man made his confession before he went up the line and that a priest was available to comfort the injured and the dying. When writing to the Catholic newspapers chaplains emphasised the spiritual aspect of their work and the success they achieved. Some chaplains asked editors to publicise such success and thus relieve relatives of worry. King asked Archbishop Kelly to assure the Catholic families of Australia whose sons have fallen, that,...remarkable opportunity was afforded the priests...to secure the spiritual safety of almost every Catholic man...many a very careless Catholic boy came back to the Church on the very threshold of his death.

Tighe agreed; the boys were never closer to God and he had not found one case of a Catholic who was killed who had not been

---

2 Ibid., pp.33-40.
3 Ibid., p.49.
4 Ibid., p.43.
5 *Advocate*, 11 November 1916.
to confession a few days before. ¹ High Church Anglicans shared this preoccupation with the spiritual as the real field for a chaplain's endeavours. Canon Cue opened what he called the Australian Military Church at the base camp at Le Havre. Instead of the usual up-turned packing case the Canon had a proper church erected with an altar and sanctuary, candles, crucifix, flowers and other decorations.² With a church behind him Cue again felt he was doing the work for which he was ordained: 'the feeling that we are merely chaplains in the A.I.F. struggling against the deadly apathy of a godless militarism no longer exists, but instead of this we are conscious of trying to do the work of an Australian Church in the A.I.F.' ³ Cue celebrated the Eucharist daily and held daily choral evensong at which he gave an address. The priests desired 'to be true to our office and the job we came to do. This was not to entertain or provide for the bodily needs of the men, it was not to sell cigarettes or cocoa or be as Charlie Chaplins for the men.' ⁴ If a man failed to understand how Cue differed from the other chaplains and consulted him on unpriestly matters Cue was not disconcerted: 'while they never thought of our office we never forgot it, and starting from their reasons for coming we honestly tried never to let a lad go away before we had supplied some test or other to ascertain his state religiously'.⁵

Although chaplains differed about how to serve the A.I.F. best, the regulations required a chaplain to conduct at least church parades and burial services.⁶ Chaplains held church parades on every possible Sunday, when the troops were out of the line and not on the move. Some chaplains suspected that officers deliberately moved troops on Sundays to avoid church

¹ Advocate, 18 November 1916.
² John A. Cue to Director AWM, undated, AWM, Uncat. MS.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Church parades were not compulsory but any man who sought to be exempted from them was given such unattractive jobs that he soon surrendered his exemption.
parades. Dexter recorded that between 4 February and 6 May 1917 he held services on six Sundays and missed them on eight. This proportion would seem to be typical. Moody complained that some officers used the church parade as an occasion for ceremonies which had no connection with religion. He described how

the men are roused early on Sundays so as to clean their arms (or steal some-one else's), bolt a hurried breakfast, and stand on parade for an hour or more...before the real purpose of the parade, the religious service begins.\(^2\)

General Birdwood attended church parade with a different battalion each Sunday and usually presented medals, congratulated the men and exhorted them to greater efforts. In his diary Birdwood always referred to the parade as under the command of an officer, never mentioned the chaplain, only once commented on the religious service and then adversely.\(^3\) The subject matter of the many sermons preached has passed into oblivion; it is probable, however, that preachers tried to encourage the men and to supply them with further motivation to bolster flagging spirits. Gault gave some idea of the content of his sermons:

The sermon is an attempt to interpret in spiritual terms the splendid sacrifice these men have made... the thought is developed that only by sacrifice is the world saved, and we in our small way are being saviours of pillaged Belgium.\(^4\)

Davidson held a parade before the men went 'over the top' in which he tried to motivate them to fight well and to stick to their task. He spoke to them about

God with us, God a reality, life a never-ending thing, death without any terror, confidence, trust in God, the thing that alone can make a soldier do his duty with a calm mind and forceful action.\(^5\)

In another letter Davidson expanded on this formula showing

\(^1\)W.E. Dexter, Diary, passim.
\(^2\)W.A. Moody, 'Experiences as a Chaplain in the AIF'.
\(^3\)Diary of Lieut-Gen. Sir W.R. Birdwood, AWM, MS. 3DRL3376.
\(^4\)Methodist, 10 June 1916.
\(^5\)PM, 8 June 1917.
how a chaplain needed faith when he made such bland promises to his men:

I try not to let the note of sadness get into my words, but ring out notes of hope and victory - telling them that even death may be a victory. Yet all the time in my own soul there is the iron of the sad knowledge that it is hard to part with them.

Burial of the dead, too, continued to be one of the chaplain's most important duties. Each week he sent a return to the A.I.F. headquarters in London showing how each man had died and where he was buried so that the grave could be identified in the future. This was important administrative work.

A chaplain performed whatever other type of spiritual work he thought appropriate to the needs of his men. Often these extra services did not conform strictly to the rites of his church. Davidson wrote of a communion service that was 'not quite Presbyterian perhaps'. During a battle a chaplain normally remained at a dressing station where he could console the wounded and help the medical staff. Often chaplains worked as stretcher-bearers and risked all the dangers of the battle. S.E. Maxted reputedly brought 150 men to safety during five hours of battle until, utterly exhausted, he sat down to rest. He was blown up by a shell almost immediately.

In the dressing station a chaplain offered spiritual advice if he thought it appropriate. The battalion historian related that Hume Robertson

attached himself to the regimental aid post during the battle and, when seriously wounded men began to arrive on stretchers, went round whispering consolation to them. Suddenly he had an inspiration. 'These men don't want prayers' he said to a stretcher bearer, 'I'll do them more good if I get them hot cocoa to drink.'

Some chaplains may have yearned for the excitement of the front line during battle but John Fahey, whom no-one could accuse of

1PM, 10 August 1917.
2PM, 27 July 1917.
3CS, 8 December 1916.
how a chaplain needed faith when he made such bland promises to his men:

I try not to let the note of sadness get into my words, but ring out notes of hope and victory - telling them that even death may be a victory. Yet all the time in my own soul there is the iron of the sad knowledge that it is hard to part with them.¹

Burial of the dead, too, continued to be one of the chaplain's most important duties. Each week he sent a return to the A.I.F. headquarters in London showing how each man had died and where he was buried so that the grave could be identified in the future. This was important administrative work.

A chaplain performed whatever other type of spiritual work he thought appropriate to the needs of his men. Often these extra services did not conform strictly to the rites of his church. Davidson wrote of a communion service that was 'not quite Presbyterian perhaps'.² During a battle a chaplain normally remained at a dressing station where he could console the wounded and help the medical staff. Often chaplains worked as stretcher-bearers and risked all the dangers of the battle. S.E. Maxted reputedly brought 150 men to safety during five hours of battle until, utterly exhausted, he sat down to rest. He was blown up by a shell almost immediately.³

In the dressing station a chaplain offered spiritual advice if he thought it appropriate. The battalion historian related that Hume Robertson attached himself to the regimental aid post during the battle and, when seriously wounded men began to arrive on stretchers, went round whispering consolation to them. Suddenly he had an inspiration. 'These men don't want prayers' he said to a stretcher bearer, 'I'll do them more good if I get them hot cocoa to drink.'⁴

Some chaplains may have yearned for the excitement of the front line during battle but John Fahey, whom no-one could accuse of

¹PM, 10 August 1917.
²PM, 27 July 1917.
³CS, 8 December 1916.
cowardice, justified the chaplain's absence on the grounds that a dead chaplain was hard to replace.\(^1\) Chaplains gave much time to counselling the men in and out of the line; as with the preaching this side of the chaplain's work has not been recorded. Apparently soldiers brought all sorts of problems to the chaplains including questions of personal morality, family matters, and moral problems arising from the conduct of the war. When matters of personal morality arose the chaplain reminded a man of what God and his relatives expected of him and asked him to remember his obligation to remain an efficient member of the A.I.F. With regard to family matters a chaplain listened and advised and sometimes wrote to the local minister in Australia asking him to keep an eye on things. When a man discussed a problem arising from the conduct of the war a chaplain was more restricted in the kind of advice he could give. As an officer he could not counsel a man to disobey an order or even to reflect on the wisdom of other officers. Davidson described how he answered a man who complained that the bayonet instructor sought to instil a spirit of venom and hate. His reply was vague:

\begin{quote}
You've come over here with the high ideal of doing your duty as a soldier of your country. You've learned the art of soldiering and of fighting. Go into it keeping to that ideal along with all the other ideals of the old home and when the moment of decision comes you will know exactly what your duty is and you will do it.\(^2\)
\end{quote}

Chaplains continued to act as unofficial liaison officers between the A.I.F. in France and Australia. They wrote to the parents of the men and to the newspapers. In some cases they were over-optimistic and their reports became misleading and stupid. Bean and others have painted a terrible picture of the French winter of 1916-1917 which severely affected the A.I.F.'s morale.\(^3\) The cold and mud depressed the troops more than the futility of Gallipoli or the bungling of Pozieres. The chaplains told a different story. Davidson reported that the

\(^1\)\textit{ Advocate}, 14 October 1916.
\(^2\)A.I. Davidson, 'A Padre's Reminiscences', report to Director AWM, undated, AWM, Uncat. MS.
\(^3\)Bill Gammage, \textit{The Broken Years}, p.179.
boys relished the winter conditions\(^1\) and McCook wrote that they adapted easily to winter because of the generous supplies of food and clothing.\(^2\) Gilder sent back perhaps the most optimistic letter ever penned by a chaplain. On his first approach to the firing line he heard guns of all sorts making tremendous noise which he found 'wonderful and thrilling'.\(^3\) The air was also filled with the jokes, laughter and repartee of the Australians; the chaplain readily understood how bold was their spirit. He wrote that the food was plain but nourishing, fresh meat daily, vegetables and the inevitable stew. The Germans were not the ferocious enemy he had expected; after a severe allied bombardment which demoralised them they rushed to the Australian lines to surrender. Finally, Gilder reported favourably on the spiritual condition of the troops. Some of the worst characters confessed that they prayed in the firing line; his communion services were largely attended.\(^4\) No chaplain served the troops or his readers well by writing such inaccurate accounts of life at the front. It may not have been possible or prudent to tell the real story but something closer to it would have helped Australian Christians form a fair impression of the war and appreciate the heights their troops achieved.

The chaplains quickly learned to appreciate the real worth of the Australian troops and expressed generous praise and admiration. Phrases such as 'the longer I am with them the prouder I am of them'\(^5\) 'brave and game'\(^6\) '[their] heroism... beggars all description'\(^7\) 'no words of praise could be too high',\(^8\) abound in the chaplains' letters. The reflective

\(^1\)PM, 27 July 1917; the letter was written on 15 April 1917 soon after the terrible 1916-1917 winter.
\(^2\)PM, 20 July 1917, written 19 March 1917.
\(^3\)CM, 22 March 1918.
\(^4\)Ibid.
\(^5\)Presbyterian Banner, February 1918, Chaplain Riddle.
\(^6\)FJ, 21 June 1917, Chaplain Boscence.
\(^7\)PM, 3 May 1918, Chaplain J.B. Rentoul.
\(^8\)Advocate, 18 November 1916, Chaplain Tighe.
chaplains conceded that the men were virtuous and good apparently without the aid of formal religion. What difference this discovery and the other lessons of the war made to the personal faith and convictions of the Australian clergymen in the A.I.F. will be examined in another chapter.
The hysteria, the cranks and crazes have been swept away, and there has been restored to the world a glorious, simple, earnest life....If the change is not so marked in Australian life, it is because Australia has not yet fully risen to the call.

Church Standard, 19 March 1915.
At the beginning of 1915 churchmen determined to recapture some of the spirit of August 1914 by calling the nation to a day of repentance and prayer. The Anglican bishops addressed a pastoral letter to their people calling on them to use the war as an opportunity for renewal. They hoped that war would show people the vanity of human affairs and draw them to Christ. At the same time the bishops warned that Australians might miss the great opportunity because the war seemed so remote to them. They reaffirmed the causes for which the Empire fought: the defence of the weak and the sanctity of treaties. Because these were honorable aims the bishops believed that Christians should not scruple to pray for victory while at the same time repenting of their national sins.

In the sermons associated with the first national day of prayer and humiliation churchmen reiterated many of the points they had made in August. Nothing had happened in the intervening five months to make them alter the main lines of the Christian response to war. Gilbert White preached a lengthy sermon in St James' Sydney on the text 'ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars. See that ye be not troubled. All these things must needs come to pass.' He denied that war showed the breakdown of Christianity; rather, men had abandoned Christianity and embraced materialism; war resulted. People made a false god of pleasure, pursuing it to unnatural lengths, even refusing to have children in the name of their new god. Such crimes demanded punishment: 'this one sin alone was sufficient to call down God's judgment'. White argued that God permitted the war 'because he saw that we were in great need of discipline and judgment' and used the war to draw

1 They followed the lead of the archbishop of Canterbury who appealed for prayer from the whole Empire for the Allies' cause. CM, 1 January 1915.

2 All bishops signed the letter except the bishops of Rockhampton, Goldfields and North-West Australia. CS, 25 December 1914.

3 CS, 25 December 1914.

4 White was the ex-bishop of Carpentaria and the newly elected bishop of Willochra, South Australia.

5 CS, 22 January 1915.
people from their love of pleasure and material comfort.\textsuperscript{1} Other preachers agreed with this diagnosis. Carr stated that the origins of the war could be found in the sins of the people and that 'the Almighty[was] making use of the war for the chastisement of sin'.\textsuperscript{2} The sin he spoke of was fundamental and repentance would require man to embrace a new philosophy. The sin involved

\begin{quote}
not merely neglect of the worship and service of God, which had always existed to a greater or lesser extent, but a regular upraising of human mind, and human understanding, and human will against the reign and providence of God.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

Men would learn from the war that they were not self-sufficient and that they could not work out their own destinies unaided. Carr implied that the war would continue until men had learnt this lesson.

Other preachers treated sin in a similarly abstract way and encountered no opposition. Bishop Stephen of Tasmania, however, discovered that while it was permissible to talk of sin in general or to particularise Germany's sins, a preacher should not identify, too closely, his own side's sins. He found in Britain's past the sins for which Germany was now arraigned. He showed how Britain had invaded territory and taken it by force, dispossessed weaker nations with the doctrine that might is right and covered other crimes with the doctrine of the rights of a superior civilisation.\textsuperscript{4} In the bishop's eyes the present generation sinned too and he joined with his colleagues in condemning drunkenness, impurity and gambling.\textsuperscript{5} The editor of the \textit{Argus} upbraided Stephen for this sermon, accusing him of leading astray the younger clergy, over whom he was reputed to have a particular influence. The editor reminded the bishop of the sins of Germany and indicated

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{2}\textit{Advocate}, 9 January 1915.
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\item \textsuperscript{4}\textit{Argus}, 4 January 1915.
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that the clergy should not belittle the Empire by comparing it with Germany.\(^1\)

Since preachers concentrated on sin as the cause of war they also argued that only sincere efforts at reform and renewal would placate God, ensure victory for the Empire and bring the war to an end. The cause was spiritual, the effect was to be spiritual, the means too, must be spiritual. Clergymen knew why God had sent the war and anxiously sought signs that his plan was beginning to come to fruition. They had already rejoiced to see signs of such conversion in Russia, France and Britain. They hailed the success of the temperance movement and cited reports that people now flocked to church as evidence of conversion and asked where such signs were in Australia. They used the response to the national day of prayer to assess the spiritual condition of Australians and were satisfied with what they found. Most churchmen reported large attendances. The Rev. R.H. Moore of Fremantle, for example, noted big congregations at the three services held in his church. In the evening, when the Archbishop preached, the church was full.\(^2\)

Dr Fitchett regretted that joint services had not been held. He wished to emphasise that in time of crisis denominational distinctions should disappear.\(^3\) In Perth they were very evident because the Catholic church took no part at all in the day of prayer. This exclusive attitude irked some Perth Catholics but the editor of the diocesan newspaper, the Rev. T.R. O'Grady, quickly explained that such criticism was not wanted: 'the church is able to take care of itself, and all punctilious irritability on the part of its members is superfluous'.\(^4\) His defence of his church's stand provided further evidence that the Catholic church saw itself as very different from other Australian churches and under continual

---

\(^1\)Argus, 16 January 1915. Only the Spectator rose to the bishop's defence stating that only an imbecile could see the sermon as pro-German; Spectator, 22 January 1915.


\(^3\)Southern Cross (Melbourne), 8 January 1915.

\(^4\)West Australian Record, 16 January 1915 (hereafter cited as WAR).
attack from them. O'Grady argued that because of the catholicity or universality of the church Catholics limited themselves to general prayer for peace and goodwill among all States and peoples. Such prayer occupied the church daily and she did not need 'the stimulus of a hint from those whose attitude to her tenets is, excepting for diplomacy's sake, one of denial'. However Catholic leaders in other states supposed themselves to be under no such impediment and observed the intercession day with the other churches. Nevertheless, while each bishop determined the policy for his diocese, many Catholics shared O'Grady's view that their church suffered from the hostility of the other churches.

Despite these endemic difficulties churchmen rejoiced in the response to the day of prayer while admitting it was a 'special' occasion. They looked for further signs of the spiritual renewal they expected as a result of the war. They compared Australia with the apparently greener pastures of Europe and wondered if a mood of seriousness would grow amongst Australians. Carruthers quoted the experience of a Scottish minister who found that the sorrow, anxiety and worry had led his congregation to God. Carruthers also relied on a Sydney Morning Herald report which assured him that society women in London had not put on an evening dress for six months. On this evidence he concluded that the war had done its work in Britain: 'that there is a profound seriousness throughout Great Britain is abundantly evident'. Carruthers looked for signs of the same spirit in Australia and rejoiced at some indications. The tone of the press and the generosity of the people in terms of men and money delighted him. He found much evidence on the debit side, however:

there is little or no abatement in the extent of Sunday pleasuring. Sport and amusement still claim their tens of thousands of ardent devotees. Meanwhile, Sunday congregations do not show any appreciable improvement. Intercessory services are the exception and not the rule.

1 Ibid.
2 Methodist, 23 January 1915.
3 Ibid.
He concluded his analysis with a question: 'shall this dread discipline leave us as formal and prayerless as it found us?'

Other clergymen used the level of church attendance to gauge the spiritual life of the nation. From all around Australia and from every Protestant denomination came the complaint that the weekly intercession services were poorly attended because the people had not realised the gravity of the situation or the importance of the issues involved. Bishop Thomas reported that while in England people flocked to the churches, in Adelaide he noticed no difference in the numbers attending services. He asked the clergy to involve the people in the war more personally by reading out the names of all who had volunteered from each district or by displaying a list of names in the church porch. Once the people had grasped the personal nature of their nation's involvement they would rely more heavily on prayer. The Rev. R. Ditterich, the editor of the Melbourne Spectator, lamented that the war had made little difference to church attendance. The war had encouraged religious people to become more religious but had left the mass of the people undisturbed. Ditterich could not understand their state of mind:

> the mind that grips the vastness of the issues involved in the unparalleled conflict now raging must feel its own impotence and unless the life of the soul has departed, it must feel drawn to call upon the Everlasting and Almighty for help.

Only Catholic clergymen, apparently, were satisfied with the numbers attending church; they did not join in the general chorus of lamentation. The editor of the Advocate viewed the Protestant problem unsympathetically, attributing the disappointing response to the lack of definite religious education in the young.

---
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The moral tone of the community disappointed clergymen who did not find the seriousness they expected. They eagerly compared the situation in Europe with that of Australia and gave an attentive hearing to anyone who had first hand information of the renewal abroad. The Rev. John Ferguson claimed, on his return from England, that the war had so impressed Englishmen as to make them abandon cricket, football and boxing. In Australia clergymen battled to convince people to give up these pleasures and the less robust recreations, drinking and gambling. Some critics alleged that clergymen used the war to impose the reforms they had advocated for many years. While it is true that the Protestant churches had campaigned for social reform for many years the war-time crusade was more than a continuation of that campaign. Churchmen saw a close connection between a regenerate nation and victory. For many, regeneration became a precondition of victory. When the Methodists mounted a social reform campaign in Wesley church, Melbourne, in early 1915 one observer commented that the occasion 'reminded one of the old days when the Social Reform campaign was at its height'. However, the two campaigns differed because now the fate of the Empire depended on the success of reform.

In Sydney the Rev. John Ferguson gave a persuasive and forthright address on the reform theme which rested on the belief that the causes of war were moral rather than political. He explained that for fifty years men lived by a philosophy of gross materialism and had given themselves to the pursuit of material possessions and glory. He particularly deplored the moral condition of the great cities, arguing that 'such a moral condition in our great cities will lead either to a moral degeneracy of the people, or to an outburst of war'.

---

1 ACW, 12 February 1915.
2 Spectator, 19 February 1915.
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believed that the moral reform that swept Britain after the outbreak of war confirmed his analysis of the causes of war. In June 1914 London stood in need of reform. Men lived for pleasure: 'there were royal drawing-rooms, balls, theatres, picture-shows galore. People were talking cricket and all kinds of sport'. Selfishness motivated political actions: Ireland and the suffragettes were in revolt. When war came Britain changed instantly. The devotees of pleasure dedicated themselves to the cause of their country, the suffragettes retired, Ireland forgot her troubles and striking workmen returned to their jobs. A similar conversion occurred in Russia and France. Ferguson regretted that in Sydney there was little evidence of reform but he declared 'that the accursed traffic in strong drink shall be grappled with as never yet, and so with the traffic in shameful lusts'.

The various Methodist conferences took up the cry for reform when they met in early March. Each conference emphasised its own particular interest in the overall campaign. The New South Wales conference concentrated on the Sunday trading bill before the State parliament; the South Australian conference issued a very direct appeal to Methodists to vote in favour of early closing of public houses at the coming referendum, the Victorian conference directed its fire, too, at the liquor industry. Western Australian Methodists unanimously agreed that alcohol should no longer be sold by confectioners and Queenslanders expressed concern about art unions, picture shows, boxing in state schools, wet canteens, 'shouting' and night pony racing.

1Ibid.
2Ibid.
3Methodist Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.259.
4Methodist Church of South Australia, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.134.
5Methodist Church of Victoria and Tasmania, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.199.
6Methodist Church of Western Australia, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.99. The exact wording of the resolution was that 'in any new licensing measures no provision whatever be made for the sale of intoxicating liquors by grocers, fruiterers and confectioners'.
7Methodist Church of Queensland, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.121.
Churchmen directed part of their concern about the moral condition of the community towards the soldiers. Bean's account of moral delinquencies in Cairo, which reached the Australian press on 20 January, inspired churchmen to take notice of conditions in Australian camps. Bean wrote:

> it is idle to pretend that the Australian is at present making quite the impression which Australians hoped it [sic] will make either on civilians or upon the great soldiers under whose eyes they come...just as in picking a cricket or football team to represent Australia, the inclusion of a man who has not the necessary moral qualities, however splendid his physical qualifications may be, is apt to do more harm than good.

Churchmen took Bean's hint and asked that some moral test be applied to the men who sought to enlist. As Carruthers put it, any rotter or waster who was fit could gain admission. He suggested that reports of ill-conduct would adversely affect recruiting, particularly from Methodist homes; parents would tremble before dangers to their sons 'compared to which those of the battlefield are almost harmless'. Ditterich believed that alcohol should not be served to men in uniform. Soldiers were entrusted with 'the King's honour' and 'no man's honour is safe in the keeping of a drunkard'. The editor of the Church Standard wanted the miscreants sent home as prisoners lest they brag of their skill in escaping from an unpleasant job.

This early campaign to impress upon the soldiers the seriousness of their commitment reached its climax in Melbourne in February. At a meeting at the Town Hall of representatives, clerical and lay, of the Protestant churches to consider co-operative effort to safeguard the morals and habits of the Australian troops, Dr J.L. Rentoul made startling allegations about the Broadmeadows camp, at this stage the principal camp

---

1Argus, 20 January 1915.

2One editor asked whether volunteers were required 'to produce evidence of good conduct from justices of the peace, schoolmasters or clergymen?' PM, 5 February 1915.

3Methodist, 13 February 1915.

4Spectator, 29 January 1915.

5CS, 29 January 1915.
for all Victorian soldiers. Rentoul informed his audience that side by side with the military tents were the tents of 'harpies' and liquor sellers. He alleged that drink and immorality retarded recruiting because parents refused to allow their sons to enlist. He hoped that by exposing the abuses he would cause them to be remedied. The allegations caused such alarm in Melbourne that the Police Commissioner requested a report on conditions at the camp. In their published report the police acknowledged that some stalls had been set up on the edge of the camp but maintained that they sold only lollies and soft drinks: 'to say that any of these places are kept for an immoral purpose is an absolute untruth'. When the army also investigated the allegations and found them groundless the editor of the Argus turned his considerable editorial power against Rentoul. He accused Rentoul of inventing the evils and characterised the reformers as 'stalwarts who, itching to reform something or other, imagine dreadful evils, turn them into shapes and give to airy nothings a local habitation and a name'. Despite this blast Rentoul refused to withdraw any of his charges and the controversy quickly degenerated into farce as Colonel Wallace, the Commandant for Victoria, debated with Rentoul the status of the chaplain-general, the sincerity of the church's concern for the soldiers' welfare and further allegations of vice. A soldier claimed that the men so deplored Rentoul's behaviour that they would be happy to see him resign his commission. Ironically, Rentoul later made the same request about another chaplain-general, Mannix.

The critics failed to understand the reformers' belief that moral reform must precede victory at the front and attacked the
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1 Argus, 23 February 1915.
2 Ibid.
3 Argus, 26 February 1915.
4 Ibid.
5 Argus, 27 February to 2 March 1915.
6 Argus, 2 March 1915.
various campaigns. While the reformers were reluctant to allow innocent young men to taste the low life they also believed that morality and victory were inseparable. They saw the war as a moral crusade which they did not expect to win until the nation set its own house in order.

The third criterion by which churchmen judged the seriousness of the nation was the willingness of young Australians to enlist. This criterion came to the fore slowly in early 1915 but dominated later clerical thinking. Those clergymen who believed that Australians hesitated to enlist sought to stimulate recruiting. A Baptist minister, the Rev. T.E. Ruth of Melbourne, entitled his intercession day address 'Wanted Men - Wanted More Men'. Ruth spoke of the 'haunting fear' that Australia had not done enough and would accept no excuse from the fit, independent, young man who shirked his obligations. The editor of the Church Standard compared British and Australian efforts. In Britain one man in 28 but in Australia one man in 116 was under arms. The British government spent £8 per head of the population on the war while the Australian government spent only £2. The editor believed that no Australian wanted the British to carry the burden alone. The Rev. Hugh Kelly in the Presbyterian Messenger noted with shame that Australia's 3,000 men per month had been referred to in Britain as 'trifling'. He asked Australian statesmen to take to the platform to educate and inspire public opinion and warn people of the threat of German domination. The editor of the Bush Brother argued that if volunteers did not come forward in sufficient numbers the government must resort to conscription.

The liturgical season of Lent enabled preachers from the episcopal churches to concentrate on the themes of sacrifice,
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1Correspondents in the Bulletin accused churchmen of opportunism; for example, the Bulletin, 21 January 1915 and 25 February 1915.

2ACW, 15 January 1915.

3CS, 8 January 1915.

4PM, 15 January 1915.

5Bush Brother, January 1915.
reform and renewal which now dominated clerical discussion of
the war. The editor of the Church Messenger described the war
as the lent of the nations implying that the nations should use
the war as an opportunity to return to God's favour by penance
and prayer just as the individual used the annual forty days of
Lent for the same purpose. The editor remarked that it was
'the duty of every State to consider wherein it has merited the
rod of the Almighty' but warned that it was 'ungracious and
indeed unpatriotic, at this time to insist very pointedly on
our own national sins'. However the editor hoped that during
Lent churchmen would bring the nation to a sense of the
seriousness of the war.

Throughout Australia Anglican clergymen used the war as
the basis of their Lenten preaching. The rector of St James'
in Sydney organised a series of sermons and addresses.
Dr Radford, giving the first sermon in the series 'In the light
of the Cross', preached on 'German Culture and Christianity'.'
The Church Standard advertised other Lenten series including
'The War and the Cross' at St Thomas', Sydney, 'Personal
Religion in War Time' at Wagga and 'The Spirit of Christianity
as opposed to the Spirit of Might and Force' by Archbishop
Clarke in Melbourne. The Rev. R.H. Moore gave a series on
sacrifice explaining that 'since the day of condemnation that
man [should] eat bread by the sweat of his brow, nothing has
been gained but [through] sacrifice'. Moore rejoiced to find
the spirit of sacrifice enthroned in the public life of
Belgium, France, Russia and England but deplored the lack of
such a spirit in Australia where the pursuit of pleasure still
dominated the lives of the people.
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1CM, 26 March 1915.
2Ibid.
3CS, 26 February 1915.
4Ibid.
5R.H. Moore Papers, Battye Library, MS.1210A, Book entitled
'Sermons Feby 1914-Ap. 1915', sermon for First Sunday of Lent,
21 February 1915.
6Ibid.
In Brisbane Archbishop Donaldson delivered four Lenten addresses on 'Christian Patriotism'. He defined patriotism as the country's 'right to everything we have: our money, energies, well-being, our health and even our life itself'. Upon this natural instinct a Christian superimposed a spiritual element, 'convictions about man's relation to God'. Thus the Christian could not shout 'my country right or wrong' but must seek to interpret God's will for his country. In the third lecture 'Christian Imperialism' Donaldson showed that God willed the British Empire to continue to protect weaker nations and lead native peoples to Christianity; this was 'a sacred trust committed by God, a gift entrusted to us for the good of mankind'. Donaldson lamented that Australians showed little awareness of their duties or God's plans. He noted 'apathy, self-content...and sometimes...self-conceit' in Australian life; he doubted whether the Australian was 'as yet alive to the obligation which rests upon him as a member of an Imperial race'. He and other Lenten preachers tried to awaken Australians to a sense of their duties. The Lenten addresses showed the extent to which the war dominated clerical thinking and clergymen's growing disillusionment with Australian society. Despite the Lenten efforts churchmen realised that in terms of Australia's response to the war Easter had not arrived. They realised further that events militated against an easy acceptance of the doctrine they preached. They had expected decisive battles and a quick victory and succumbed to the general despondency as the war slipped into stalemate. They acknowledged, too, that because Australian troops had not seen action the full impact of the war had not yet 'hit' the

1Donaldson later published the complete text of his addresses.
3Ibid., p.19.
4Ibid., p.31.
5Ibid., p.16.
6Ibid., p.42.
Australian people. In some quarters churchmen began to hope that the A.I.F. would soon face the enemy. The editor of the Church Standard now appreciated that Australian apathy would remain until the war had dealt Australians 'a shattering and sledge-hammer blow'; then they would appreciate war's 'cleansing, its refining, or its spiritual revelation'. This editorial appeared on 30 April, five days after the landing at Gallipoli and just as the news of it reached Australia. At the meeting of the Presbyterian Assembly on 17 May the newly elected moderator, W.H. Cooper, gave a similar analysis of what was needed to arouse Australians. He claimed that

if in this awful struggle of the nations we emerge unchastened, having made only pecuniary sacrifice, there is danger of overweening pride and boastfulness, but if with the brave fighters from the British Isles and Canada and India our soldiers mingle their blood...then sacrifice will hallow all our Australian life and we shall value our liberty and privileges.\(^2\)

The first brief news of the landing at Gallipoli appeared in Australian newspapers on Friday 30 April but few preachers seem to have commented on it on the following Sunday, possibly because the accounts gave no clear idea of what had happened. On Saturday 8 May, however, Australians thrilled to read Mr Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett's highly dramatic description of events at Gallipoli.\(^3\) Inspired by such moving prose many preachers devoted the bulk of the next day's sermon to comment on the landing. They rejoiced that Australians were, at last, under fire and they took pride in the achievements of their fellow countrymen.

Many preachers regarded the Australians' first experience of war as a test of the national character and an indication of the extent to which British virtues had been eroded by colonial

\(^1\)CS, 30 April 1915.

\(^2\)PM(V), 21 May 1915.

\(^3\)A fellow journalist, H.W. Nevinson, described Ashmead-Bartlett's despatch as 'the most vivid piece of war corresponding that I know'. Quoted in Scott, Australia, p.289. There is a condensed version of the despatch in F.K. Crowley, Modern Australia in Documents, Volume 1, Melbourne, 1973, pp.234-6.
Clarke expressed frank relief that the Australians had lived up to the traditions of their forefathers: 'no-one doubted the spirit and courage of our men, but we waited with trembling hope in the confidence that they would not turn themselves back in the day of battle'.

John Ferguson rejoiced that the Australians had proven themselves 'worthy of their race, worthy of their forefathers, worthy of their country and worthy of their God'. The clerical editors endorsed these comments. Ditterich wrote in the Spectator that 'our lads proved the mettle of their pasture, and their gallantry has won the Empire's praise'.

The editor of the Advocate said he had expected the Australians to do well but they had done more: 'they have acted in a manner worthy of the best traditions of their race'.

Churchmen also gave fulsome praise to the achievement of the Anzacs, as they now came to be called. At Scots church, Melbourne, the Rev. W. Borland spoke of the landing as an event 'which nothing in the history of human bravery has surpassed'.

Wright advised his congregation to glory in the deeds, the fame of which was ringing throughout the empire. Bishop Stone-Wigg, writing in the Church Standard, said that 'the troops exceeded the most sanguine expectations in steadiness, dash and military efficiency'. The editor of the Southern Churchman boasted that 'nothing in history has been greater than the heroism of our men at the Dardanelles'. Churchmen also spoke words of
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1 Australians expressed similar relief when they celebrated a sporting victory over the British. See W.F. Mandle, 'Games people played: cricket and football in England and in Victoria in the late nineteenth century', Historical Studies, vol.15, no.60, April 1973, p.526.
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comfort to the sorrowing. Carr believed that a soldier who unselfishly laid down his life for his country had 'no bad chance of salvation'.\(^1\) Borland said that God accepted and crowned the supreme act of consecration of those who had died: 'they brought their strength to God and He glorified it, and is using it in His purpose of love which is saving the world and purifying it'.\(^2\) Clarke reminded his congregation that the earthly pilgrimage was merely the beginning of a Christian's existence.\(^3\)

Churchmen immediately expressed the hope that Australia's 'baptism of fire' would generate a new spirit of seriousness in the nation and some even saw signs of what they fervently expected. Duhig called on Australians to give up pleasures and make more sacrifices to show that they were sincere in their intentions.\(^4\) Wright found Australia 'richer by this sacrifice of her sons'. He noted the increase in the appeal for funds for the church tent and the large crowd at the Town Hall meeting in favour of early closing and concluded that a new spirit was abroad in the country.\(^5\) T.R. O'Grady wrote that Australians understood the reality of war now that the 'rose petals' and the 'poetry' had been blown away. The reality did not dismay O'Grady: 'if our grand, strapping, edifying young Catholic soldiers suffer, let us thank God that they have been chosen as victims to atone for 'the infidelity of the World'.\(^6\) The editor of the Advocate observed a new seriousness in Melbourne as the successive casualty lists brought the war very close to the people and allowed them to appreciate the suffering involved.\(^7\) The landing at Gallipoli renewed the

\(^1\) Advocate, 15 May 1915.
\(^2\) Argus, 10 May 1915.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) Brisbane Courier, 10 May 1915.
\(^5\) SDM, June 1915.
\(^6\) WAR, 8 May 1915. O'Grady's exclusive concern for the Catholic members of the A.I.F. is worthy of note.
\(^7\) Advocate, 8 May 1915.
confidence of churchmen who now expected Australians to reflect at last on the eternal truths.

In the early months of the war church leaders had agreed with a government request that clergymen be used to deliver the telegrams sent by the Defence department informing people of the death of a relative at the front. This work began soon after the news of the landing became public. At first clergymen accepted the task willingly. Carruthers asked who was 'so fit to carry the sad news' believing that 'one of the really beautiful things about the work of the minister is found in the freedom of the homes of his people'. Clergymen discovered, however, that the duty took them to people who, having no connection with the church, saw the minister as an intruder at a time of family grief. Furthermore, normal pastoral visitation became 'exceedingly difficult and unpleasant' as the sight of the clergyman, always distinctive in his clerical garb, threw terror into the hearts of all who had relatives in the forces. A minister wrote that 'when the door was opened and it was seen who was there, faces became pale and voices trembled. [The minister] was compelled to put on a forced joviality or a silly grin to relieve anxiety.'

Some clergymen adopted special expedients such as the wearing of 'peculiarly shaped hat[s]' or 'coloured badge[s]' when they delivered telegrams so that they would be welcome in the streets when not so dressed. Unfortunately this had the effect of taking all hope from the person on whom the clergyman

---

1 I have not been able to find any archival evidence that the Government made such a request to church leaders but many churchmen testified that this was the case. See, for example, CS, 5 January 1917, 21 September 1917 and 14 June 1918 or Archbishop Wright in SDM, September 1915.

2 He was replying to a correspondent who believed that ministers had no right to do the government's business. Carruthers assumed that all the people he would call on would be 'his people'. Methodist, 22 May 1915.

3 James Norman, John Oliver North Queensland, Melbourne, n.d. [1956?], p.78. Norman was the Anglican rector of Mackay during the war years so had first-hand experience of the difficulty.

4 Ibid.

5 Letter from the Rev. F.E. Haviland of Cobar, CS, 21 September 1917. Haviland disagreed with such practices and recommended that clergymen become such familiar figures in the streets that people would not remark on their presence.
called and intensifying the initial shock. Before long ministers referred to the government's commission as 'this dread duty' or 'this terrible task' but they carried on until the end of the war. The commission deeply involved clergymen in the suffering and tragedy of war.

Churchmen seized on the news of the landing at Gallipoli to give impact to their statements about the war which had been, for the first eight months, largely abstract theorising. The news of the sinking, by German torpedoes, of the huge passenger liner Lusitania, gave clergymen further opportunities to make practical their theories about the war. Churchmen spoke of the sinking as a terrible crime which showed that the Germans fought on the side of the devil against Christian principles. They tried to stiffen Australian resolve to withstand such wickedness. John Ferguson, for example, spoke of the 'dastardly and murderous attack made on civilians'; the attack was 'unprecedentedly fiendish' and 'cold-blooded and premeditated murder' which God would eventually overcome because 'vengeance is with God'.

Through these two events which followed one another so closely clergymen regained the confidence they had shown in the early months of the war because they were now convinced that Australians must realise the nature of the struggle and throw themselves into it wholeheartedly. Gallipoli and the sinking of the Lusitania arrested and suspended, for the time being at least, the disillusionment about Australia's failure to respond to the war or, more accurately, the failure of Australians to rise to the expectations of churchmen. A spirit of optimism predominated amongst clergymen in May and June.

The Presbyterian State assemblies met during May and expressed this new confidence in enthusiastic war resolutions. The Victorian resolution declared the Assembly's 'profound gratification at the heroic conduct of the Australian troops' and its hope that the suffering and sacrifice would make the

1Ibid.
2F.B. Boyce, Fourscore Years and Seven, p.81.
3Daily Telegraph, 10 May 1915.
Australian 'righteous and earnest'. The Assemblies concentrated on the connection between victory and moral reform. They believed that the war had brought about 'a growing, world-wide public sentiment...in favour of Total Abstinence' and urged their people to take the Kitchener pledge or abstain from alcohol for the duration. The New South Wales assembly insisted on the importance of preaching 'sobriety, purity and social brotherhood' because 'the logical outcome of the condemnation of the appalling wickedness thus displayed [by Germany was] a strong, united and persistent effort to uplift the moral life of our own nation'.

Preachers and editors hastened to express the renewed confidence in the war as a cleansing and purifying agent. A Franciscan told the men of the Woollahra parish that the war would quicken the spiritual life of the world. Bishop Stone-Wigg believed that the war had at first seemed like a struggle between the ideals of two great empires but had now emerged as a struggle between humanity and inhumanity. Carruthers agreed that God allowed the war because of the good that would result from it; the war was showing the failure of the materialistic way of life. Archbishop Clune declared that the war brought a wonderful cohesion to the empire and the religious, social and political elements within it. He gave high praise to the efforts of the troops who, at the Dardanelles, displayed 'valour, intrepidity, courage and disregard of danger'.

Some churchmen became so enthusiastic for the war that they organised 'patriotic demonstrations' to coincide with

1 Presbyterian Church of Victoria, Minutes of Assembly, 1915, p.23.
2 Ibid., p.40.
3 Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Assembly, 1915, p.43.
4 FJ, 3 June 1915.
5 CS, 4 June 1915.
6 Methodist, 19 June 1915.
7 WAR, 19 June 1915.
church assemblies, conferences or synods. The Brisbane Anglican synod followed the lead of the Queensland Methodist conference and replaced the home mission night with a patriotic demonstration. Donaldson opened the evening saying that the war concerned them as citizens and concerned them even more deeply as churchmen because the church stood at the heart of the nation’s life.¹ He repeated his argument that the war had lifted the world from the terrible malaise into which it had fallen. War would purify and regenerate the empire. He pleaded with his hearers to assist in the regeneration now that Australians gave signs of participating in it.² The second speaker, Canon Micklem, who was introduced as having five brothers at the front, made a stirring recruiting speech while the final speaker, Colonel Lee, asserted that German preachers in Queensland had espoused 'Germanism' and 'Kaiserism' from their pulpits for the past seven years.³ He needed no further proof that Germany had planned the annexation of Australia some time ago. Churchmen also expressed their enthusiasm for the war by appealing for more recruits. The Catholic archbishops of Sydney and Brisbane led the call to arms. Duhig confessed that reports of atrocities like the sinking of the Lusitania affected him powerfully: 'he could not help feeling an ardent desire to gird on the sword, take the rifle, and offer himself to the service of his country'.⁴ However, he mastered this feeling and instead 'exhorted every one of them who could possibly be spared to offer himself to the service of his King'.⁵ Kelly made similar appeals in Sydney. He argued that the fallen should not be left to make their sacrifice in vain; 'in the name of the fighting and the fallen let all join the colours', he said.⁶ He asked congregations to urge young men to go to the front because the empire fought for justice.

¹ACW, 25 June 1915.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Brisbane Courier, 11 May 1915.
⁵Ibid.
⁶FJ, 6 May 1915.
Donaldson became a consistent recruiter. In May he announced that the authorities had told him that more troops were needed to capture Constantinople which they regarded as a vital objective. They also told him that Brisbane and Ipswich were Queensland's recruiting black-spots so he addressed himself particularly to those areas.\(^1\) In June Donaldson wrote a pastoral letter on the subject of recruiting. He again claimed to be privy to information from the 'highest authority' that recruiting was unsatisfactory. He argued that if people believed the war was just then they should throw themselves into it wholeheartedly.\(^2\) Again in June, in his synod address, Donaldson referred to recruiting. He first mentioned the landing with relief and pride: 'we now know what indeed we never doubted, that the spirit of the British race lives in its latest sons'.\(^3\) He then postulated that 'the main indication of the national spirit is the eagerness of the nation's manhood to get to the fighting line'.\(^4\) People should not object if clergymen tried to form a worthwhile national spirit by encouraging men to enlist; this was their job. Donaldson saw the war almost entirely in spiritual terms. He said that the result did not depend on material resources but on spiritual qualities: 'the governing forces in this war are spiritual forces, and the conflict is a conflict of national spirit'.\(^5\) He recruited not because he believed the war would be won by the side able to field the greatest number of recruits but because he wanted to inspire the nation to adopt the spirit that was a precondition of victory.

Other Anglican clergymen joined in the recruiting movement but relied less on theory, however dubious, and more on emotion and rhetoric. Wright asked his clergy 'to utter a loud call to arms for men to come forward to fill the vacant places left

\(^{1}\text{ACW, 7 May 1915.}\)

\(^{2}\text{CS, 4 June 1915.}\)

\(^{3}\text{Church of England, Diocese of Brisbane, Yearbook for the Diocese of Brisbane 1915, Brisbane, 1915, p.15.}\)

\(^{4}\text{Ibid., p.16.}\)

\(^{5}\text{Ibid., p.15.}\)
blank by our gallant heroes'.\(^1\) In Melbourne Archdeacon Hindley preached a fine recruiting sermon at the Cathedral's main Sunday service. He asked the congregation to realise that they faced the prospect of German victory and German domination. He gave them a lively account of life under German rule: 'there is no hope, none at all, of any happiness or any liberty'.\(^2\) Using Colonel McCay's reported words to the troops, the preacher concluded with a stirring peroration: 'the gallant Colonel's call ["on Australians!"]...should re-echo in the ears of every Australian man that can come forward still to enlist. "Come on, Australia," the Empire is calling, "come on, ye noble scions of noble sires: Help me in my hour of need."'.\(^3\)

While the Catholics and Anglicans entered the recruiting campaign in its initial stages the Methodists and Presbyterians waited for more definite proof of the need for troops. They did not sound the call to arms to their young men. Carruthers wondered whether Methodists were enlisting in their full numbers because although he started an 'honour roll' with the names of all New South Wales Methodist recruits he had few names on the list. He hoped Methodists were enlisting because only 'the basest poltroons and cowards [would] withhold their personal service and active help'.\(^4\) At this stage he went no further than expressing the wish.

During the first half of 1915 churchmen continued to see the war in the spiritual terms they had elaborated in August 1914 despite the fluctuations in the tide of events. They looked eagerly for the signs of national renewal that they expected must come from sacrifice and suffering and when the landing at Gallipoli stirred the nation's soul they predicted that the people were on the brink of conversion. Clergymen

\(^1\)SDM, July 1915.
\(^2\)CM, 18 June 1915.
\(^3\)Ibid.
\(^4\)Methodist, 5 June 1915.
applied different tests to assess the extent of renewal: some looked for renewed morality and others anxiously checked the figures of church attendance. By the middle of the year, however, more and more clergymen agreed with Donaldson that 'the main indication of the national spirit is the eagerness of the nation's manhood to get to the firing line'. Clergymen would use the success or otherwise of the appeals for recruits as proof of the fulfilment of their expectations for the nation.
Chapter 5

THE FAILURE OF RECRUITING

We wage a holy war. Therefore, as a Church it is our duty...to call our men to fight.

Archbishop Wright, Sydney Diocesan Magazine, July 1915.
During the second half of 1915 politicians, government officials and other patriots made the first serious and systematic efforts to ask men to join the army. Until 18 June 1915, officials of the Australian Defence department seemed not to have a clear idea of the numbers needed; men enlisted in satisfactory, and initially overwhelming, numbers. On that date, however, the War Office in London cabled, in response to an Australian query, that every available man was wanted at the front. This information provided a powerful stimulus to the recruiting movement. Victorian politicians began a recruiting campaign because figures showed that their state lagged in the numbers of men sent to the A.I.F. The campaign achieved such success that rival states were forced to emulate it. The recruiting campaigns revealed, for the first time, the divisions and disagreements in Australian attitudes towards the war. The War Office's statement generated the impossible expectation that every man was needed and, as a result, recruiters set out to appeal to every Australian man. When large numbers of men turned down the appeal recruiters realised that not every one agreed with them about the demands of patriotism and the duties of citizens. The patriots tended to brand those who disagreed with them 'shirkers' and 'slackers'. Patriotism became the exclusive preserve of those who thought as they did; recruiters recognised only two categories of men. As the recruiting movement failed, the bad temper accompanying this sort of moral segregation grew.

Churchmen participated in the recruiting movement, and the story of their experiences further indicates their growing
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1 Scott, Australia, p.292.

2 The Minister for Defence, Senator George Pearce, made the accusation in Melbourne on 21 June 1915. Scott accepted Pearce's figures, referring to recruiting in Victoria as 'especially backward'. Scott, Australia, p.292 and Robson, First A.I.F., p.46. Robson argues that Pearce's assertion may have been, tragically, erroneous. See 'The origin and character, of the First A.I.F., 1914-18: some statistical evidence', Historical Studies, vol.15, no.61, October 1973, p.740.

3 The Victorian campaign was a spectacular success. At its peak recruiters netted 1,071 men in a single day and 6,222 men in one week. Robson, First A.I.F., p.48. In June 1915, 3,381 Victorians enlisted compared with 21,698 in July. Scott, Australia, Appendix no.3, p.871.
disappointment with Australian society and their frustration at the refusal of society to conform to the expectations they had formulated in the early weeks of the war. The clerical thesis remained unchanged. God permitted the war to remind men of his omnipotence and to wean them from materialism. The suffering would continue until men grasped God's message and repented of their national and individual sins. God used war as an instrument in his overall plan for the salvation of the world. Churchmen had begun to perceive the indifference of Australians to this thesis, their indifference to the redemptive value of sacrifice. The failure of recruiting reinforced this perception and churchmen began to turn to governments to compel men to be good. They adopted Archbishop Donaldson's test of a nation's worth, the readiness of its young men to rush to the firing line, and decided that, by the second half of 1915, Australians had begun to fail.

Clergymen, apparently, felt ill at ease on the recruiting platform because they were asking men to do what, in most cases, they could not do themselves. Many clergymen sought to justify their enthusiasm for the work. Some pointed out that they were too old, others claimed they had been rejected, others that they had been unable to secure a chaplaincy and others that their sons had enlisted, as if they themselves were serving vicariously. Only Hugh Kelly, among the church editors, sought to discuss the propriety of clerical efforts at recruiting. He argued that God's plans could be brought to fruition only by human agents, implying that clergymen, privy to those plans, had the duty to appeal on God's behalf. He asked how the Empire could win 'unless the men of Australia place themselves at God's disposal in this matter by putting themselves in the Australian army'.

In this context 'failure' refers to the gap between the expectations of recruiters and the numbers of men who enlisted. In this way, even the Victorian campaign could be called a failure.

For example, Rev. Dr J.E. Carruthers, Daily Telegraph, 3 November 1915; Rev. R. Scott-West, Sydney Morning Herald, 10 August 1915; Rev. C.E. Perry, Age, 7 July 1915; Rev. W.A. Phillips, Age, 15 July 1915.

PM, 2 July 1915.
The Victorian recruiting campaign ran for two weeks, from 5 to 17 July. The politicians initiated, organised and directed it and invited other citizens to speak in support of the arguments of the organisers. The daily press reported the campaign in full so that it has been possible to identify many of the speakers at the local meetings and assess the role clergymen played. This gives some estimate of the value others placed on the persuasive powers of clergymen. In Victoria, clergymen spoke at 61 of the 125 recruiting meetings reported. Twenty-five of the clerical recruiters were Anglican, eighteen Presbyterian, eight Methodist and five Catholic. For what it is worth, these figures, considered in relation to the strength of each denomination, show that Presbyterian ministers participated most fully in the campaign. Despite their traditional readiness to mount the public platform, the Victorian Methodists played a curiously inconspicuous part at the meetings. The local, largely council-based, recruiting committees drew up the list of speakers and consistently invited the local clergymen, rather than the church leaders, to take part. In fact, neither archbishop appeared in the Victorian recruiting movement, nor did the leaders of Methodism. Perhaps the local clergyman was thought to be more persuasive and more accessible than his superiors. Perhaps, too, the committees invited few Catholic priests to speak because the priests generally held themselves aloof from community affairs. Their absence did not necessarily indicate a lack of interest in recruiting. The Advocate proudly recorded the efforts made, congratulating the priests who contributed. Adherence to

---

1 *Age*, 5 July 1915.

2 I have not counted those meetings where the names of the main speakers were given and the rest grouped together as 'other speakers'. Clergymen may, or may not, have addressed these meetings.

3 Fifteen ministers from the smaller churches also spoke.

4 The *Argus* showed no interest at all in Catholic recruiters and refused to notice their presence on the platform. Where the *Age* noted that a priest recruited, the *Argus* ignored him. See, for example, *Age* and *Argus*, 7 July 1915. The historian who consulted only the *Argus* would conclude that Catholic priests played no part in the campaign.

5 *Advocate*, 10 and 17 July 1915.
Mannix's later contention that the nature of a priest's vocation prohibited him from appealing for recruits was not evident during the first campaign.¹

In appealing for recruits churchmen relied on the arguments favoured by their parliamentary colleagues. They made no unique contribution to the campaign. The editor of the Australian Christian World showed how clerical recruiters could make their appeal in terms of religion, if they so chose. He advised them to emphasise that the conflict raged to determine which moral system would have the ascendancy, Kultur or Gospel. Clergymen should ask for recruits to fight the Lord's battles, to wage a holy war.² Churchmen rejected this advice, preferring instead to direct their appeals largely to the emotions. They made much of the threat a victorious Germany posed to Australia's security and independence. The Germans would claim Australia as the first prize of victory. Dr Rentoul showed less imaginative brethren what could be made of this argument. He promised that if the Germans gained control of the English Channel for six hours they would be masters of the world; then 'Australia's freedom would be euchred and Australians would be members of a German conscript army, kicked and cuffed into the goose-step'.³ Others tried to shame their audiences into approaching the recruiting-sergeant's table. If fear did not drive men into the army, shame might. Clergymen appealed in the name of the Australians already at Gallipoli, whose deeds received the highest praise. The recruiters concentrated on the Australian virtue of mateship, of never deserting a mate in trouble. They drew distressing pictures of the consequence of a defeat at Gallipoli, or even a retreat from that bleak peninsula.⁴ Lest these appeals lack impact, clergymen addressed their audiences in savage terms. Name-calling, categorisation and imputation

¹At an anti-conscription rally in December 1917 Mannix said: 'at the beginning of the war I made up my mind that the recruiting platform was not the place for a Catholic priest'. Advocate, 8 December 1917.

²ACW, 30 July 1915.

³Age, 6 July 1915.

⁴Argus, 6 July 1915.
of motives became common-place during the Victorian campaign. Rentoul contrasted the heroes at Gallipoli with the youths who crowded around the goals at Saturday's football matches and branded the man who, though free to enlist, preferred football, as 'a loon, a coward and a dastard'.

The Rev. Andrew Law gave cold comfort to Brighton's young men who, he said, were 'killing [their] compatriots' by withholding their aid. 

Father Robinson referred to such as 'cowards and renegades', while the Rev. D. Millar expressed general contempt for the working classes. They had most to lose from a German victory, he argued, and yet they watched the progress of the war with supreme indifference. Instead of meditating on the consequences of a German victory the workers flocked to race meetings and football matches. The recruiting meeting, like the temperance rally or revival session, was apparently no place for sustained argument. Emotional appeals carried the day.

Clergymen at the recruiting rallies sometimes behaved enthusiastically. Dr Fitchett contrasted the behaviour of the Rev. Frank Lynch of Williamstown who rushed to an interjector and 'struck him a violent blow on the nose' with that of the Rev. Hume Robertson of Brighton who conducted a prayer meeting before the recruiting meeting. Fitchett commented that 'there [was] no discord betwixt the prayer meeting and the recruiting meeting; one helped the other'.

The Rev. Edward Scheweiger assisted Sir John Forrest at Casterton and Merino 'by singing numerous patriotic songs'.

---

1 Argus, 6 July 1915.
2 Age, 13 July 1915.
3 Age, 6 July 1915.
4 Age, 20 July 1915.
5 Southern Cross (Melbourne), 16 July 1915. In his own speech Lynch referred to the 'damned cowards' at the back of the hall. Reactions to Lynch's behaviour were mixed. 'Gaiety is a great relief in these dolorous days' (CS, 16 July 1915); 'there is no excuse for hysterical outbursts which are more indicative of the weakness of panic' (Advocate, 17 July 1915). For the aftermath of Lynch's attack see Robson, First A.I.F., p.48.
6 Southern Cross (Melbourne), 16 July 1915.
7 Novar Papers, NL, MS.696/7447.
The New South Wales government, encouraged by Victoria's example, determined to organise a special week of recruiting to coincide with the anniversary of the war.\(^1\) The Premier, W.A. Holman, who organised the campaign, invited both archbishops to address the opening rally at the Exhibition building. He asked Kelly to speak because he was 'most anxious for all sections of the community to be represented'; he also asked Kelly to co-operate throughout the campaign.\(^2\) Kelly hesitated before accepting the invitation not because he doubted whether he should recruit but because he did not wish to mix with politicians. As he told his own people the day after the rally, 'I know what I am saying when I am in the pulpit, but when I am leagued with politicians...I am afraid I would be compromising'.\(^3\) So Kelly discussed the invitation with 'worthy advisers' who told him 'that it would be a bad policy not to support the Government, no matter who the Government was, in every way'.\(^4\) Kelly thought he needed to justify his association with such company but he had no scruples about recruiting. Archbishop Wright, on the other hand, was pleased to help in the recruiting work in any company. Before the campaign began, he wrote to his clergy asking them to take an active part in the recruiting work. He believed their efforts would bear fruit because of the respected position clergymen held: 'many of our young men are only waiting for outspoken counsel from those whom they have learned to trust'.\(^5\) He also believed that men from church backgrounds would make better soldiers than the others so clergymen should try to attract them first. He asked each clergyman 'to take such steps as you think best to bring home to your people the true significance and urgency of this call to arms'.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\)Scott, *Australia*, p.292.


\(^3\)FJ, 5 August 1915.

\(^4\)Ibid.

\(^5\)CS, 2 July 1915.

\(^6\)Ibid.
It is not likely that either archbishop much enjoyed his night on the recruiting platform. Owing to the defective acoustic qualities of the building, the crowd barely heard the first two speakers, the Governor and the Chief Justice, and when Wright began they raised the cry 'come down! get on the bandstand!'\(^1\) The two churchmen agreed to this request and climbed to a small overhead bandstand in the centre of the building. A reporter referred to this as 'a difficult acrobatic task'.\(^2\) From his lofty position Wright dealt with the consequences of a German victory: 'the lives of our children were not safe; the honor of our mothers, wives, daughters and sisters was not safe'.\(^3\) Wright emphasised that the danger could only be averted by crushing Germany completely; that was a sacred task.\(^4\) Perhaps Kelly's climb had jolted his speech from his memory; as reported he was not easy to follow. He mentioned the presence at the front of a quarter of a million brave Irish soldiers, he announced that peace would only come from the sword and he counselled all to take up the sword until they crushed tyranny. Kelly spoke with pride of the great reputation the Australians had already won and insisted that all soldiers be thoroughly trained to preserve that reputation.\(^5\) The crowd then unanimously carried a motion calling on 'every physically fit man of military age, unencumbered by family ties and not directly engaged in the production of warlike supplies' to join the forces.\(^6\) The motion, taken at its face value, aroused an impossible expectation and when at the end of the meeting only 111 volunteered from the large number of young men in the audience, it was clear that the campaign was doomed to failure. Not every physically fit man would enlist.

---

\(^1\)CS, 6 August 1915.
\(^2\)Ibid.
\(^3\)Daily Telegraph, 2 August 1915.
\(^4\)Ibid.
\(^5\)Ibid.
\(^6\)Ibid.
Having secured the presence of the two archbishops at the opening rally Holman believed he had demonstrated the churches' enthusiasm for recruiting and he engaged few clergymen to speak at subsequent meetings. Newspaper reports give the names of eight Anglican, four Presbyterian, three Methodist and four Catholic clergymen who spoke during the New South Wales campaign.\(^1\) Amongst the churchmen only the Presbyterian R.G. Macintyre had an impact on the campaign and he was involved more in his capacity as Secretary of the State Recruiting Committee than as a professor of theology. New South Wales clerical recruiters employed similar arguments to those used by their colleagues in Victoria. The Rev. David Brandt said he had seen enough men going in and out of four hotels at Redfern 'to fill all the gaps in the ranks at the Dardanelles'.\(^2\) The Rev. Victor Bell told a Darlinghurst audience that it rested with Australians whether Germany was to take possession of the country. He believed that people who refused to defend themselves 'were below the beasts of the field'.\(^3\) Macintyre pitched his appeal higher. He saw the conflict as between Christ and Caesar; the Empire fought against the greatest menace to civilisation. He pleaded with his Martin-place audience to enlist 'in the name of your country - in the name of freedom - in the name of democracy - in the name of God and Truth'.\(^4\)

Even though the campaign organisers largely ignored clergymen when selecting speakers for recruiting meetings churchmen, at the Premier's request, gave the campaign warm support from their pulpits.\(^5\) The acknowledged spokesmen for

---

\(^1\)New South Wales newspapers gave much less space to the campaign than had the Victorian papers. In fact, Holman blamed the papers for the failure of the first week; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 August 1915. It is likely, therefore, that clergymen spoke more frequently than was reported.

\(^2\)*Daily Telegraph*, 2 August 1915.

\(^3\)*Daily Telegraph*, 11 August 1915.

\(^4\)*Daily Telegraph*, 6 August 1915.

\(^5\)Letter from W.A. Holman to M. Kelly, 21 July 1915, Kelly Papers, SDA, File 'Kelly: War, Conscript Chaplains 1915-27'. Holman wrote that the 'intervention of the Churches would be most welcome'.
the Sydney churches, Wright, Kelly and Ferguson, all preached enlistment at the start of the week, although, as in Melbourne, the Methodist spokesmen were silent.\textsuperscript{1} Churchmen also spoke with disgust and loathing of the boxing fans who had howled down Holman and counted him out when he attempted to urge the patriotic duty at the Sydney Stadium.\textsuperscript{2} Such behaviour confirmed clerical suspicions that the majority of people at sports meetings were slackers. Brandt believed that the incident showed that the government must compel 'men of this class to be trained'.\textsuperscript{3}

The New South Wales campaign was not a success.\textsuperscript{4} Indeed the results of the first week were so disappointing that Holman extended the campaign for a second week and eventually it struggled on fitfully for several weeks. Perhaps Sydney people were less susceptible to hysteria and enthusiasm than were their Melbourne counterparts.\textsuperscript{5} The politicians and the press gave their reasons for the failure of the campaign; the editor of Church Standard found a deeper cause; he blamed the promoters who had failed to arouse a spirit of consecration.\textsuperscript{6} He complained that he heard many appeals for patriotism and many attempts to scare people with stories of German brutality but he had not heard 'an attempt to enlist men in the cause and service of God'.\textsuperscript{7} He called on the church to make up this deficiency by initiating a spiritual campaign to whip up 'enthusiasm and moral fire'.\textsuperscript{8} If so, Holman had erred in not giving clergymen a bigger part in the campaign.

\textsuperscript{1}Daily Telegraph, 2 August 1915.

\textsuperscript{2}Daily Telegraph, 2 August 1915. In justification of the Stadium crowd it is only fair to say that the fight involved one of Australia's greatest sporting heroes, Les Darcy. His opponent was Eddie McGoorty of the United States of America.

\textsuperscript{3}Daily Telegraph, 2 August 1915.

\textsuperscript{4}8,961 men enlisted from New South Wales in July and 12,991 in August. Scott, Australia, Appendix No.3, p.871.

\textsuperscript{5}See C.M.H. Clark, 'Faith', in Peter Coleman (ed), Australian Civilisation, Melbourne, 1962, pp.85-8, for some differences between Sydney and Melbourne.

\textsuperscript{6}CS, 20 August 1915.

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{8}Ibid.
The Government of South Australia placed the organisation of their recruiting campaign in the hands of the director of the Tourist Bureau, Victor H. Ryan. The Governor, opening the two-week campaign on 2 August, mentioned the inter-state rivalry which had set the various campaigns in motion. He noted that Victoria had temporarily taken the lead in the recruiting movement as the result of a vigorous campaign but he prophesied that South Australia would soon be in the van. During the first week clergymen played only a small part in the recruiting work; they were not asked to address the local meetings. However, at the end of the first week Ryan appealed for patriotic men to make recruiting speeches. The number of churchmen involved in the campaign increased markedly. In South Australia Methodist clergymen took up the work enthusiastically; fourteen of them gave recruiting addresses as did ten Anglican clergymen, two Presbyterian and three Catholic. Clergymen spoke at twenty-nine of the seventy-nine meetings reported.

The high-point of the campaign was the monster meeting held at the Exhibition building on 4 August to mark the anniversary of the war. A large, enthusiastic crowd assembled to listen to the speeches of the Governor, the Premier (Crawford Vaughan), the Leader of the Opposition (A.H. Peake), and three clergymen, Father Le Maitre, Archdeacon Clampett and the Rev. Henry Howard. Peake explained the preponderance of clergymen, saying that it showed that the churches regarded the war as Christian, 'waged for the maintenance of the principles of the Christian religion, for liberty and freedom, and for

1. *Advertiser*, 3 August 1915.
2. Ibid.
4. *Advertiser* gave full lists of speakers at local meetings.
5. *Advertiser*, 2 to 16 August 1915.
6. As Archbishop O'Reily had died within the last month (6 July 1915) it was probably not possible to invite Archbishop Spence and therefore Bishop Thomas. Spence later received many requests from V.H. Ryan and usually complied. O'Reily/Spence Papers, Catholic Church Office, Adelaide, passim.
everything that deserved to be consecrated and held dear in family and social life'. The three churchmen came at their work from different angles. Le Maitre dealt with German brutality. He spoke of the Kaiser's 'ruthless, relentless butchery of defenceless old men, women and children'. He called on South Australians to follow the example of the men already at Gallipoli and help in crushing 'the ogre's head' to ensure permanent peace. Clampett argued on the lines of self-defence. He believed a victorious Germany might make Australia a German province. Howard, voicing the feelings of many Australian clergymen, expressed regret at the necessity of a recruiting rally. 'National feeling ought to be running at such a full tide of force and flow as to swamp every other consideration excepting the defence of hearth, home, liberty and faith.' A recruiting campaign, as such, pointed to the failure of the spirit of the nation's young men because they needed to be asked to enlist. Howard's attitude predisposed a recruiter to despondency and gloom no matter what the actual gain to the army was. He granted that Australians fought for Australia's existence but he said that he preferred to make his appeal on nobler grounds than self-defence. He spoke of Britain's historic role as 'the defender and guardian of the world's rights and the redresser of the world's wrongs'. He asked the young men to consecrate their lives to the defence of freedom. The meeting endorsed a call for every available man who was physically fit to join the forces and a similar motion was passed at each local meeting. In these terms the campaign failed; judged more realistically it succeeded,

1Advertiser, 5 August 1915.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
6Ibid.
attracting 2,705 men to the army in August against 1,453 in July.¹

The Western Australian Government scorned to follow the example of the eastern states. As the Premier said, 'it would be absurd to initiate a recruiting campaign until it could be shown that the State had not done its part in finding men for the front'.² Even so, some Western Australians adopted the eastern vice of categorising apparent eligibles. T.R. O'Grady, for example, referred to 'slackers' as 'parasites clustering around the community for existence, and the community should shake them off with a cold shoulder'.³ In Queensland, too, the politicians saw no need for organised recruiting and left it to interested citizens to set up a committee. Although this deprived the organisation of much impact a committee was formed largely at the instigation of Canon Garland who became the first secretary.⁴ The committee sponsored recruiting talks from the back of a lorry during Brisbane's Exhibition week and sent five recruiting trains to tour the country districts, but there was no unified campaign.⁵ However, Garland's influence ensured that churchmen were prominent in the recruiting movement. Donaldson supported the movement enthusiastically as did Duhig who replied to a priest who asked permission to take part in the campaign, 'heartily approve your speaking noble cause; wish you every success'.⁶ In Hobart special recruiting meetings were held for a week in early August; clergymen spoke at about half the meetings.⁷

¹Scott, Australia, Appendix No.3, p.871. The extent of the failure was sometimes quite dramatic. A meeting at Glenelg called on every available man to join up: 'one man in the audience signified his intention of enlisting and Mr Soward said he had had a letter from a resident of Helmsdale saying he was going to join'. Advertiser, 4 August 1915.

²Advertiser, 17 August 1915.

³WAR, 21 August 1915.

⁴Courier, 7 August 1915.

⁵Courier, 9 August 1915.

⁶Catholic Age, 21 August 1915. The priest, Fr McCarthy, confessed that if he had witnessed the German atrocities '[he] should be unworthy of the name of man did [he] not kill'.

⁷Mercury, 4-14 August 1915.
Clergymen all around Australia, therefore, actively participated in the recruiting movement so far as they were permitted; they played an important but not a dominant role. Their participation reinforced their fears about the apathy of Australians to the war. They tried to sow the seed of sacrifice and duty and in many cases it fell on barren ground. The clerical recruiters refused to prepare the soil by speaking of God and the demands of morality. Instead they fell back on emotional appeals calling on men to fight to protect their daughters or to help their mates. They did not try to convert men to their understanding of the war. Perhaps they had already lost confidence in the appeal of their interpretation to the ordinary Australian. When however, they encountered the blank stare or the apathetic shrug of the man to whom they appealed they assumed that he was indifferent to the great issues involved in the war; but they did not explain those great issues to him. Clergymen adopted, too, the habit of speaking ill of the men who refused to enlist. They professed to find the mind's construction in the face. Words as offensive as shirker, coward, slacker, traitor, parasite and even murderer were on their lips as much as on the lips of others. Many clergymen damned the man who took his recreation at a sporting event. Clerical behaviour, in some cases, assumed a frenzied air. These were not rational reactions to the problems involved in securing recruits but were born of anger and frustration at the indifference of many to the doctrines clergymen held to be so important and the inability to convert this indifference to something more positive. These frustrations became endemic among those clergymen who continued to ask every fit man to join the army long after the recruiting campaigns ended.

Methodist clergymen escaped these troubles by remaining aloof from the recruiting campaigns. Australian Methodism celebrated its centenary in July and August 1915 and much church activity was taken up with this event, leaving little time for recruiting. Methodists were also genuinely concerned about the dangers to morals associated with the soldier's life and they hesitated to advocate a course that might retard a man's chance of salvation. Henry Worrall showed how precious that chance was when, speaking at a Pleasant Sunday Afternoon on 'Soldiers and Drink', he detailed the injuries his son had
received at Gallipoli. He predicted that his boy would be permanently disfigured and said he would have his son know such wounds a thousand times over rather 'than bear about in his body the marks of the iniquitous liquor traffic'. McCallum spoke even more explicitly saying that Methodists 'felt it was almost useless urging men to enlist and then allow the liquor business to undo so much of the manhood of the country'. Carruthers claimed that 90 per cent of courts martial originated from the drink business which public men, despite their patriotism, refused to clear up. He concluded that 'parents hesitate[d] to consent to their sons going into camp under these conditions'. Apparently most Methodist ministers refused to recommend such dangers, except in South Australia where the smaller camps made the danger less pronounced.

While the enthusiasm of the young men to rush to the firing line was one test of the national spirit, clergymen continued to test it in other ways. The gloom induced by the failure, in clerical terms, of the recruiting campaigns deepened as the other tests showed a negative result. Churchmen deplored the unsatisfactory level of church attendance, using such attendance as an important indication of the national spirit. Clergymen complained about attendance not because people stopped going to church but because the increase that they anticipated did not occur. One editor reported that many Australian ministers had told him that the war had not produced a greater interest in religion. They acknowledged that special services, such as the unveiling of honour rolls, brought overflowing congregations but complained that 'from the stand-point of the regular Sunday and week-night gatherings, there is no increase'. Many had hoped that the publication of the first casualty lists would lead the nation to God to ask

---

1 Spectator, 17 September 1915. Some Methodists were so disturbed to hear of Worrall's tragedy that he was forced to retract some of his hyperbole later: 'the surgeons have done wonders with him. There will be no disfigurement, so I am told, and his speech will be alright.' Spectator, 1 October 1915.

2 Spectator, 15 October 1915.

3 Methodist, 4 September 1915.

4 PM, 10 September 1915.
for pardon, healing and strength. They found instead that 'not even our sorrows have drawn us to the feet of our Father'.

Events now seemed to conflict with the optimism churchmen had expressed at the beginning of the war and doubts about the interpretation of events grew. It is probable that many clergymen who knelt in prayer at night sought answers to the problems caused by the disparity between faith and event and grew increasingly unhappy at their inability to explain and affect the world in which they lived. Hugh Kelly asked whether 'the life of the average citizen is such as to justify us saying it is worth the price now being paid for it'. His answer gave even less comfort: 'if their death does not make us wiser, more thoughtful, more kindly, more reverent and more spiritual in our ideals, then they have died in vain, and we are of all men most miserable'. The historian may ask whether an appreciation of the extent of the sacrifice caused many clerics to wonder whether the price was too high. Bishop Feetham gave a just appraisal of the cost:

the rising statesman, the scholar, the poet, the scientist, the musician, whose high talents were just beginning to yield their fruit, they are laid low in an instant by the blind, indiscriminating forces of destruction.

He could justify such a cost only in terms of the improvement in national standards of thought and behaviour. The losses made no sense, the bishop concluded, except for 'faith in the efficacy of sacrifice'. The nation, however, gave no indication that the sacrifice was efficacious. Feetham's tone changed to indignation and outrage; the lives of his fellow citizens, 'the ugly tokens of our degeneracy', challenged his faith. He argued that

---

1 *PM*, 10 September 1915. The situation was just as bad in Victoria; see *PM (V)*, 13 August 1915 and *Spectator*, 22 October 1915.

2 *PM*, 5 November 1915.

3 Ibid.


5 Ibid., p.11.
while the fate, not only of our nation but of 
the whole human race, hangs in the balance, it 
is indeed astounding and disgusting that the 
sensations of the stadium or the cinematograph, 
or the speculations of the turf, should absorb 
the attention of large numbers of society.¹ 
The nation must show signs of renewal to make sense of the 
terrible loss of life at Gallipoli. So Feetham appealed to 
his people to practise prayer and self-denial and called on 
them to encourage the recruiting movement to give the nation a 
chance to show its determination to accept sacrifice.² The 
war god was inexorable: he made sense of sacrifice by demanding 
even greater sacrifice.

Churchmen who faced these problems began to lose confidence 
in themselves and asked if the whole blame for the degeneracy 
of the people lay with the people. Some churchmen looked for 
other targets, accusing the church of failing to lead the 
people to renewal. Stone-Wigg, in the Church Standard, 
complained about the war sermon with which preachers had sought 
to inspire the community. He described it, instead, as a stale 
digest of war news culled from the newspapers. People did not 
make the effort of going to church to hear 'a pathetic echo of 
the world's futile, tired and strident cries'.³ The good war 
sermon would clarify the spiritual message of the war as 

shrieks against Germany are stale now...clergy, 
moreover, do not minister either to their own 
or their Church's dignity by wild babblings 
against German philosophers whose names they can 
seldom pronounce, and with whose works, perhaps, 
they are not over-familiar.⁴

In the following issue the editor attacked the general reaction 
of the church to the war. He found that the church had not 
grasped the opportunity. Churchmen had neglected the ministry 
to the soldiers in the Australian training camps and had 
fostered unreal devotions which failed to express what men 
were thinking and praying about. Although the circumstances 
differed greatly 'precisely the same forms of service were used

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., pp.14-16.
³CS, 8 October 1915.
⁴Ibid.
at services on the anniversary of the war, and are still being used as were used at the day of intercession last January.\textsuperscript{1}

The church's worship and social work did little to engage the attention of the men for whom it was undertaken. A Presbyterian critic charged that his church had been diverted from its true mission by its own loyalty, 'a snare' and patriotism, 'an unsure guide'.\textsuperscript{2} The church had devoted its energies 'to providing material support' and had failed to mobilise its unique force, prayer. The writer concluded:

\begin{quote}
we have loyally and effectively promoted recruiting, contributed to patriotic funds, and sent a ceaseless stream of necessities and comforts to our lads in camp or at the Dardanelles. We are so absorbed in these noble enterprises that we have come to regard them as the highest service we can render.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

Methodists stopped short of blaming their church for the unregenerate state of the nation but they were aware of the pressures on the church in time of war. A writer in the Spectator warned that some patriots showed little concern for the supreme moral issues and used churchmen simply to advance the material well-being and security of the state.\textsuperscript{4} Churchmen should insist at all times that religion was man's highest concern before which all, even wars, must yield and was not a tool to be used by politicians to arouse the people to greater activity.\textsuperscript{5}

Catholic churchmen did not indulge in public doubts about their war-time relationship with the state. They appeared, as ever, supremely confident in their ability to interpret their founder's commands. Catholic journalists reported the patriotic excesses of Protestant ministers with delighted amazement although they ignored such excesses in their own men. An Advocate columnist deplored the action of a Methodist minister who sent a white feather and offensive letter to the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[1]{CS, 15 October 1915.}
\footnotetext[2]{PM, 10 September 1915.}
\footnotetext[3]{Ibid.}
\footnotetext[4]{Spectator, 17 September 1915.}
\footnotetext[5]{Ibid.}
\end{footnotes}
shire president of Rochester and commented that such 'parsons' 'should be taught to attend to their professed business of saving souls and leave the work of destroying bodies to the laity'.¹ The same columnist reported that many Protestant clergymen sought leave to join the army but ignored the report that a Catholic priest had done so.² Nor were Catholics as dependent on national reform to make sense of the war. They did not expect the experience of war to reform the nation although they hoped for individual improvement. In the Catholic view the church itself was the vehicle of salvation and Catholics continued to pray that the war would benefit the church.

In the prevailing atmosphere of gloom and frustration Protestant churchmen were particularly susceptible to talk of compulsion. This was not an original impulse inspired by the war: Australian Protestants had operated for decades on the principle that if people would not be good of their own choosing then churchmen should ask the state for help to make them good.³ The desire to compel men to join the army when they would not do so of their own accord was an extension of this principle. However, churchmen did not initiate talk of conscription in Australia; as in many other matters connected with the war, they followed where others led. Discussion of conscription began in earnest in Australia with the formation of the Universal Service League in September 1915.⁴ The League

¹ Advocate, 9 October 1915.
² Advocate, 24 July 1915. The Age, 6 July 1915, reported that the Rev. J. Henahan of Smythesdale had enlisted as a private. He was, reportedly, a keen sportsman and a good shot.
³ See, for example, J.D. Bollen, Protestantism and the Social Reform Movement, Melbourne, 1972, passim.
received the blessing of both archbishops of Sydney and while early church reaction to conscription was almost entirely favourable Catholic and Protestant churchmen supported it for different reasons. These differences became important in later years. Catholic editors supported conscription on the grounds of efficiency and economy, demanding the best use of the available man-power. Their arguments were almost entirely practical. Tighe Ryan, in the Catholic Press, expressed concern that the bush was being bled dry of skilled workers; men needed years of training to acquire their expertise and Australia could ill afford to lose them. Ryan called for a rational policy that would ensure the most efficient use of the skills available to the nation. Conscription appealed to Protestant editors who wanted to see all sections of the community participate in the war, for their own good. They also argued that the burden of the war should be distributed more evenly and that one section of the community, the 'slackers' should not be able to float on the patriotism of others. A number of church editors, Catholic and Protestant, agreed that the decision for or against conscription should remain with Great Britain; as one said 'if Lord Kitchener says [conscription] is warranted then we will loyally acquiesce'.

T.R. O'Grady announced his total and unalterable opposition to conscription in three vigorous editorials in 1915. Firstly he rejected it on philosophical grounds because it took away the free will of Australian manhood and as such was

1 However, there were no clergymen on the executive committee of the Victorian branch. The Argus, 22 September 1915, gives the full list of twenty members. Kelly was quite prepared to speak at the inaugural meeting at the Sydney Town Hall, if needed. He and Wright signed the Manifesto and both became vice-presidents of the League. Letter from T.W. Edgeworth David to M. Kelly, 14 September 1915, and the heads of Kelly's reply [on the back of the letter], Kelly Papers, SDA, File, 'Kelly: War, Conscript Chaplains 1915-1927'.

2 Catholic Press, 12 August 1915. Other editorials agreeing with this viewpoint were: FJ, 9 September 1915 and Southern Cross, 15 October 1915.

3 See, for example, Methodist, 9 October 1915.

4 CM, 24 September 1915 and also CS, 16 July and 31 December 1915; Advocate, 25 September 1915 and Southern Cross, 24 September 1915.
'a device of the devil'. He acknowledged the existence of 'shirkers' but denied anyone the right to force the will of another Australian. Thus he completely rejected the Protestant thesis that if men will not be good the state has the right to compel them to be good. O'Grady also opposed conscription because of the effect it would have on Australia's future. He pictured Australia denuded of her young men, the life of the nation carried on by the 'aged, feeble, physically unfit, and morally degenerate'. He asked his readers to consider Australia's future: were Australians building a great civilisation for the white man or were they merely preparing the country for the 'yellow, flat-nosed denizens of the Far East' who would move in when Australia was weakened?

The majority of church leaders did not share O'Grady's respect for free will and sought to reinforce persuasion with the arm of the state even in the matter of prayer. When they made preparations for the national day of prayer for January 1916 they relied on the help of the state to fill the churches. This was the measure of the extent to which their optimism had evaporated since January 1915. Archbishop Wright was the prime mover in this direction. In November he wrote to his Catholic counterpart about 'the advisability of inducing the Government of New South Wales to set apart a Week Day for Special National Prayer for War'. The nation, he wrote, was still asleep spiritually, and the special day, while some would treat it as an extra public holiday, would awaken the bulk of the people to the realities of the war. Wright suggested that Kelly make the request to Holman independently; apparently he wrote to other heads of churches in a similar vein.

This first plan was too ambitious so early in December Wright approached the Governor-General, Sir Ronald Munro-Ferguson, with another scheme. He stated that the

---

1. *WAR*, 3 July 1915.
2. *WAR*, 16 October 1915.
4. J.C. Wright to M. Kelly, 22 November 1915, Kelly Papers, SDA, File 'Anglican Archbp. of Sydney 1912-23'.
Anglican bishops had called on their people to observe Sunday, 2 January 1916, as a special day of prayer and he asked the Governor-General, either alone or with the Prime Minister, to appeal to all religious bodies to observe the day too. He did not envisage a common service, stressing that each church would pray according to its own rites and usages. He believed that the effect of such an appeal from the King's representative 'would be incalculable on the moral life of the Community', implying that the people would pay more attention to the Governor-General than to their own church leaders.\(^2\)

Munro-Ferguson passed the letter on to Hughes, the new Prime Minister, apologising for having to trouble Hughes with the matter.\(^3\) He believed Wright's motives were disinterested and not merely another example of Anglican pretension to national spiritual leadership. He advised Hughes to grant the request: 'so long as Churches act together, and on an equal footing, I think it is a mistake to isolate the State from religion'.\(^4\) Hughes accepted this advice but, believing the people would heed his appeal above the Governor-General's, issued a call to prayer in his own name. He summoned heads of churches to organise prayer 'in such a way as they may deem fit and in a fervent hope that all sections of the community will be associated with the movement'.\(^5\) He asked churchmen to pray 'for Divine guidance and aid to the British Empire and her allies'.\(^6\)

---

1. J.C. Wright to R. Munro-Ferguson, 11 December 1915, Novar Papers, NL, MS.696/8476.
2. Ibid.
3. Andrew Fisher replaced Sir George Reid as the Australian High Commissioner in London and W.M. Hughes, the Attorney-General in the Fisher government, became Prime Minister on 27 October 1915. Scott, Australia, p.303.
4. Post-script to an undated letter from R. Munro-Ferguson to W.M. Hughes, 'Novar Papers, NL, MS.696/2952.
5. Telegram from W.M. Hughes to M. Kelly, 23 December 1915. Kelly Papers, SDA, File, '1915'. For the text see Argus, 24 December 1915, which, however, gave little prominence to Hughes' appeal.
6. Ibid.
Wright had already asked Kelly to issue a pastoral letter, even listing the points he might make in it. Kelly dutifully wrote a short letter neglecting Wright's points and inviting his people, instead, 'to additional works of piety and of personal repentance and sanctification'. Apparently Kelly could see little point in asking Catholics to attend church on the Sunday in question because they were already obliged to do so. In contrast the Anglican bishops sent a long letter to their people asking them to pray with confidence that God would hasten the day of peace. They should also examine their consciences and repent of their sins because the result of the war depended on the calibre of the nation.

In Adelaide Spence signed the joint letter with other church leaders but hastened to assure his own people that the Catholic church had not abandoned her claims to be the one church founded by Christ. He had 'joined with the heads of the other denominations in appealing to all the people to do something to appease God's anger' but had 'compromised no principle'. As in January 1915 Catholics hesitated to make common cause with other Christians fearing to minimise their claims to exclusiveness.

The way in which the events of the second half of 1915, in particular the 'failure' of the recruiting movement, conflicted with churchmen's interpretation of the war must have

---

1 J.C. Wright to M. Kelly, 15 December 1915, Kelly Papers, SDA, File, 'Anglican Archbp. of Sydney 1912-1923'.

2 FJ, 30 December 1915. Kelly sent a copy of the letter to the Governor-General who thanked him for its 'Catholic and loyal' spirit. Letter from R. Munro-Ferguson to M. Kelly, 25 December 1915, Kelly Papers, SDA, File, '1915'.

3 CS, 24 December 1915. The editor of the Presbyterian Messenger disapproved of the letter because of its emphasis on repentance which might lead some to think that the Empire was to be blamed for the war. PM, 10 December 1915.

4 Circular from Archbishop Spence, O'Reilly/Spence Papers, Catholic Church Office, Adelaide, File, '1915'.

tested their faith in this interpretation. Few churchmen, however, abandoned the interpretation in favour of one more in harmony with the events. Instead, some churchmen sought to enlist the power of the state to mould events until they fitted the clerical thesis more closely. The optimism that had prevailed in 1914 and again in May 1915 was now replaced by a grim determination to force a lesson on an apparently indifferent nation.
Chapter 6

PRIORITIES

Surely any Church which in this crisis preaches "Business as Usual"...is a Church with coldness close to her heart.

L.V. Biggs, Melbourne Synod, 1917.
War was more than an intellectual problem for pulpit and pew. Church leaders interpreted events for their people and also participated in them, so, while they preached about the war, they also attempted to balance the demands of patriotism against the needs of the church. They had to decide the extent to which the normal ministry of the church should be sacrificed to meet the needs of a nation at war. Church-people were required to assign a priority to their church activity. Ministers wondered whether to enlist as soldiers and so discard, even temporarily, the call they believed they had received from God. Lay-people decided to what extent they should continue to support their church in the face of the incessant demands on their time and money from patriotic movements. They were also asked to forego church services and, in many cases, the personal help and counsel of a minister. These difficult decisions drove ministers and people to think about the essence of their church; the implications were far-reaching. Some of the more practical questions revealed the defects of church organisation and led churchmen to contemplate change. In this chapter we are concerned with the impact of the war on the individual Christian; we move from glib assurance to, at times, agonising uncertainty.

The departure of the chaplains for the front caused some unavoidable disruption to normal church life. When a chaplain was appointed his parish fell vacant; there were few unemployed ministers to fill the gaps. Despite this reduction in the number of ministers and the consequent reduction in the number of church services many young ministers who were unable to obtain a chaplaincy were sorely tempted to enlist in the ranks. Since they urged every fit young man to enlist they believed that their own manhood was rebuked if they stayed at home. They addressed harsh words to the 'shirker' but feared that the 'shirkers' looked on ministers as men of their own stamp whose lives were too important to be disrupted by enlistment. Many Australians could not understand why the clerical collar was a bar to enlistment; the younger clergy, in many cases,

---

1The New South Wales Presbyterians tried to minimise this dislocation by requiring presbyteries only to grant chaplains leave of absence when 'arrangements are made for the supply of ordinances and...the financial arrangements are satisfactory'. NSWPGA, Minutes of Assembly, 1915, p.28.
agreed with them. The editor of the Church Standard feelingly described the terrible dilemma, 'the unbearable agony', that perplexed young clergymen.

All the hard abuse heaped upon the shirker hits [the priest] every time. He has been ordained to preach the religion of the Cross...why, when men are carrying the utmost terrible cross, in suffering, in prison and in death, cannot he share the cross with them.¹

The young clergyman was ashamed when his health and vigour marked him in war-time Australia as a man apart; he yearned to take the place in the firing line which his Australian citizenship offered him. The reaction of church leaders to this dilemma differed from church to church and depended, to a large extent, on the theological interpretation of the role of the minister that each church had elaborated.

The Australian Catholic granted his priest great respect. While the Irish origins of Australian Catholicism accounted for some of this respect, universal Catholic theology taught that the priest was entrusted with a sacred mission and that his calling precluded him from the tasks of this world.² Therefore, because Australian Catholics did not expect their priests to enlist there was less pressure on them to do so. Curiously, however, Catholics took great delight in the exploits of the French clergy who were conscripted into the army, apparently not unwillingly.³ Some Australian priests were tempted to enlist but the hierarchy did not even discuss the question. Catholic bishops protested against the threatened conscription of clerics in 1917.⁴ One Australian priest, at least, managed to reach the front. R. Courbon, a member of the French order of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, was born in France but spent the greater part of his life in Australia where he had

¹CS, 2 August 1918.
²Herbert M. Moran, Viewless Winds, p.23.
³See, for example, Advocate, 12 June 1915, for a picture of a priest in cassock and clerical hat with a rifle over his shoulder and a cartridge belt across his breast. On 9 October 1915 the editor advised Protestant ministers 'to attend to their professed business of saving souls, and leave the work of destroying bodies to the laity'.
⁴See Chapter 7.
studied and then worked as a priest in Sydney and among the aborigines of the Northern Territory. Courbon's voluntary return to France to enlist was ignored by all Catholic editors except the editor of his order's own journal.\(^1\) Perhaps editors treated other departures similarly. Likewise, it would require a great deal of work to determine how many seminarians and unordained members of orders abandoned their vocations to enlist in the A.I.F. Catholic students knew far less about the war than did their Protestant counterparts because they lived a secluded life and had limited access to newspapers. A priest later recalled that at Manly 'a strict censorship was exercised lest our imaginations might be too deeply stirred concerning European events'.\(^2\) Those students who left their studies were not readmitted on their return from war; their decision was irrevocable.\(^3\)

High church Anglicans also emphasised the difference between priests and ordinary citizens and they refused to countenance the enlistment of clergymen. Even low church bishops agreed, although they rejected clerical enlistment for different reasons. The Church Standard, the organ of the high church party, took a hard line on the question. The issue tested, so the editor believed, a priest's faith in the worth of his vocation:

> to work one's parish in days of tension, to keep colour and warmth in one's church and its services, while the war and its death-roll are bleaching them white means an incessant struggle...the pilot of the parish must not leave his post.\(^4\)

The Victorian bishops wrote a joint pastoral letter in which they took a practical approach: the clergy carried out vital war work inspiring and consoling the people, they should remain at their tasks.\(^5\) The bishop of Bunbury concentrated on

---

\(^1\)Annals of the Sacred Heart, February 1917.


\(^3\)Denis Meadows, Obedient Men, London, 1955. He shows that his decision to transfer from the Society of Jesus to the British Army was irrevocable. See pp.290-304.

\(^4\)CS, 17 November 1916.

\(^5\)CS, 31 March 1916.
the exalted role of the priest: 'the vast majority of people prefer infinitely that the man who ministers at the altar should not stain his hands with blood'. Feetham was juridical: canon law forbade clerics to fight. The bishops in conference in Sydney advised the clergy to stay at home to 'labour with untiring zeal to foster such a spirit as may continually support and uphold those who are at the front'. The bishop of Wangaratta likened the enlistment of a minister to the use of a razor to cut wood: 'any strong, healthy man of ordinary intelligence can do the duties of the rank and file of the A.M.C. But every such man is not called, trained and consecrated to be a priest in the Church.' Only Wentworth-Shields permitted his priests to enlist and even he restricted them to non-combatant duties. All other bishops reminded each priest that his work was spiritual and asked him not to allow the excitement of war to deflect him from it.

Despite such clear teaching fifty-one Anglican priests succumbed to the pressure and enlisted in the ranks. A bishop's opposition was not the ultimate guide to conscience because the priests enlisted from every diocese except Brisbane where the high church Donaldson prevented defections. Eight priests enlisted from Melbourne, six from Sydney, seven from

---

1 CS, 11 February 1916.
2 Bush Brother, January 1917.
3 CS, 26 May 1916.
5 Armidale Diocesan News, July 1918. Wentworth-Shields became bishop of Armidale in 1916; only one of his thirty-seven priests enlisted.
6 This figure may not be completely accurate. I gathered the list of Anglican priests from newspapers, synod reports and from references, often critical, in bishops addresses to synods. It was not easy to verify a man's war service in the autobiographical details of later editions of Crockford's Clerical Directory. A priest often omitted his war service or pretended that he had served as a chaplain.
Newcastle and five each from Ballarat and Bendigo; one or two men enlisted from the other dioceses. While fifty-one recruits from amongst 1,400 clergymen may seem insignificant it should be remembered that perhaps only 500 of the total number of clergy were eligible in terms of age and health and also that even the 175 men sent as chaplains had significantly reduced church effectiveness at parish level. Even chaplains on continuous service were away for an average of only two years, while a man in the ranks was lost to the church for the duration of the war. Ministers must have thought deeply before they decided to enlist. Unfortunately, few of these men wrote of their experience on active service and church editors gave them almost no publicity, possibly because they had not complied with the bishops' wishes. G.K. Tucker showed that the minister received no special privileges as a soldier and after a few months in the ranks he was happy to accept a chaplaincy.

Of the fifty-one ministers who enlisted, three were killed on active service, one died in training camp, fourteen left the ministry and thirty-two returned to it after the war. Bishops required students who shared the church's ministry to stay at their posts, but were happy to see the residents of theological colleges enlist. Bishop Stone-Wigg encouraged students to join the army because their experiences would enrich their later ministerial life. However, the bishop of Armidale, H.E. Cooper, refused to 'approve or encourage' enlistment because 'there [were] so many thousands of eligible men in Australia who ought to enlist;

---

1 Of the 252 clergymen listed in the Sydney Diocesan Directory for 1914 only 113 (44.75 per cent) were in the eligible age-group.

2 G.K. Tucker, As Private and Padre. For a fuller account of Tucker's experiences see Chapter 8.

3 I arrived at these figures by reading Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1925 and checking as closely as possible the backgrounds of those who were no longer listed as priests. The number of defections is considerably higher amongst these men than amongst the chaplains.

4 The Victorian bishops refused to allow the enlistment of students whose departure would harm the effectiveness of the church. CS, 31 March 1916.

5 CS, 17 November 1916.
and so few who were called to Christ's ministry'. In the event, eighty students joined the A.I.F.; as a result several of the smaller theological colleges closed down. Fifteen of these students died on active service, twenty-two failed to return to their studies and forty-three were eventually ordained to the ministry. These figures show that the war experience of the majority did not alter their faith in God or their faith in the relevance of the church.

The terrible dilemma may have occupied the thoughts of Presbyterian ministers but it aroused little discussion in the journals and assemblies of their church. W.H. Cooper, delivering a rare Presbyterian judgment on the question, acknowledged that his church's theology allowed for no distinction between minister and people. The minister made no special vows nor did he acquire any unique 'character' that set him apart from the people. Thus each minister, as a citizen, would examine his conscience and decide for himself whether or not to enlist. Cooper admitted, however, that ministers differed from other men in as much as they already served their country by sustaining morale and guiding their people. He implied that the loss of a minister was similar to the loss of a trained munition worker in Britain; the country needed them at home rather than at the front. Cooper said that the minister's work would vitally affect the outcome of the war; ministers fought the spiritual fight and had the high duty of sustaining the nation's courage. A minister should forsake such important national work only in obedience to a clear inner call; moreover, the minister should seek advice from his

---

1Letter from H.E. Cooper, bishop of Armidale to W. Holmes dated 6 September 1915. The original is held by Mr J.W. Holmes of Somerton Park, South Australia.

2This figure is subject to the same reservation made about the priests' enlistment.

3Arrived at by a close reading of Crockford's Clerical Directory.

presbytery so that a rush of ministers to the army would not cripple the church's efficiency. However, as no presbytery restrained a man who wished to enlist and as only six ministers in fact enlisted, Cooper's careful and impartial judgment was unnecessary. Few Presbyterian theological students seem to have joined the army, possibly because church leaders opposed their enlistment. When the President of Ormond Theological College announced at the final session for 1914 that two students had enlisted the audience greeted the news with what J.L. Rentoul described as 'feeble applause'. Rentoul complained that the students had abandoned Christ's work to take up work other men could do better. Despite Rentoul's well-known devotion to the cause of the Empire he argued that 'the work of the Christian ministry was harder work, more chivalrous work, and more soldierly than the fight in the battlefield'. Rentoul's attitude won general acceptance amongst Presbyterians.

Methodist churchmen first debated whether clergymen should enlist when three ministers applied to the Victorian conference for permission to do so. Fitchett introduced a motion supporting the applications saying that if a minister could send his son to war he could also send his spiritual son. He hoped, too, that the minister/soldier would protect the troops from vice, a danger greater than bullets. Watkin said the public would think more highly of the church if conference granted the requests; Nance warned that if conference refused permission the public would turn from the church in disgust.

Hodge believed that God needed men in the army as much as he

---

1PM (V), 11 February 1916.

2As the church did not publish the names of ministers who enlisted this figure is an approximation. One of the six ministers was in Scotland when war broke out and joined a British regiment.

3Argus, 22 August 1914.

4Ibid. The Rev. Alex. Stewart of St John's, Essendon, where one of the students worked, contested Rentoul's view. Rentoul, uncharacteristically, failed to take up Stewart's challenge. Argus, 25 August 1914.

5The debate was fully reported in the Spectator, 5 March 1915.

6Ibid.
needed them in the ministry.¹ Worral, provocative as usual, asked whether 'if a few German shells came through the window of the church just then, the brethren opposing the resolution would not be amongst the first to run'.² Those brethren, however, based their opposition largely on a different understanding of the ministry. Adamson saw the call to the ministry as supreme; Ditterich said it excluded all else.³ Mason reminded conference that a minister should never adopt the principle of expediency and asked conference not to worry about the reaction of the public.⁴ Despite these arguments, conference granted the applications. The New South Wales conference left the decision to each minister's conscience and J. Watts, a South Australian president, rejoiced that many young ministers 'rightly interpret[ed] the call of country as the call of God'.⁶ An elderly Methodist regretted that ministers who were supposed to visit the fatherless and comfort the widows should be asked 'to invade a foreign country and kill its inhabitants'. He said he would enlist himself 'to save ministers from this degradation'.⁷ Unfortunately, little is known of the experiences of the eighty ministers who enlisted.⁸ Twelve were killed in action, twenty-two survived but left the ministry and forty-six returned to church work.⁹ R.J.F. Boyer, who later became chairman of the Australian Broadcasting

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
⁵This was the decision of the conference's committee on privileges. Methodist, 29 January 1916.
⁶Methodist Church of South Australia, Minutes of Conference, 1918, p.58.
⁷Spectator, 3 September 1915.
⁸This figure is accurate because Methodist conferences gave full lists of ministers who enlisted.
⁹I followed the careers of ministers who enlisted in C. Kingston Daws (ed.), Methodist Ministerial Index for Australasia, Ninth edition, Melbourne, 1962. This is a cumulative list of all Methodist ministers.
Commission, 'agonised at length' as to how he could best serve his country before adopting a compromise solution and securing work as a YMCA secretary.  

Boyer disliked the work because although he was stationed in Egypt he felt isolated from the troops; he was not one of them. He managed to land at Gallipoli in August 1915 and was then enrolled as a private.  

When he returned to Australia for training in 1916 Boyer already doubted his vocation and further experience with the A.I.F. determined him.  

On his final return to Australia in September 1918 Boyer refused to think of going back to the ministry although his decision to seek a new way of life left him 'aimless, cynical, shaken, [and] he could see no purpose or vocation before him'.  

Twenty-nine Methodist theological students served with the A.I.F. and of these six were killed and eight returned to their studies.  

The Master of Queen's College, Melbourne, reported that the first departure 'had a fine effect on the College'.  

Doubtless many young men who had intended to apply for the ministry joined the A.I.F. instead.  

All churches lost potential students to the war machine.  

Catholics continued their schizophrenic approach to the question of clerical enlistment by ridiculing those Protestant churches which allowed their ministers to enlist. The editor of the Advocate believed that such enlistment showed that the national idea dominated Protestant theology in time of crisis.  

The editor also ridiculed those Protestants who argued that the church would lose ground if ministers remained outside the A.I.F. He regarded such a proposition as opportunistic and the

---

2 Ibid., p.18.  
3 Ibid., p.19.  
5 Figures for students were derived in the same way as figures for ministers.  
7 Some churches refused to accept eligible students.  
8 *Advocate*, 19 August 1916.
antithesis of Catholicism which made decisions solely in terms of principles. The editor, in fact, treated his Protestant colleagues unfairly. That some ministers enlisted in the ranks in the face of hostility or caution from their leaders, showed how deeply they believed in the Empire's cause and how sincere were their views about the righteousness of the war. The reluctance of many church leaders to allow ministers to enlist showed the extent of their faith in the spiritual basis of the war about which they had so often spoken. Above all, the 'terrible dilemma' showed that ministers could not remain aloof from the suffering nation. It was not easy to be a clergyman in war-time Australia.

The war threw extra demands on lay-people. They suffered a reduction in church services because of the departure of ministers to the front. At the same time they faced the conflicting demands of patriotic funds and church appeals. These demands forced them to decide how highly they valued the ministry they had come to expect. Like the ministers, lay-people assigned a priority to the role of the church in Australia; in most cases they gave the church a high priority.

The withdrawal of many Anglican clergymen from parochial work restricted the services that the church provided. Church leaders appealed to the laity to show patience in accepting these shortcomings. Donaldson reported a serious shortage of men; all his theological students, who helped with the Sunday services, enlisted and fourteen priests secured chaplaincies. This led to the suspension of much work: 'rectors in huge parishes have had to forego their curates, and for most of the year two parishes have been standing vacant'. Wentworth-Shields reported that there were only four curates in the whole diocese. Cranswick warned the laity in rural areas to be prepared to struggle on without a priest by overcoming their

1Ibid.  
2St Clair Donaldson, Inaugural Address delivered at the opening of the First Session of the Eighteenth Synod of the Diocese of Brisbane, Brisbane, 1917, p.4.  
shyness and taking turns as lay-readers.¹ Langley licensed a large number of lay-readers.² Those dioceses which depended on recruits from England suffered most heavily. Feetham explained that of the eighteen Englishmen he had recruited from 'Cambridge and elsewhere' in 1914 all but two, who were unfit, had joined the army.³ The number of clergymen in his diocese dropped from thirty-three in 1914 to twenty-one in 1918.⁴ Proportionately, this was the most disastrous decline in any Anglican diocese.

The Presbyterian and Methodist churches suffered from the loss of ministers and home missionaries. The home missionary worked in the poorer and less populous country districts which were unable to support a minister and his family. The missionary was unordained, single and young and lived on a wage far below that of a minister. Because he was single he was also able to travel extensively. The churches depended on the home missionary in the remote areas where he acted as an advance guard or scout for a full-scale assault on the district.⁵ The call of war made a great impact on the home missionaries who were not tied to the church by ordination. In New South Wales the organising committee of the Presbyterian Church reported in 1916 that '[its] chronic difficulty in obtaining men had become painfully acute'.⁶ The situation deteriorated as the war continued. In 1919 the committee remembered that 'the last year of the war was the worst of

⁴John Feetham; Inaugural Address...to the Twenty-Fourth Synod, Townsville, 1918, p.6.
⁵See, for example, the letters of R. Bruce Plowman, a home missionary with the Australian Inland Mission, NL, MS.1941.
⁶Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Assembly, 1916, p.74.
...our organisation felt the strain almost to breaking point'. The various Methodist committees bemoaned the shortages at the 1917 General Conference. The New South Wales committee employed nineteen men but had vacancies for twenty more. The Victorian committee despaired of recruiting unmarried men and accepted thirty-four married men who would not have been employed before the war. This added to costs. In South Australia only twenty-seven men staffed the forty-seven churches and seventy-eight preaching places. In Queensland half the staff enlisted and the majority of centres stood idle. The Western Australian committee abandoned sixteen of its thirty centres by 1917. The shortage of ministers added to this disruption.

The departure of young, male parishioners depressed even those parishes which enjoyed the services of a minister. Choirs lost their male voices, Sunday schools lost their teachers, fellowship associations lost their leaders and many of their members. The sporting clubs attached to the churches withered as the young men left, the debating and cultural clubs closed. Much of the life of the parish drained away forcing minister and people to put on a brave face and carry on. Despite the increasingly gloomy atmosphere church membership grew, although not as spectacularly as churchmen had at first hoped. The membership of the Methodist church in New South Wales, for example, grew from 24,291 in 1914 to 27,821 in 1919 and an increase, sometimes very small, was recorded each year.

---

1Ibid., 1919, p.71.
2Methodist Church of Australia, Minutes of General Conference, 1917, p.254.
3Ibid., p.258.
5Ibid., p.261.
6Ibid., p.263.
7See, for example, the lament of Archdeacon Hindley of Melbourne who said that there was 'not a department in church work but has suffered loss'. CM, 20 October 1916.
8Methodist Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.68; 1916, p.67; 1919, p.74.
In Queensland the Presbyterian church grew from 33,755 members in 1914 to 39,679 in 1919, although a drop of nearly 1,000 members occurred between 1915 and 1916. The New South Wales Presbyterian church experienced a decline during the war years. There were 34,503 members in 1914, 32,312 in 1915 and then a steady 33,500 for the next three years with a drop back to 32,748 in 1919. At the same time the number of communicants increased during the war years, which may indicate that those church people who retained their membership were more committed to the church.

Because of the reduction of services and the gloomy atmosphere inside the churches clergymen feared that lay-people, in their enthusiasm for the patriotic funds, would neglect church finances, particularly the annual appeals for the home and foreign missions. The local minister could demonstrate his need for support; the missionary, unseen, was more easily forgotten. The Home Missions Committee of the Presbyterian Church explained that

> when [war's] shadow first fell upon us, our faith was considerably chilled, and our courage almost failed us, for we feared that in this world-wide welter, contributions towards Home Missions would so seriously diminish that we would be compelled, however reluctant, to curtail our work and abandon some of the districts already occupied.

To counter such dangers churchmen argued that contributions to church funds involved a high form of patriotism. Bishop Thomas summarised the thinking:

> by supporting the church financially, by maintaining all her activities in a high state of efficiency, we shall be helping the State by having always ready a well-organised band of

---

1. Presbyterian Church of Queensland, Minutes of Assembly, 1920, inset showing statistics for war years.
2. Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Assembly, 1920, inset showing statistics for war years.
3. Ibid. However the increase was small; 20,662 in 1914 to 22,936 in 1919.
4. Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Assembly, 1915, p.74.
willing and patriotic workers...while we work for our Church then, we work for our country. 

Lay-people took Thomas' point apparently because, despite the plethora of patriotic funds, church finances did not suffer. This delighted and surprised church leaders. Riley noted that '[the] work in the parishes has been maintained, and some progress has been made' and this '[had] given me greater hope for our Church than any preceding year I have been in Perth'. While it would be tedious to examine church finances in detail some general examples will be given to show how church people maintained their liberality throughout the war.

The Anglican financial position remained healthy during the war years. In Bathurst Long reported that the home mission fund had never before attracted such large contributions despite the war and the drought. All parishes reached their quotas and half exceeded them. In Brisbane, Melbourne and Newcastle receipts to the home mission fund

---


2 In New South Wales by August 1915 at least fifteen patriotic funds solicited donations from the public. These ranged from the Australia Day fund which raised £619,377, through the funds for the various suffering nationalities, French, Belgian, Polish, Servian and Montenegrin to the smaller funds like the Tanned Sheepskin Clothing Fund. These funds are listed in Prime Minister's Department, General Correspondence File, CRS, A2, File 1917/3530 'Patriotic Funds - Various', AA, Canberra. There is a full account of the evolution of the patriotic funds in Scott, Australia, pp. 697-738. He claimed that the Australian people donated £12m during the war years. Ibid., p. 737.

3 Church of England, Diocese of Perth, Year-Book for 1915, Perth, 1915. Bishop’s address to synod, p. 17. Riley celebrated the twentieth anniversary of his accession to the see of Perth on 18 October 1914. Diary, entry for that date, Battye Library, MS.1921A/25.

4 Church of England, Diocese of Bathurst, Year-Book for 1916, Bathurst, 1916, Bishop’s address to synod, p. 37.
increased in each year of the war. In Adelaide receipts fell in the middle years of the war but the 1918 figure exceeded that of 1914. Riley reported a grim situation in the Perth diocese by 1918 because support from England, on which the diocese had depended since its foundation, had dried up. Although local people continued to support the church generously income decreased by £1,000 per year. Anglican contributions to foreign missions grew steadily, too. In Bathurst in 1918 the people almost doubled the quota of £304 for foreign missions. Brisbane contributions increased from £1,450 in 1914 to £2,465 in 1918. Only the tiny diocese of Riverina departed from this general picture of prosperity. In 1913 diocesan receipts totalled £1,418; they fell to £961 in 1914, £457 in 1915, £626 in 1916 and £658 in 1918. The 1917 sum of £1,690 was inflated by a single gift of £650. The bishop blamed the disastrous drought which ravaged the area for the lack of support; no other diocese repeated this pattern.

1 Church of England, Diocese of Brisbane, Year-Book for 1918, Brisbane, 1918, p.64. Church of England, Diocese of Melbourne, Year-Book for 1918, Melbourne, 1918, p.89. The figures were, 1915: £3,796; 1918: £5,020. Church of England, Diocese of Newcastle, Year-Book for 1918, Newcastle, 1918, p.173 and Year-Book for 1919, p.174. The figures were, 1914: £807; 1915: £1,235; 1918: £1,754.


3 Church of England, Diocese of Perth, Year-Book for 1918, Perth, 1918, Bishop’s address to synod, p.4. The diocese was so dependent on overseas funds that it published a Quarterly Magazine in England which attempted to arouse interest by reporting news and aspirations. The magazine collapsed during the first year of the war. Some bishops continued to appeal in England and incurred the Bulletin’s ire: ‘any person who now sets out on a cadging expedition to harrassed England doesn’t know what decency is’. Bulletin, 10 August 1916.

4 Church of England, Diocese of Bathurst, Year-Book, 1918, p.37.


6 ‘Tiny’ in terms of man-power and facilities, not in terms of size.

The Presbyterian church experienced no significant drop in the overall level of financial support. Queensland revenues increased in each year of the war: 1905, £18,621; 1915, £32,198; 1917, £39,418 and 1918, £41,730. Support for home missions also increased despite drastic reductions in services. Queensland Presbyterians gave generously to the 'heathen' mission fund, even allowing a new mission to be opened. In New South Wales the foreign mission committee thanked God for the continued generosity of the people. The Women's Missionary Association, however, pondered the effect of the war on the missions in spiritual rather than material terms. They asked 'what must our converts in India, for instance, think when they hear that the German missionaries in India are all interned as political prisoners'. Most other Australians gave little thought to the effect of the war on the attitude of potential Christians. In Victoria the amount of money raised by the home mission committee increased in each year of the war and although the foreign mission fund declined the committee seemed satisfied with the very large sum of money raised.

Each Methodist conference exceeded the annual quota imposed for foreign mission appeals during each year of the war. The figures for Victoria showed the general trend. The 1914 contribution of £13,316 exceeded the quota by £2,631. In 1915 the committee raised £13,000, £920 above the quota, in 1916, £11,419, 1917, £13,482 and 1918, £15,264. The home mission

---

1 Presbyterian Church of Queensland, Minutes of Assembly, 1919, p.84.
2 Ibid., p.84. The figures were, 1916: £5,068; 1917: £5,324; 1918: £5,477.
3 Ibid., 1916, p.59.
4 Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Assembly, 1917, p.79.
5 Ibid., 1915, p.86.
6 Presbyterian Church of Victoria, Minutes of Assembly, 1918, statistical inset.
7 Methodist Church of Victoria and Tasmania, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.73; 1916, p.161; 1917, p.158; 1918, p.259; 1919, p.190.
appeal achieved equal success.¹ In Western Australia the people gave a record £1,550 to the home mission fund and set a new record for each following year of the war.² The South Australian committee raised £3,766 for foreign missions in 1914 and nearly doubled this by 1918 with £7,162.³ The slight decline in South Australian home mission funds did not worry officials; fewer services had meant fewer collections.⁴

The Catholic church did not publish financial returns but the level of building activity and the growth of the education system indicate the maintenance of at least pre-war levels. Bishops blessed and opened new churches, presbyteries, convents and schools on almost every Sunday of the year.⁵ The Newman College appeal, organised by Mannix, achieved the most spectacular success in the early years of the war.⁶ Some Protestant critics complained that the Catholic church diverted too much from the war effort to its own needs; the complaint is

¹Methodist Church of Victoria and Tasmanian, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.123. The committee reported that they had raised 'the largest sum ever in our 41 year history'. In 1918 they again created a record and commented: 'this is really wonderful considering the incessant and worthy patriotic appeals...the increased cost of living and the general commercial unrest'; p.193.

²Methodist Church of Western Australia, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.34; 1916, p.143; 1917, p.147; 1918, inset; 1919, p.157.

³Methodist Church of South Australia, Minutes of Conference, 1915, p.162; 1919, p.87.

⁴Ibid., 1915, p.167; 1919, p.185.

⁵See, for example, the diaries of Archbishop Duhig of Brisbane, Catholic Church Office, Brisbane. Duhig, nicknamed 'James the Builder', was constantly touring the diocese opening and planning.

⁶There had long been talk of efforts to raise money to construct a Catholic university college in Melbourne. When an anonymous donor promised £30,000 if Catholics would raise an equal sum, Mannix accepted the challenge and raised the money. Advocate, 25 May 1915 et seq. Cattaneo opened the college in March 1918. See also Frank Murphy, Daniel Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne, pp.27-9.
evidence in itself of lay-Catholic liberality. Christians from all churches continued to recognise the justice of the churches' appeals for money despite high war-time inflation and the needs of the patriotic funds. Australian Christians gave generously to the causes they believed in. The church was amongst their highest priorities.

While the laity generously supported existing church ministries they gave less generously to new works that arose as a consequence of the war, in particular the mission to the soldiers in the training camps. The failure of this mission sprang from two causes, the limited horizons of some church leaders and an organisational defect built into the church structure. The parish formed the basic unit of church administration. Church leaders placed the highest priority on supplying the needs of the parish. It was a struggle for ministers to interest parishioners in church works that lay beyond the boundaries of the parish. The churches were not well equipped to meet a sudden need. First a committee must be appointed to supervise the receipt and expenditure of money and then an appeal must be conducted from parish to parish. By comparison a centralised body such as the Y.M.C.A. was well placed to act in an emergency. The duplication implied in denominationalism also limited church work in the camps. Each church tried to be represented in each camp so that often four church huts were erected with four canteens, four libraries, four sets of games equipment and so on. Churchmen were also slow to move into the camps because they expected, as did almost all Australians, that the war would be of very short duration. At first churchmen set up tents in the training camps and only gradually erected permanent buildings. Sydney Methodists were so confident that few Australians would be needed in the army that they devoted their limited funds to a

---

1 Mannix defended Catholics against such attacks in his famous 'trade war' speech. He said that economic activity must be maintained: 'the waving of flags would not feed hungry mouths', Advocate, 3 February 1917.

lavish farewell dinner for their brethren of the first contingent.  

Archbishop Kelly delayed appointing a chaplain to the Sydney camps because of his determination that the ordinary work of the diocese should not suffer. Even as late as April 1915, he refused to send a chaplain to the Catholic soldiers in the camps because he regarded the staffing of the parishes as his principal obligation. He also declined to spend money on a tent for Catholic soldiers and suggested that as they received five shillings a day they might pay for their own. He promised to donate £10 to an appeal but said he preferred to give the money to a needy Catholic charity. However, once Kelly had stated his priorities as baldly as this he apparently came under some pressure to moderate his view. Soon after this speech he paid his first official visit to Liverpool camp and in May he returned to open the Catholic tent. Although Kelly thereafter showed personal interest in the welfare of the troops no organisation existed to provide the facilities needed. Interested Catholics launched an appeal for a tent at Holsworthy camp when they learnt that the visiting priest had been forced to say Mass in the rain and later, calling themselves the Catholic Recruits Assistance Committee, they undertook to provide facilities in all the camps. A collection at the parish churches raised £515. Kelly then appointed a permanent chaplain to Liverpool who made do with a tent until the Catholic hall was opened in January 1917. When

---

1 The Methodists hired a cafe and catered for 500 men; due to a late cancellation of leave only 200 attended. *Methodist*, 17 October 1914.

2 *FJ*, 1 April 1915.

3 Ibid.

4 *FJ*, 22 April 1915 and 20 May 1915.

5 *FJ*, 23 September 1915.

6 The Committee was formed on 21 October 1915. Letter from P.S. Cleary (president) to M. Kelly, 22 January 1916, Kelly Papers, SDA, File, 'Kelly: War, Conscript Chaplains 1915-27'.

7 Ibid.
he appealed for funds for the hall Kelly commented, 'it is unhappily a fact that our Catholic troops have been a little neglected by our Catholic public'.

The hall cost £1,244 and was free of debt when Kelly opened it; the chaplain boasted that it was 'by far the best in the field' and after the war Kelly sold it to the government for £850. Melbourne Catholics awoke to their obligations to the soldiers earlier when 'Soldier's Wife' asked 'why our Catholic societies are doing nothing for our Catholic soldiers at present in camp at Broadmeadows'. By December 1914 an appeal opened to provide 'a spacious marquee' for Catholic soldiers to house 'literature, a piano, and other things'. The marquee was erected early in the new year but the appeal to equip it continued for months.

By late March the authorities perceived that the tent, as it was now less grandly called, would afford no protection from the bleak Broadmeadows winter and Carr launched an appeal for funds to build a substantial hall. An Advocate correspondent reported that Catholic soldiers reluctantly used the Y.M.C.A. facilities in preference to their own inadequate tent although 'they would "do anything" they say to hasten the day when they could "settle down with pen and pencil" in their own domain'.

The soldiers promised to pay for the flooring of the proposed new structure. The appeal met with only partial success but nevertheless Mannix opened the building in October and declared that 'nothing they could do would be too good for the soldiers' and that 'the very least they could do was to try and make

---

1 *FJ*, 28 December 1916.
2 *FJ*, 18 January 1917.
4 *Advocate*, 12 September 1914.
5 *Advocate*, 5 December 1914.
6 *Advocate*, 13 March 1915.
7 *Advocate*, 27 March 1915.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
[them] as comfortable as possible while [they were] with them in camp'.¹ In those days of harmony, the Methodist and Baptist chaplains joined Mannix at the ceremony.²

The Anglican soldier fared little better than the Catholic. The church entered the field late, incorrectly assessed the needs of the men and the length of the war and refused to draw on church funds to finance the work. The camp chaplains themselves provided the best summary of Anglican activity in a series of articles in the Church Standard. The Rev. Stacy Waddy set the tone of the articles by appealing to the church to wake up to its duties before it was too late. He saw a 'need, an opening, a bounden duty' about which the church had done little.³ Wright appointed Waddy as part-time chaplain to the 20,000 men in the three large Sydney camps; at the same time he remained headmaster of The King's School.⁴ Waddy secured tents at Liverpool in early 1915 and raised £1,200 for a permanent building which opened in 1916.⁵ Wright visited the camps regularly. When he held a Lenten mission in the church tent leaflets proclaimed 'Jesus Christ is in this camp. He wants to speak to you. Won't you find time to listen?'⁶ The mission reached a climax with a grand confirmation service at which fifty-four candidates were presented before 1,500 onlookers.⁷ In South Australia, after eight months of a part-time ministry, Thomas appointed a resident chaplain to the Mitcham camp and because someone donated £400 for the church hut, no appeal was necessary.⁸

¹Advocate, 30 October 1915.
²Ibid.
³CS, 5 November 1915.
⁴Waddy became headmaster in 1906, Fred Johns' Annual, 1914, p.215. In 1916 he sought leave of absence to work as a chaplain with the A.I.F. The council insisted that the welfare of the school was paramount and refused his request. Waddy resigned. The correspondence is printed in Church of England, Diocese of Sydney, Year-Book for 1917, Sydney, 1917, pp.133-41.
⁵CS, 5 November 1915.
⁶SDM, 1 April 1915.
⁷SDM, 1 May 1915.
⁸CS, 10 December 1915.
As Thomas refused to take more than one man from parish work the Anglicans co-operated with the other denominations in supplying the needs of the Exhibition camp. An Anglican minister was in residence one week in four. High church Anglicans, who insisted that their church was not simply one of the branches of the Protestant church, regarded this arrangement as a betrayal of church teaching. Thomas gave camp duty a low priority in comparison with parochial work and indeed declined to appoint an Anglican to the joint venture at Morphetville. Moreover, South Australian Anglicans allowed the Y.M.C.A. to cater for the social needs of the men. Despite this apparent indifference the resident chaplain referred to the work as 'the opportunity of a life-time'. The bishops were not entirely responsible for the indifference. When R.H. Moore asked his people's help to build an Army and Navy Institute in the busy parish of Fremantle they defeated the proposal by 21 votes to 15.

The Victorian dioceses showed what might have been done. Clarke opened a church tent at Broadmeadows and installed a resident chaplain there on 9 September 1914. When winter came in 1915 the Anglicans replaced the tent with a wooden building which housed all sorts of games equipment, a library of 2,000 books, a bank and a post-office which handled 1,000 letters a day. By November, similar buildings or marquees were set up in every camp in the state. The Anglicans also erected two large tents in the cathedral grounds in Melbourne to provide facilities for those lonely soldiers who were unused to the city. The visitors' book recorded soldiers' appreciation:

---

1 Ibid.
2 See chapter 8 for the difficulties Anglicans made about sharing services even in France.
3 CS, 10 December 1915.
4 Ibid.
6 CS, 12 November 1915.
7 Ibid.
'an oasis in the desert of temptation', 'a good substitute for home in the midst of turmoil'.¹ Victorian Anglicans could act swiftly to meet soldiers' needs because they used home mission funds to finance the work instead of awaiting the results of appeals.² They spent £2,000 by October 1914.³ However this was a temporary expedient and, after some agitation by L.V. Biggs, Clarke set up the League of Soldiers' Friends to raise money and look after the buildings.⁴ By October 1917 between eighty and ninety parishes had branches of the League and membership exceeded 5,000.⁵ Then Canon Garland in Brisbane decided on the need for a national Anglican organisation to supply the needs of troops overseas. He inaugurated the Australian Fund for Soldiers Overseas and foisted it on all dioceses regardless of their existing funds or commitments.⁶ The Victorians, who already had their League, never supported Garland's AFSO but the existence of the two competing organisations created confusion.⁷ The realisation of the haphazard and chance nature of Anglican administration led to some plain talking at the Melbourne synod of 1917. Biggs asked the synod to recognise that 'the machinery of the Church for prompt corporate action is gravely defective'; he recommended the establishment of a consultative body of laity, clergy and bishops.⁸ He regretted that the Y.M.C.A. rather than the Church of England had captured the imagination of the

¹ CS, 22 January 1915.
² CS, 12 November 1915.
³ Church of England, Diocese of Melbourne, Minutes of Synod, 1915, p.37.
⁴ Ibid., 1917, p.50.
⁵ Ibid., p.113.
⁶ CS, 24 August 1917.
⁷ Sums raised for AFSO included Armidale, £401; Adelaide, £1,880; Bathurst, £296; Ballarat, £24; Bendigo, £4. Diocese of Perth, Year-Book, 1918, p.64. The bishop of Wangaratta was so confused that he did not know that the LSF sent funds overseas until corrected from the floor of the synod. Diocese of Melbourne, Year-Book, 1918, report of Wangaratta synod, p.17.
⁸ Diocese of Melbourne, Minutes of Synod, 1917, p.50.
Australian soldier. When the Archbishop agreed that 'for prompt unified action the Australian Church was badly equipped' Biggs's motion passed.¹ The realisation came too late in the day, however, the consultative body was never set up and the muddle continued until the end of the war. In many diocese church leaders gave work amongst the soldiers a lower priority than parochial work. Those who wanted to do more were unable to move the church as a whole because of the independence of each diocese.

Presbyterian and Methodist leaders spoke of their interest in the mission to the camps but they achieved only partial success in securing the support of the laity on whom they depended. The Methodists in New South Wales began an appeal for a tent in June 1915. At first they asked for a modest £500 but when this was easily raised they set their sights on a wooden hall to cost between £1,300 and £1,400.² Conference appointed a full-time chaplain in mid-1916 when the camps had passed their peak.³ In contrast, the Victorian Methodists spent £1,300 in six months in 1915, engaged three full-time chaplains in camp work and raised over £1,000 at each of three appeals.⁴ The smaller branches of the church cast envious eyes at such opulence. In Western Australia the first appeal opened in August 1915 and aimed at £150. By February 1916 church-people had contributed £93.⁵ Victorian Presbyterians took up camp work when the Victorian camp commandant accused them of a wowserish interest in the soldiers' morals without a corresponding intention to help them resist temptation.⁶ Rentoul collected £800 for a church hall.⁷ Although Rentoul

¹Ibid., p.51.
²Methodist, 10 July 1915.
³Methodist Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Conference, 1917, p.155.
⁴Methodist Church of Victoria and Tasmania, Minutes of Conference, 1916, p.126; 1917, p.128; 1918, p.270.
⁵Western Methodist, September 1915 and February 1916.
⁶See Chapter 4.
⁷PM (V), 30 April 1915.
boasted of it the chaplain, who was appointed in May, wrote that it might pass for a 'well-kept barn'. He complained that it was lit by petrol gas, which boils our water as well. It is warmed by a glorious coke stove, but neither stove nor lights are a match for the draughts which blow out the lights and freeze the heels of the man who is toasting his toes at the stove.¹

The New South Wales Presbyterian Assembly appointed a chaplain only in May 1915 at its first meeting since the outbreak of war. He lamented that he arrived so late on the scene because the soldiers remained loyal to those who had helped them first.² In March 1916 he began an appeal for a church hut because the men would no longer tolerate his leaking tent.³ When after four months the appeal failed to reach its target the church decided to build anyway.⁴ The chaplain and the work in the camps then disappeared from the view of the ordinary Presbyterian. Queensland Presbyterians appointed one chaplain to care for the 14,000 men and raised £400 but by 1916 the appropriate committee reported that it was 'impossible for one man to do the whole of this work in such a way as its importance demands'.⁵ They agreed to merge with the Methodists to husband limited resources by avoiding duplication.⁶ Dr Merrington lectured on his experiences at Gallipoli and raised £507 for the venture while the Presbyterians gave £700.⁷ Necessity forced the churches to co-operate but even then the mission failed. When the Presbyterian chaplain joined the A.I.F. he was not replaced in the camp because of 'limited

¹PM, 16 July 1915.
²PM, 4 June 1915.
³PM, 10 March 1916.
⁴PM, 21 July 1916.
⁵Presbyterian Church of Queensland, Minutes of Assembly, 1916, p.111.
⁶Ibid., 1917, p.67.
⁷Ibid.
indeed Queensland Presbyterians lost interest in the work. In 1917 they raised £159 and in 1918 £76.  

In their rhetoric churchmen barely admitted a distinction between the cause of the church and the cause of the Empire, yet when they faced practical problems they saw the force of the distinction. Churchmen refused to be stampeded by blind patriotism; they refused to curtail church services drastically; they refused to jeopardise church finances. In fact, the only serious problem to emerge during the war years was the shortage of ministers caused more by the demands of the chaplaincy than by the enlistment of clergymen. Church leaders argued that a nation at war needed an efficient church to bolster home spirits; they maintained that church work was war work and they tried to prevent any weakening of the church's grip on the community. They were not inebriated by patriotism as some historians have suggested; in fact they even limited their work amongst the soldiers when it appeared that the normal church program would suffer. Some disagreed with these priorities. The younger clergymen found particular difficulty in remaining at their parish posts and many were tempted to enlist in the A.I.F. However, most were guided by an unspoken maxim that the normal life of the church must continue. In turning to the conscription debates we will find that most clergymen remained sensitive to their role and refused to treat the issue solely in political terms. Church leaders remained, at every turn of the war, vitally interested in the fate of the Empire, but also aware of the limitations of their commitment.

1 Ibid., 1918, p.108.
2 Ibid., 1918, p.67 and 1919, p.68.
Chapter 7

THE CONSCRIPTION YEARS

Conscription: 'the undignified process of spurring the willing steed'.

Archbishop Mannix, October 1916.
Politicians, press and pulpit continued to clamour for conscription throughout 1916. Eventually Hughes succumbed to the weight of this advice but such was the tenuous nature of his support, at least in the Senate, that he decided to allow the people to vote on the question in a referendum. The campaign was bitter and at times heated; neither side could see virtue in the other and political lines were cut when the majority of the labour movement opposed the Labor Prime Minister, Hughes. Australia voted on 28 October and gave victory to 'no' by a very small margin. The majority for 'no' in New South Wales determined the result. Hughes left the Labor party on 14 November and formed a temporary government from amongst the small band of Labor men who followed him. Later he amalgamated with the Liberal opposition to create a Nationalist or 'Win-the-War' government. The handsome victory they won at the general election of May 1917, and the worsening recruiting situation, encouraged Hughes to have a second try for conscription. The second campaign was even more bitter than the first and showed that the nation was divided deeply.

1Scott, Australia, pp.338-9.

2The final figures were: 'No': 1,160,033; 'Yes': 1,087,557; a majority for 'No' of 72,476. Scott, Australia, p.352.

3The State figures were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>474,544</td>
<td>356,805</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>328,216</td>
<td>353,930</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>158,051</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>119,236</td>
<td>87,924</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>40,884</td>
<td>94,069</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>37,833</td>
<td>48,493</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Territory</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,160,033</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,087,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Scott, Australia, p.352.

4Scott, Australia, p.365.

5Ibid., p.377.
over the question. The vote, however, produced a greater majority for 'no'; only Tasmania and Western Australia voted 'yes'.

Historians have explained the referenda results in many ways. They have analysed the figures in city and country electorates and have sampled opinion in other ways too, although, as K.S. Inglis said, because the result was so close 'any one of a number of things can be said to have been decisive'. The opinions of church leaders may have influenced some voters but even an analysis of those electorates where members of one denomination predominated could not be conclusive. If, for example, all Catholics in a particular electorate voted against conscription they may have been persuaded more by the arguments of Mr Tudor than by those of

---

1 The figures were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>487,774</td>
<td>341,256</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>332,490</td>
<td>329,772</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>168,875</td>
<td>132,771</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>106,364</td>
<td>86,663</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>46,522</td>
<td>84,116</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>38,502</td>
<td>38,881</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Territory</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'No' majority: 166,588

Source: Scott, Australia, p.427.


3 K.S. Inglis, 'Conscription in Peace and War, 1911-1945', in Forward and Reece, Conscription in Australia, p.39.
Fr O'Brien. In this chapter I will not attempt to assess the influence of the church leaders in determining the outcome of the referenda. Rather, I will concentrate on what they said about conscription and how the result affected them.

Scott remarked that if all the previous disputes in Australian life had been pooled the disturbance produced would not have equalled that of the conscription debates.¹ The referenda have attracted historians who are always eager for the sound and the fury of debate but this very attractiveness influenced many of them to telescope the nation's war experience before 1916 and see it in the light of conscription. This defect has been particularly important when historians have discussed churchmen's response to conscription. They have neglected the background to this response: the understanding churchmen had of the war itself. Thus they have simplified clerical support or opposition for conscription. For example, some historians explained the almost unanimous support of Protestant clergymen in terms of patriotism or imperialism. Inglis said that Protestants saw 'Christianity [as] the obverse of Empire' and Gilbert interpreted this to mean that churchmen had subordinated everything to winning the war and that the church was in danger of compromising its message.² These explanations do not go far enough. Churchmen accepted war as a part of God's providence for the world; through sacrifice, suffering and devotion to duty men would be lifted to a higher, more thoroughly Christian, plane. Their concern was not, primarily, for the welfare of the empire. They hoped that war would transform Australian society: conscription might be one of the methods of transformation.

The synthesis of war and religion enabled churchmen to digest otherwise puzzling events and make the best of them.

¹Scott, Australia, p.342.

²K.S. Inglis, 'op.cit., p.36 and A.D. Gilbert, 'The Churches and the Conscription Referenda, 1916-17', M.A. Thesis, A.N.U., 1967, p.49. Gilbert found that 'a survey of war-time denominational periodicals gives the impression that they found their raison d'etre in the propagation of patriotism... articulate Protestants subordinated everything to winning the war'. Ibid.
They greeted the news of the evacuation of Gallipoli with the equanimity one would expect from men confident in the controlling providence of God. The editor of the Bush Brother refused to look on the campaign as a failure; he enunciated a law that sacrifice was never a waste. Brennan rejoiced in the success of the expedition, although he did not explain the nature of the success. Carruthers believed that the suffering and death had not been in vain. Behind these attitudes lay the clerical belief that victory would be achieved not only by the physical efforts of the soldiers but also by the creation of a regenerate spirit on the home front. If the heroism and sacrifice at the Dardanelles thrilled Australians at home and aroused in them a new respect for duty and self-sacrifice then the campaign had succeeded irrespective of the military consequences. For victory would be denied until the people at home showed that they had repented of their sins and learned the lessons of the war. Archbishop Donaldson gave a clear exposition of this doctrine in a sermon entitled 'Are We Ready for Peace'. His text was the verse 'behold now is the accepted time; behold now is the Day of Salvation' and he argued that the war searched out the true character of each nation and allowed it to find its soul. Australia, however, had not repented and Donaldson dreaded the arrival of peace at the present moment...we are not ready for victory. Our moral and spiritual condition is such that if peace came tomorrow, the confusion, and the outburst of all sorts of evil passions would be such that we might even find ourselves in worse case than now.

The nation would find joy and happiness in the prospect of peace only when it had achieved genuine repentance. Donaldson gave some examples of the failure of repentance: church attendance in Brisbane was no better than it had been before

---

1Bush Brother, January 1916.
2Advocate, 1 January 1916.
3Methodist, 1 January 1916.
4ACW, 24 March 1916. It is a sign of the esteem in which Donaldson was held that the editor of this inter-denominational paper published the full text of the sermon; it occupied two pages.
the war. While Donaldson expressed the doctrine in a rather extreme way most churchmen would have accepted his general theme. This was not blind imperialism whatever else it may have been. Churchmen had synthesised war and religion. They had not discarded their religious beliefs in favour of the Empire.

Conscription presented no philosophical problems to the majority of churchmen who, as we have seen, were irritated by the shirkers' indifference to the great issues of the war. Nor was compulsion an unusual weapon for churchmen who felt 'a puritan attraction' for conscription. 'Where the interests of the whole nation are concerned', as the Spectator put it, 'the personal interests of the individual must give way.'

Churchmen's enthusiasm increased early in 1916 when they learnt that the British Government had introduced conscription. Some doubts persisted. Angus King wondered what would be the use of conscripting shirkers, whom he defined as those who watched boxing matches. When such people joined the army they would need more intensive training than was given to volunteers and they would never become real soldiers. However, 'they might be made fighters' and in any case they should be forced to pull their weight. 'Stiff training would make men of them, and if they did die, they would at least die in a good cause.' Protestant editors generally agreed in early 1916 that conscription should be tried. This agreement preceded political pressure by many months.

The Catholic papers gave general support to conscription in 1915 but in early 1916 a change came over them and by March the Catholic press, although still divided, was predominantly opposed to compulsion. However, Catholic editors did not express their opposition vehemently, nor did they base it on

1Ibid.


3Spectator, 11 February 1916. The principle referred in this instance to the suppression of the drink traffic.

4PM, 7 January 1916.
Catholic doctrine or moral principles. The *Southern Cross* provided a good example of the revised position. The editor supported the principle of compulsion: 'the principle that every citizen should be prepared to defend his country should the necessity arise, no one will gainsay'.¹ He objected to conscription on practical grounds saying that 'in Australia we have not arrived at [the necessity] yet. It is not likely that we ever will.'² The editor of the *Advocate* believed that the adoption of conscription in Great Britain made its introduction more imminent in Australia but he counselled against following Britain's lead blindly.³ The *Advocate*,'s news reports gave space to those who supported conscription. Father O'Dwyer, the rector of Xavier College, argued that the burden fell unequally on the best; 'he found that the boys who honoured and gave distinction to their schools were the boys who enlisted'.⁴ By March the *Advocate* believed that conscription was only justified by necessity and pleaded with people to give the voluntary system a fair trial.⁵ In Sydney the Catholic Press remained silent and the *Freeman's Journal* continued to argue for conscription. The editor wrote that Australian families were making unequal sacrifices and that the young, unmarried men should be forced to fight while the married men stayed home to keep industry moving: 'the volunteer system has been satisfactory, but unfortunately it encourages the slackers, the very class we can do without'.⁶

Thus by March 1916 only the *Freeman's Journal* still argued positively for conscription. The change in attitude began, and

¹ *Southern Cross*, 14 January 1916.
² Ibid. The editor expressed a similar view in *Southern Cross*, 10 March 1916. P.M. Gibson, 'The Conscription Issue in South Australia', p.65, shows that the *Southern Cross* arrived at this position before the Irish rising or the intervention of Mannix.
³ *Advocate*, 8 January 1916.
⁴ *Advocate*, 5 February 1916. Fr O'Dwyer's brother, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, was Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab. *Advocate*, 19 September 1914.
⁵ *Advocate*, 11 March 1916.
⁶ *FJ*, 20 April 1916.
in many cases was completed, well before the outbreak of the Irish rebellion, which most historians have seen as the turning point; Robson, for example, saw the rebellion as the sole catalyst of Catholic change: 'Catholics who in 1915 would have given their last man and last shilling became overnight eager and resolute opponents of conscription'. More subtlety is required to explain what was in fact the gradual disenchantment of the Catholic editors. Perhaps they perceived that the bulk of their people disagreed with conscription and in the early months of 1916 they attempted to fall into step, once more, with their readers. In 1916 accusations of Catholic disloyalty grew in volume and it may be that the Protestant extremists so antagonised Catholic leaders that they rejected the policy their opponents so wholeheartedly espoused. These accusations derived more from myth than from reality. Since the sixteenth century, Englishmen have been reluctant to admit that their Catholic countrymen can distinguish successfully between their spiritual allegiance to the Pope and their temporal allegiance to the monarch. Englishmen invested the Pope with the power to compel Catholics to commit treacherous acts against their country; they believed the Pope held England in special abhorrence. Without evidence, extremist Protestants charged that Australian Catholics were failing to enlist according to their proportion in the community because the priests discouraged such enlistment. It was part of the Protestant mythology that priests had an absolute mastery over their people. When Mannix refuted these charges of disloyalty in February 1916 the Argus applauded his 'striking, commendable

---

1 Robson, *The First A.I.F.*, p.95.

2 See the Rev. F.A. Hagenauer, *The Papal-Kaiser Intrigue*, Melbourne, 1917, for an example of the force of these myths. Hagenauer argued that the Pope began the war to regain the spiritual and temporal power he had lost. Angus King enthusiastically reviewed the pamphlet saying 'the subject deserves the careful attention of every loyal citizen'. *PM*, 20 July 1917.

3 Fitchett, a moderate Protestant, asked whether 'the loyalty of Roman Catholic subjects to a Protestant ruler would quite be above suspicion' if the priests and 'higher dignitaries' had their way. He concluded: 'the facts of history are stubborn'. *Southern Cross*, (Melb.), 18 February 1916.
and forceful declaration' and warned no-one to doubt his sincerity or 'the sincerity of the patriotism of Roman Catholics'.

When the news of the rebellion in Dublin reached Australia Catholic bishops and Irish leaders expressed their amazement and regret. Their instinctive reaction was to deplore any circumstance that would hinder Britain's war effort and they reaffirmed the loyalty of Australian Catholics. Carr spoke of the uprising as 'an outburst of madness, an anachronism, and a crime'. Mannix declared that Carr had truly expressed the feelings of the Catholic body. In South Australia an Irish leader depicted the rebels as 'some cranks, some mad devils whom nobody could do anything with'. Kelly and Duhig denounced the rebellion as a crime. Carr, Phelan and Kelly all explained that the plot was hatched in Germany and paid for with German gold. Despite such denunciations Carruthers discerned treachery in Kelly's statements because he could 'read between lines so expressed and get at the real sentiments of this clamorous Popish prelate'. Was the horror and anguish so much window-dressing on the part of disloyal Catholic prelates? Kelly at least tried to match his bold words with bold action. Soon after he heard of the uprising he sent a telegram to all Australian Catholic bishops asking them to join with him in cabling John Redmond, the Irish Nationalist leader,

---

1 *Argus*, 15 February 1916. The full text of Mannix's refutation is in the *Advocate*, 19 February 1916.

2 See, for example, the reaction of Tasmanian Catholics and Irish leaders described in R.P. Davis, 'Tasmania and the Irish Revolution, 1916-22', Tasmanian Historical Research Association, Papers and Proceedings, vol.21, no.2, June 1974, p.70.

3 *Advocate*, 6 May 1916.

4 Ibid.

5 *Southern Cross*, 5 May 1916.

6 *FJ*, 4 May 1916 and *Catholic Advocate*, 4 May 1916.

7 *Argus*, 28 April 1916; *Advocate*, 27 May 1916; *FJ*, 4 May 1916.

8 *Methodist*, 6 May 1916.
to condemn the eruption as 'anti-patriotic, irrational and wickedly irreligious, [and] expect consolidation, true national policy'. Unfortunately only the replies of Carr and Mannix survive to show why the cable was not sent. Carr did not wish to embarrass the Irish bishops who might not have condemned the rebellion so unequivocally; his chief concern was for the visible unity of the church. He also believed that as the rebellion had been suppressed 'it might be regarded as slaying the slain to express united condemnation'. Mannix agreed with this.

The bishops' attitude changed as British reprisals began; many Catholic authorities appealed for clemency. The Catholic newspapers in Australia participated in the process which transformed the rebels into martyrs. The Catholic Press, admittedly more interested in Irish affairs than other Catholic papers, allowed Irish news to dominate its pages from July to September 1916. One edition contained pictures of all the 'heroes' of the rebellion and reports of their deaths; another devoted two pages to the Casement trial and justly described his speech from the dock as 'memorable and dramatic'; another, late in September, filled a page with 'Memories of the Men who Died in the Recent Dublin Rebellion'.

With the Catholic condemnations of the rebellion ringing in their ears extremist Protestants used the uprising as proof that the loyalty of Catholics was dubious. Such attacks embittered Catholics who took a justifiable pride in their contribution to the war effort. For the first time since the outbreak of war Catholics perceived that they were not fully accepted as part of the community and this perception made them

---

1 Copy of the telegram in Kelly Papers, SDA, File '1916'.
2 Letter from Carr to Kelly, 3 May 1916, Kelly Papers, SDA, File 'Melbourne Archdiocese'.
3 Letter from Mannix to Kelly, 1 May 1916, Kelly Papers, SDA, File 'Melbourne Archdiocese'. Mannix said, '[Carr's] view is the better view. The worst is now over.'
4 Catholic Press, 13 July 1916, 24 August 1916, 21 September 1916. In Melbourne, the Tribune was more pro-Irish than the Advocate.
even more sensitive to supposed insults. Dr Alexander Leeper, the Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne, provided an example of the kind of charge made against Catholics at this time. He claimed that Australian Catholic bishops and priests were doing all they could to discourage recruiting.\(^1\) As we have seen, the facts made nonsense of this assertion. Perhaps Catholics should have ignored such attacks but they felt a strong temptation to champion the loyalty and heroism of their young men. The editor of the Advocate sounded the right note when he asked Leeper to understand that 'the feuds of the past must be buried in the graves of those who have died in a common cause'.\(^2\) Protestant calumny bred Catholic resentment. The mother who had recently lost her son at Gallipoli would not thank the Protestant minister who reproached her as a traitor. The Irish rebellion gave credibility to the fantastic accusations of Protestant extremists and put Catholics on the defensive. The Protestant extremists prepared the ground for the popularity that Mannix won amongst Catholics later in the year. Sectarianism was his greatest ally.

Australians discussed the question of conscription in a mood of growing bitterness and hostility and without the religious unity that had characterised the early years of the war. In this atmosphere minor disagreements were magnified and myths created. Apart from this, Catholic and Protestant church leaders approached the question of conscription in substantially different ways. They disagreed about whether the issue was moral or political. The Protestants, during both campaigns, treated conscription as a moral question about which the church must comment. Catholics viewed conscription as a political matter in which the church had no interest and no voice.

George Brown, the President of Australian Methodism, clarified the issue for his people. In a letter to the various state presidents on the subject of the referendum he disclaimed any interest in the political issues. He also denied that the war could be looked at from a political standpoint. Recognition

\(^1\)*Argus*, 25 May 1916.

\(^2\)*Advocate*, 3 June 1916.
of the duty owed to God, to the Empire and to the men already
at the front lifted conscription above the level of politics.
Brown, however, insisted on 'the necessity for the exercise of...
charity and forbearance towards those who differ from
[us]'.\(^1\) The Victorian president, Alfred Madsen, reinforced
Brown's point by stating that 'the Methodist Church claims no
authority over the individual conscience of its members and
adherents'. Though these Methodists saw conscription as a
moral issue others were free to disagree.\(^2\) The Presbyterian
church in Victoria debated whether the church should offer
guidance on conscription. The director of Victorian home
missionary work, Donald Cameron, argued that his observations
as a constant traveller around Victorian churches convinced him
that Presbyterians were equally divided about conscription. He
contended that church people felt the church had sunk to the
level of party politics, that the people did not regard the
issue as moral, and he pleaded with the church 'to resume its
attitude of impartiality and toleration'.\(^3\) The 1917 Commission
of the Assembly rejected this position: 'the issue is a moral
one, and therefore comes within the sphere of Church action'.\(^4\)
Anglican leaders, too, justified their intervention in the
campaigns on the ground that the church should show moral
leadership. Wright admitted to his synod in December 1916 that
his vigorous support for Hughes's proposal had exposed the
church to some measure of unpopularity. He was unrepentant,
however, because his behaviour

\[
\text{was dictated solely by the conscientious belief that victory for our arms can only be secured by the supremest sacrifice, and is necessary not only for the defence of the hearts and homes of Australia, but for the cause of God.}^5
\]

\(^1\) Methodist, 14 October 1916.
\(^2\) Spectator, 18 October 1916.
\(^3\) PM (V), 20 October 1916.
\(^4\) PM (V), 23 November 1917.
Reginald Stephen persuaded the General Synod to advocate a 'yes' vote by arguing that if the church were silent on moral matters it might as well put up the shutters.¹

Protestant churchmen intervened in the conscription debate in 1916 and 1917 because they believed the community needed and deserved guidance on a moral and ethical issue. This raised interesting questions in the continuing elaboration of relations between church and state in Australia. Churchmen asserted that where moral considerations were involved no part of political life escaped their scrutiny. The editor of the *Church Standard* insisted that 'churchmen have no business to shelter...behind an absolute distinction between Church and State' and that it was impossible to forego the claims of conscience in the conduct of public affairs.² Apparently only churchmen could form conscience correctly. Churchmen did not set limits to the areas where they could guide moral decisions; some insisted on the right to help voters in the general election of May 1917. The Rev. Hugh Kelly argued that 'the issue before the country at present is so clearly a moral one' that the church must offer advice even though 'the Presbyterian Church has no politics'.³ The advice was, predictably, that the 'Presbyterians of Australia will feel it their solemn duty to vote for Mr Hughes and the boys in the trenches'.⁴ The editor of the *Church Messenger* wrote of the church's duty 'to say to her children that they should vote Nationalist' because to do so was to 'cast a vote for the cause of Christ'.⁵ Carruthers used the moral argument to encourage Methodists to vote for Mr Holman's Nationalists in New South Wales in April 1917.⁶

¹*CM*, 20 October 1916.
²*CS*, 4 May 1917.
³*PM (V)*, 27 April 1917.
⁵*CM*, 20 April 1917.
⁶*Methodist*, 24 March 1917. Carruthers saw that election as between 'loyalty versus disloyalty; constitutional safety versus industrial extremism; win-the-war versus Australia shirking its duty'. He also warned of the 'solid phalanx of Roman Catholics who will vote to a man for the no-conscription party'.

issues about which they should speak was consistent with their view that the nation would achieve regeneration through the war by universal, sacrificial participation. It remains to be seen what moral arguments churchmen used when they advocated conscription.

The General Synod of the Anglican church met in Sydney on 10 October 1916. The representatives at the national body were able to discuss conscription and give an opinion that must have carried weight with their members. J.C. Wright delivered the primatial address in which he mentioned the main problems before the synod; conscription was one of these. Wright believed the synod should tell the people to honour the pledge they had given about the last man and the last shilling and also stress the moral obligation of each citizen to defend his country in time of danger. Only six Synod members spoke to the motion urging people to vote 'yes' which passed unanimously to the accompaniment of the National Anthem. Gilbert White made the only speech of substance in which he concentrated on what he saw as the moral issues. It was immoral, he said, to desert the men who had fought so gallantly in Gallipoli and France. The 'yes' case involved the virtues of justice, honesty and self-sacrifice. Compulsion was just because it was fair to all, honest because it honoured the promise of the last man and self-sacrificial because it was necessary for the good of the country.

Other Anglican leaders followed the lead of the General Synod. During the 1917 campaign Clarke wrote to his flock advocating a 'yes' vote because Australians must show they were worthy of their great inheritance, must stand by the Empire which protected them and must show Mannix and his disloyal

---

1 The Anglicans had attempted to postpone the General Synod from 1915 in the hope that the war would be over by 1916 and they could concentrate on church business. However several 'high' bishops were so incensed by this move that Wright called synod together in 1915, went through the forms and adjourned to 1916 after an afternoon's work. CS, 13 August 1915.

2 CM, 20 October 1916.

3 Daily Telegraph, 17 October 1916.

4 Ibid.
followers that they could not dominate the country. The Victorian bishops then issued a joint pastoral letter in which they stressed the duty Australians owed to their soldiers. To desert these men would involve national betrayal, as would desertion of the Empire that had sheltered and protected Australia. They described war as the testing time of the nations, the opportunity for purification and renewal, and stated that Australians could not afford to opt out of the 'fiery furnace'. They quoted President Wilson who had said that the Allies were fighting for democracy, the liberties of small nations and the universal dominion of right and rested their moral case on his words.

The Rev. R.H. Moore preached twice on the subject of 'organised enlistment' before the first referendum and his sermons give us some idea of parish fare. He offered no apology for dealing with the matter saying he had a right to speak as moral issues were at stake. His only positive statement in the first sermon was that Australians must not shrink from honouring their pledge about the last man. He then dealt with the objections to conscription. While some said conscription would denude the country of men Moore believed that every man should enlist rather than allow the madman of Europe to roam unrestrained. Others claimed that an additional 200,000 Australians would be but a drop in the ocean but Moore argued that perhaps the last ounce would turn the scale. And so the preacher cavalierly bowled over one objection after another. In the second part of his statement given on the following Sunday he rejected the possibility of pacifism saying that the cancerous growth of Kaiserism must be rooted out of Europe and that this task concerned Australia as much as it concerned

---

1 CM, 30 November 1917.
2 CM, 14 December 1917.
3 Ibid.
4 Notes of a sermon preached on 24 September 1916. R.H. Moore Papers, Battye Library, MS.1210A.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
England. He concluded the sermon with the thought that only traitors opposed his view and what was traitorous was unchristian.2

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia met in Sydney on 26 September 1916. Two ministers, Cameron from Melbourne and Brandt from Sydney, moved an amendment to the standard motion of loyalty that the church should not pronounce either for or against conscription.3 The amendment was lost, allowing J.T. Robertson to move a comprehensive motion about conscription.4 In the preamble he dealt with the duty of the church to lead the people. He then gave eight lengthy reasons which showed that conscription was just and necessary.5 Since the Empire fought in obedience to Christian principle she was 'bound to put forth the full strength of her manhood and resources until her righteous cause triumphs'; the duty of resisting evil and fighting for right was a moral obligation of citizenship; the government could compel citizens who refused to accept their obligations.6 Robertson's motion passed by 92 votes to three7 but not before Dr Burgess had tried to move an amendment calling on the people to vote 'no'. Burgess believed this would force the government to introduce conscription by proclamation which he thought would be more expeditious.8 When the Public Questions Committee of the Victorian Assembly asked ministers to urge a 'yes' vote from their pulpits the Rev. H. Erskine of

1Notes of a sermon preached on 1 October 1916. R.H. Moore Papers, Battye Library, MS.1210A.
2Ibid.
3Presbyterian Church of Australia, Minutes of Assembly, 1916, p.21.
4Ibid. The amendment was lost 'by a large majority'; Argus, 28 September 1916.
5Presbyterian Church of Australia, Minutes of Assembly, 1916, p.31.
6Ibid.
7Daily Telegraph, 3 October 1916.
8Presbyterian Church of Australia, Minutes of Assembly, pp.36-7 gives Burgess' rambling motion.
Maryborough wrote to the Messenger saying he would not do so because conscription was a political matter. Labor supporters in his congregation opposed conscription and he refused to provoke them lest his spiritual work, which, he implied, had a higher priority than war work, might suffer. Erskine's view received no support in the Messenger. Presumably most ministers complied with the committee's request. The newly elected Moderator-General of the church, Professor R.G. Macintyre, believed that a refusal to reinforce the Australians in France would leave them at the mercy of the Germans; he warned that those who voted 'no' would sacrifice thousands of lives needlessly. Hugh Kelly stated that as a righteous God demanded the punishment of evil-doers a Christian might have to surrender his normal rights to achieve such a good. He concluded, 'if the State is ordained of God to be a lesson to evildoers, the ordaining carries with it full authority to press into the service all who are needed to repel and punish the aggressors'.

Methodists campaigned less strenuously for 'yes', possibly because the conditions in camp and related moral dangers still concerned them. Also, no representative body met at the time of the campaigns and individuals may have been reluctant to speak for the whole church. However, the President asked Methodists to consider their duty to God, to the Empire and to the men at the front before they voted. Madsen, the Victorian president, wrote of the moral duty to reinforce the men at the front and Henry Howard, who campaigned in Melbourne, preached from a text which showed that Moses' introduction of compulsory service welded Israel into a nation. He believed that

---

1PM (V), 20 October 1916.  
2Ibid.  
3Ibid., 27 October 1916.  
4PM, 22 September 1916.  
5Methodist, 14 October 1916.  
6Spectator, 18 October 1916.  
7Spectator, 15 September 1916.
democracy and compulsion were interchangeable terms and that national service in the defence of one's country ought to be no more optional than rate-paying. Carruthers asked his co-religionists to consider whether the lower, baser and disloyal elements in Australia are to prevail or be defeated. The combinations that are on one side are sufficient to cause all right-minded people to unite to bring about their defeat, and to save Australia from having its fair fame besmirched and its reputation in the Empire lowered, to the great joy of the Kaiser and his generals in Berlin.  

While the Protestant leaders argued that the moral issues compelled them to speak about conscription they concentrated on the tenuous moral duties of not deserting the men at the front, of repaying Australia's debt of gratitude to the Empire, of ensuring Australia's freedom and of acting honourably by fulfilling a pledge. This was ordinary civic morality, the morality of boys' magazines, rather than that, specifically, of the Christian religion. Nor was the moral argument always well based in fact. For example, opponents of conscription, who might have accepted as a moral principle that one does not desert a friend in need, argued nevertheless that the Australian soldiers, even if not reinforced, would be adequately supported by the Allies and would never be left 'to the mercy of the Germans'. Churchmen need not have restricted their moral arguments to suit a general audience because they addressed themselves almost exclusively to their own church people. Whereas during the recruiting movement significant numbers of clergymen spoke at public meetings in halls, at street corners and from lorries, very few clergymen spoke at public meetings in favour or against conscription. Perhaps they were reluctant to inject moral arguments into what most saw as a political campaign or perhaps they feared the hurly-burly of the conscription rallies. In South Australia a clergyman was pelted with eggs when he attempted to argue for conscription; his colleagues avoided direct personal

1 Ibid.

2 Methodist, 28 October 1916.
confrontation. During the 1916 campaign in New South Wales newspapers recorded the names of eight ministers who supported 'yes' at eighteen public meetings, while one minister (Rivett) spoke at ten 'no' meetings. In Victoria eight clergymen spoke at twenty-six 'yes' meetings. In 1917 the clerical involvement increased. Ten clergymen spoke at seventeen 'yes' meetings in New South Wales and two spoke at twelve 'no' meetings. In Victoria seventeen clergymen spoke at seventy-one 'yes' meetings. Apart from those people who attended church regularly or subscribed to a church newspaper the bulk of the people may have had ill-informed ideas about clergymen's views on conscription and may not have known why clergymen joined in the debate. F.B. Smith said that 'the warmth of [religious leaders'] exhortations [was] not a measure of their influence'; perhaps because the warmth was confined to the otherwise bleak walls of the churches.

In contrast to the Protestants, Catholic churchmen held that because conscription was a political matter the church could have no views. Archbishop Duhig expressed the Catholic position clearly when he replied to the Rev. A.C. Plane, who charged that the Catholic church was opposed to conscription. Duhig said that while the church had given the strongest proofs

---

1Daily Telegraph, 19 October 1916. The clergyman was A.E. Gifford, a Congregationalist. He had attempted to speak to the men at the Islington government workshops.

2Daily Telegraph, 2-27 October 1916. On the 'yes' side there were two Anglicans, two Methodists, three Presbyterians and one other. A.C. Rivett was an Independent. As he left one 'no' rally a supporter congratulated him saying that 'ministers of religion, by publicly supporting conscription, are driving thousands of young men into infidelity and atheism'. Daily Telegraph, 19 October 1916.

3Argus, 2-28 October 1916. There were two Methodists, two Presbyterians, one Anglican and three others.

4Daily Telegraph, 1-20 December 1917. The 'yes' speakers comprised two Anglicans, two Methodists, four Presbyterians and two others.

5Argus, 26 November-20 December 1917. The speakers were two Anglicans, six Methodists, three Presbyterians, one Catholic and five others.

of its patriotism during two years of war it would not debate a purely political matter.\(^1\) Catholics would make up their own minds, said Duhig, because 'we decidedly have not the right, as a church, to interfere in the matter'.\(^2\) Cerretti, the Apostolic Delegate, endorsed Duhig's exposition saying he had 'stated the position admirably'.\(^3\) Cerretti continued: 'it would be altogether unreasonable to involve the Church, as a Church, in an issue which its members, as citizens, in common with others, are called on to decide'.\(^4\) He warned editors of church newspapers not to commit the church to one side and he forbade discussion of the matter from pulpits.\(^5\) The other archbishops accepted Cerretti's directives loyally. Carr said that traditionally the Catholic church had made a clear distinction between the temporal and the spiritual which the Protestant churches had failed to make. In general, he believed that

when religious or moral questions are not concerned, but political or purely social questions are to be decided, the less interference the Church, as a church, has with the State...the more pleasant and profitable will their mutual relations be.\(^6\)

Kelly issued a pastoral letter adopting the non-political stance and calling for prayers for harmony.\(^7\)

However, the archbishops found it necessary to stress the apolitical nature of the church because of the notoriety of Mannix who supported 'no'. It is a tribute to the power and magnetism of Mannix, and the force and vigour of his language, that although he spoke against conscription only twice during the first campaign he was seen then, and subsequently by

\(^1\)Catholic Advocate, 28 September 1916. The interview was reprinted in the Advocate, 14 October 1916.
\(^2\)Ibid.
\(^3\)Advocate, 14 October 1916.
\(^4\)Ibid.
\(^5\)Ibid.
\(^6\)Ibid.
\(^7\)FT, 19 October 1916.
historians, as a leader of the 'no' case. As he was the only non-political public figure to advocate 'no' he stood head and shoulders above the 'no' supporters. Mannix first announced his opposition to conscription on 16 September in a speech at Clifton Hill which lasted less than three minutes. He argued that Australia had already contributed her full share to the war effort and that very few Australians had not shared the common burden. He believed that the Australian economy would suffer seriously if many more men were taken from the workforce and doubted if Australia's contribution could settle the issue, anyway. He congratulated Hughes on allowing the people to decide the issue and pleaded for full freedom of discussion saying that in supporting 'no' he exercised the same right as the 'authorities of the Anglican Church' who supported 'yes'.

In his second speech against conscription at Preston on 22 October Mannix defended his right to speak. He had been criticised in the newspapers although he had spoken 'in a secular place, at a secular function, and in [his] individual, personal capacity' while Protestant leaders spoke from the pulpit and urged that conscience compelled a 'yes' vote.

Again Mannix argued against conscription on the basis of the likely damage to the Australian economy. The conscriptionists, he alleged, were engaged 'in the undignified process of spurring a willing steed'. In neither speech did Mannix discuss the morality of conscription; he treated it as a question of practical politics and concentrated on the effect on the future of Australia. In the new year Mannix re-examined the war, not conscription, in the light of Aquinas' 'just war' principles.

---

1 Mannix said he had another engagement that evening and could only speak for two to three minutes. Advocate, 14 October 1916.


3 Advocate, 28 October 1916.

4 Ibid.

5 Max Charlesworth in 'Australian Catholics and Conscription' in Forward and Reece, Conscription in Australia, claimed that 'it was the moral aspects of conscription that [Mannix] had primarily in view', p.245. I am unable to find any evidence to support this view.
but his rejection of conscription preceded this re-examination. To confuse the two periods in Mannix's thinking, his practical objection to conscription, and his moral doubts about the war, is to minimise the importance of the latter.1

As an orthodox Catholic theologian Mannix subscribed to the just war theory.2 In the early months of the war he joined with other church leaders in supporting the Allies' participation in a defensive war provoked by an unjust attack. The war was just. As it dragged on, however, Mannix began to look into its causes more closely and by the end of January 1917 he concluded that 'whatever else may be involved, it was a truism that the war was a trade war'.3 This statement provoked a ferocious outcry from those who sustained themselves with thoughts of the nobility of Britain's actions. Commentators, however, failed to notice the drift of Mannix's thinking. In terms of the just war theory Britain was entitled to resist German aggression be it an attack on Belgium or an attack on Britain's trading position. Britain was not entitled to continue the war once Germany's aggression had been checked. If the Allies hoped to prolong the war to smash German industry and economic activity then they became the aggressors and, if this situation arose, Britain's participation in the war would be unjust. Mannix worried about this possibility because politicians put such aims before the people; they were told 'that victory would be a barren victory, and all the bloodshed vain, if the enemy were to retain after the war a chance of again beating in trade the rivals whom they failed to beat in

1Ian Turner, Industrial Labour and Politics, p.111 and F.B. Smith, The Conscription Plebiscites, p.10, both mistakenly confuse Mannix's rejection of conscription in 1916 with his discussion of the 'trade war' in 1917. Dr Smith has corrected his mistake in the third edition of The Conscription Plebiscites.

2Mannix was a Professor of Theology at Maynooth before he became President. Frank Murphy, Daniel Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne, 1917-1963, Melbourne, 1972, p.4.

3Advocate, 3 February 1917. Mannix made the remark while opening a technical school in Brunswick. The bulk of his speech dealt with the necessity for more technical schools if Australia was to become a strong industrial nation.
While the press and many Protestant preachers howled for Mannix's blood none of them tried to understand what, in fact, he was saying. So Mannix returned to his theme again. He conceded that the Allies had entered the war to protect Belgium and to safeguard legitimate trade interests but he warned of the danger that the Allies might proceed past the point where these just aims had been achieved and attempt to emasculate Germany as a trade rival: as Mannix said, 'a war which was just in the beginning may become unjust before it is over'. Mannix raised the question; he never gave an answer.

In these speeches and others like them Mannix revealed himself as one of the few churchmen, and the only one in a position of authority, who was prepared to subject the Allies' war aims and effort to independent intellectual scrutiny. He rejected the hollow catch-cries and emotional appeals that sustained his counterparts in the Catholic and Protestant churches. Although mixed up with his arrogance, theatricality, contempt for Britain and obsession with Ireland, his moral re-examination deserved better than the hysteria which it aroused. Mannix was not simply anti-British; he fulfilled the legitimate role of a churchman who scrutinised the actions of the state in the light of morality. He performed the function that, as regards conscription, Protestant church leaders said they were obliged to perform. Mannix was reviled not because he entered the field of morals but because, when he did so, he made unpalatable suggestions. If the war was unjust no churchman could support it.

Despite his new-found uncertainty about the justice of the war Mannix used the same arguments during the second campaign as he had used in the first. In 1917, however, he spoke more frequently and received the support from his brother bishops

---

1Ibid.

2Advocate, 17 March 1917. Mannix returned to this theme at the end of 1917. He said that if the war was fought to advance the economic domination of the Allies then he opposed it and enlistment. Advocate, 8 December 1917 and 29 December 1917.
which they had refused in 1916. The bishops abandoned the Cerretti line of non-interference in 1917 ostensibly because they believed the interests of the church would suffer if conscription were introduced. When Hughes published the proposed exemptions he omitted ecclesiastical students and religious brothers from the list. The bishops chose to interpret this as a threat to the future sacramental life of Catholics and the existence of the Catholic boys' schools. Although Hughes gave an assurance that he would exempt the students and brothers the bishops refused to accept his word. On 25 November Kelly described the proposed conscription of brothers and students as 'an outrage upon God' even though he had a message from Hughes assuring him that 'the Government has no intention whatever of including such persons as Christian Brothers and Brothers of similar orders with those liable for service under the scheme'.

---

1F.T. Hurley, 'Compulsory military training', p.127, argues that in Victoria, at least in 1916, 'clear leadership for Catholics was obviously given [to vote no]'. His evidence does not support this because, apart from Mannix, Phelan (Sale) asked people to examine their consciences, Foley (Sandhurst) and Carr said nothing and Lockington (influential Jesuit) said as a citizen he opposed conscription. In 1916, no other Australian bishop publicly supported 'no'.

2The exemption list specified only ministers of religion and thus neglected the case of students and brothers. For the full list see Scott, Australia, p.413.


4FJ, 29 November 1917.

5Copy of a letter from W.M. Hughes to J.D. Fitzgerald, 22 November 1917, Kelly Papers, SDA, File '1917'. Hughes asked Fitzgerald to pass the information on 'in strictest confidence'. Apparently he did not wish to appear to make concessions to the Catholics.
It may be that Catholic leaders and the section of the Catholic press that had supported conscription in 1916, notably the Freeman's Journal, seized this issue as a means of bringing themselves more into line with lay-Catholic opinion which was, for reasons which probably had little to do with religion or Ireland, solidly anti-conscription. While it was widely believed that priests and bishops exercised a large influence over the behaviour of Australian Catholics it is more likely that a determined, united laity forced the leaders to re-examine their position. Mannix's phenomenal popularity amongst all but the upper levels of Catholic society gave the other bishops a firm indication of the feelings of their people. The Vatican recognised the power of the laity's unity. The Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, writing to the British envoy to the Pope about Vatican attempts to restrain Mannix concluded:

> it must not be forgotten that Monsignor Mannix, wrongly or rightly, enjoys great influence on the working classes - proofs of this are the imposing and clamorous demonstrations of Melbourne and Sydney - therefore severe measures taken against him even by the Holy See, would undoubtedly aggravate the situation and create grave difficulties for the Government itself.¹

Again, rather tactlessly perhaps, Kelly invited Holman to speak at the St Patrick's Day sports in March 1917, during the New South Wales election campaign.² The Apostolic Delegate also attended. The crowd gave Kelly and Cerretti the usual respectful hearing but they greeted Holman with boos, shouts and catcalls when he rose to speak and he failed to gain a hearing. Although Kelly appealed for quiet and Cerretti showed his annoyance by banging his stick on the table the crowd

---

¹Letter from Cardinal Gasparri to Count de Salis, 22 August 1918. Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence File, Secret and Confidential Series, Third System, 'Archbishop Mannix 1920-21', CRS A1606, item no.F42/1, AA, Canberra.

²Kelly was unwise to invite Holman but apparently he felt obliged to do so. In 1918 a wealthy Catholic lady threatened to withhold her usual contribution of £100 to Catholic charities if those unfriendly to Mannix took part in the St Patrick's Day celebrations. Kelly's secretary replied that 'only once before in the history of our celebrations was it agreed to exclude the government'. Mrs E.M. Freehill to Archbishop Kelly, 18 March 1918 in which she quotes Fr O'Gorman's reply to her first letter. Kelly Papers, SDA, File '1918'.
continued to demonstrate. A reporter feared a riot. Holman sat down. Kelly spoke sharply to the crowd who continued to demonstrate even while Cerretti gave the papal blessing. The two prelates were left in no doubt about the people's sympathies. Finally, during 1916 the circulation of the 'anti' Catholic Press doubled. Such a spectacular increase must have been at the expense of the Freeman's Journal which supported 'yes'. Perhaps the Freeman's change of editorial policy in 1917 was influenced as much by the prospect of further erosion of circulation as by alarm at the supposed fate of the brothers and students. Freeman's could not afford to antagonise its readers again.

Other Catholics laboured to demonstrate that no 'Catholic line' existed about conscription and that Mannix spoke, as he claimed, as a private individual and not as a churchman. Fr T.J. O'Donnell of Tasmania supported conscription so enthusiastically that he offered his services to Hughes to make 'a dramatic declaration' from the platform to counteract the influence of Mannix. Hughes appreciated the value of O'Donnell's appearance on a 'yes' platform but he also thought he knew what such a gesture would cost O'Donnell:

it would mean ostracism, it would mean bringing down on his devoted head the implacable hatred of tens of thousands of men of his own religion, and probably cutting himself off forever from even living in Australia.

O'Donnell spoke for 'yes' in Tasmania and in Melbourne but there is no evidence that he suffered as Hughes predicted.

1Daily Telegraph, 19 March 1917.
2Catholic Press, 19 April 1917.
3There was a minute book of the directors of the Freeman's Journal in the Sydney Diocesan Archives which showed this decline but unfortunately this has been lost.
4Letter from W.M. Hughes to G.F. Pearce, 25 November 1917, in which Hughes described O'Donnell's offer. Pearce Papers, AWM, MS.2222, Third Series.
5Ibid.
Ironically, when he visited Ireland in 1919 he was arrested as a traitor; Hughes worked hard for his release. Laymen who opposed Mannix's views suffered for it. Benjamin Hoare, for example, a devoted friend of Archbishop Carr, lost his position in the Catholic Truth Society, which he had helped to found, because he wrote to the Age complaining of Mannix's unCatholic utterances. Sydney Catholics reviled Judge Heydon for his stand against Mannix. Such actions refuted the claim that Mannix acted as a private individual; as such he should have expected opposition. Instead, when Mannix was insulted, the whole Catholic body felt insulted. This division and intolerance showed how confused the conscription issue had become and how, for Catholics, the debate involved other issues of class and even of the status of Catholics within the community.

Although some historians who have dealt with the churches and conscription have concluded that the rejection of conscription showed how minimal was the political influence of Protestant leaders, given the way these men regarded the issue the implications were far more serious. They treated conscription as a moral issue, as a question of conscience, and the majority of Australians rejected either their judgment that the issue carried moral obligations or their view of what was the moral way to act. The defeat of conscription showed Protestant clergymen the extent of their influence in the field where they claimed a special competence. The defeat also justified clerical fears about the unregeneracy of Australian

---

1See Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence File, secret and confidential series, 'Court Martial of Father O'Donnell, 1919-1920', CP 447/2, item SC 292, pt.4, AA, Canberra.

2Advocate, 14 April 1917.

3FJ, 22 November 1917. The editor asked what the social position of Catholics would be if they took their leadership from men like Heydon. The editor of the Advocate accused Heydon of being 'disloyal to the Church of which he professes to be a member'. Advocate, 24 November 1917.
society. In fact, churchmen now faced a dilemma: they were
dissatisfied with the moral condition of society and yet they
perceived their influence over society was small. Few
churchmen, however, thought through the implications of the
failure although some were quick to rejoice at the influence of
the church when they claimed a victory. The editor of the
Ballarat Church Chronicle hailed the 1917 general election
result as a victory for 'the power of the Church - the power
only of prayer, statement of duty, and appeal for thought and
religious action'. When this formula failed the editor did
not publicise the failure. Only one clerical editor,
W.H. Fitchett examined the implications of the churches' failure, as he called it, honestly. He believed no minister
could say that his judgment had influenced the voting of his flock. After mentioning some ways in which churchmen could
take comfort, Fitchett concluded:

> it is surely a matter for profound regret that when the Churches of the land have agreed in
> judgment on a moral question affecting national
> affairs, and have declared their judgment in a
> form so public, and in terms so impressive, this
> has not arrested and influenced public opinion in
> a higher degree than is proved to be the case.

Fitchett saw no need to alter this analysis after the 1917
referendum; again he regretted that the pulpit and the press
had been put to one side.

Protestant churchmen, on the whole, did not face the
implications of their failure nor did they return, immediately,
to the old game of assessing the community's worth. They
rejected Round Table's sensible advice that instead of blaming
a section of the community the blame be laid at the door of the
whole community. They found a scapegoat in the Catholic
church. Almost as soon as the 1916 results were posted
Protestant church leaders began to attack the 'disloyal' Irish
Catholics. Given the attitude of the Catholic leaders during

---

1 Ballarat Church Chronicle, 12 May 1917.
2 Southern Cross (Melbourne), 3 November 1916.
3 Ibid., 4 January 1918.
4 Quoted in J.M. Main (ed.), Conscription: The Australian Debate, p.75.
the first referendum these men said in effect that Catholics abandoned all their other leaders and followed Mannix blindly. The virulence of the attacks on Catholics after the first ballot probably contributed to the revised Catholic position in 1917. No Catholic wished to associate with Snowball, Worrall, Leeper and the Argus. It is not my purpose to record the growth of this hideous sectarianism. Doubtless the hysteria of the war situation encouraged its growth; some people seemed to need to hate.\(^1\) Sectarianism diverted much church thought and activity away from the war. The mass of war news and comment found in the church papers in 1915 and 1916 underwent a steady reduction as domestic issues, particularly sectarianism, took the centre of the stage. Members of the A.I.F. deplored the churches' inability to co-operate with each other. If the 'ordinary Australian' shared this dislike, churchmen, who had damaged their credibility by supporting conscription so enthusiastically, damaged it even further by encouraging sectarianism. Protestant churchmen had looked to the war to reform society and to restore the church to its rightful place at the centre of things. By the end of 1917 this seemed a forlorn hope.

Most Catholics rejoiced at the defeat of conscription although they hailed it as a victory for Australian liberty rather than as a victory for Mannix. They resented bitterly the accusations of mass Catholic disloyalty and subversion. Sectarianism drew Catholics together as a group which felt alienated from the rest of the community, made them less tolerant of internal Catholic dissent and encouraged enormous displays of Catholic solidarity. Perhaps the tragedy of the

\(^1\)Perhaps the best example of this need is found in the Critchley Parker War Pamphlet Series. The early titles are ferociously anti-German but, apparently running out of steam, Parker turned his invective on the Catholics. Titles include 'The German Must Go', 'The Enemy in Australia', 'German Crimes established by German Documents', 'How Germans Intrigue', 'German Blackguards and British Prisonners' and then came 'Pope and Kaiser', 'Rome Rule in Australia', 'Is the Vatican in the War?', 'Church Vote for Sale', 'Is the Papacy Anti-British'. Once the anti-Catholic pamphlets began no more anti-German pamphlets appeared. Parker edited the Australian Statesman and Mining Standard and was an enthusiastic supporter of conscription.
divided community is best seen in South Australia where Catholics felt more alienated because of their numerical weakness. For three years they had tried to gain community acceptance by loyally joining in almost every activity designed to promote the war effort. They gloried in their young men's response to the call. Yet despite these sacrifices Catholics found themselves reviled as traitors. Lacking a Mannix to mount an attack on their enemies, South Australian Catholics worked even harder to prove their loyalty. They accepted the community's criterion of worth and answered their critics with a spate of honour board unveilings to show how many of their sons had enlisted.¹ The necessity for such advertisement showed how deep was Catholic resentment of the attacks.

¹See *Southern Cross*, 7 September, 28 September and 16 November 1917 for examples of unveilings.
Chapter 8

THE CHAPLAIN, THE SOLDIER AND RELIGION

How can I take up Parish work when I get back after all this amongst men?

Padre Dexter's Diary,
25 December 1914.
James Gault, who had entered the ministry in 1894, described himself as 'a timid, nervous minister' when first he donned khaki.\(^1\) While his timidity may have been due in part to the natural shyness a man feels when he begins a new job in strange circumstances, Gault was also conscious that for the first time in his ministry he faced the 'man in the street'.\(^2\) In all his previous experience, which included a long period as Superintendent of the Collingwood Methodist Mission, he had spoken to those who chose to hear him.\(^3\) Now he must discover how to convert men who had, perhaps, never been inside a church and who took no interest in religion. Many chaplains shared Gault's apprehension of that unknown, strange creature, 'the ordinary Australian'. Would he be antagonistic towards the church and religion and positive in his rejection of them, or would he be merely apathetic? The story of how the chaplains came to terms with the men of the A.I.F. throws light on the relation between church and people in Australian society. The men of the A.I.F. represent a cross-section of Australian male society and the chaplains represent the type of men who staffed Australia's churches. Through their experiences we can explore what each group thought of the other and what each expected from the other. If in this exploration the opinions of the larger group, the men of the A.I.F., seem monolithic that is because I have relied on the conclusions of those historians who have written about the 'character' of the A.I.F.\(^4\) The A.I.F. was not a monolith, a mass of men thinking uniformly, but the task of even outlining the shades of opinion is beyond the scope of this chapter.

The point of departure for the chaplains' reflections was the respect and admiration, almost reverence, they held for the men of the A.I.F. They honoured men who accepted death

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p.168.

\(^3\)Spectator, 9 July 1915.

for a good cause, who showed extraordinary courage in battle and cheerfulness in adversity and who, above all, were selfless. They sent back enthusiastic reports about the men and helped to create the myth that sprang up quickly after Gallipoli. For the chaplains, the most important aspect of this goodness, which conformed in so many ways to the Christian recipe for salvation, was that it existed independently of formal religious belief. Chaplains discovered that a man, outwardly irreligious, was capable of performing good and even heroically unselfish acts. Since most chaplains believed that religion provided the only basis for the exercise of the virtues, they needed to reconcile these apparently contradictory facets of character. Some chaplains implied that if a man was virtuous he was necessarily religious. Bishop Long wrote that because the men showed greater concern for others than for themselves they were religious.1 Dexter agreed that the men were deeply religious in their hearts because they were capable of such goodness.2 Others regretted that many of the men lacked the formal element of religion, piety, but believed that religion must be present in an incipient way because the men displayed its fruits. Tomkins wrote perceptively that 'the soldiers valued the fruits of religion and displayed some of the noblest of them while they too often forgot that the roots also are important'.3 Catholic chaplains could make nothing of this incipient religion, however. While they admired and loved the troops as warmly as their Protestant colleagues they taught that salvation could only come to the man who was in vital contact with the church. They tested a man's religion by noting his participation in the Sacraments. They understood the church not as a leaven in the lump, incidental to the salvation of man, but as the only means by which a man could be saved.

Chaplains shared the faith of their colleagues in Australia in the all-seeing providence of God and so they

1Church News for the Diocese of Bathurst, December 1918.
2CM, 28 January 1916.
3C.W. Tomkins, 'Some Recollections of War Service as a Chaplain', Report to Director, AWM, Uncat. MS., written 4 May 1922.
believed that because God permitted the war he must have ordained that good come from it. Many of them seemed as optimistic about the effect of the war on the troops as the clergymen in Australia were about its effect on society. Chaplains hoped for specific indications of improvement among the troops and were not satisfied with the general impetus towards virtue. Catholic chaplains believed that the war forced their men to think about God and what he meant to them. They recorded many instances of men who had all but abandoned their religion but who sought out the priest before going into the line. The priests noted happily that when these men died on the battle-field their salvation was virtually assured because the chaplain had put them right with God. Had the war not entered these men's lives they may have died obscurely without the help of a priest. Protestant chaplains also believed that God permitted the war because of the good that would come from it but they defined the good less specifically than the Catholics. Davidson hoped that because the men had experienced different cultures during their period of service, they would be broader and more tolerant when they returned to Australia. He also hoped that by grappling with temptations which would never have come their way in Australia they would be morally stronger. Talbot told an Australian audience that while he abhorred war he had nevertheless found that it brought out 'the finest qualities in men, of endurance, of self-sacrifice, of comradeship'. Wray emphasised how war deepened men's characters. He wrote of the young office-worker who suddenly had responsibility thrust on him when he joined the A.I.F. He learnt to command, control and support men as he progressed from platoon leader to the higher ranks. When such a man returned to Australia he would be 'vastly different in character and capability and outlook'. Tomkins found another

1 See, for example, Goidanich's reminiscences in Advocate, 4 May 1918; Francis Clune, C.P., 'Records', written Belgium, 28 January 1919, AWM, Uncat. MS.
2 PM, 16 March 1917.
3 SDM, 1 April 1916.
4 CS, 1 December 1916.
benefit: the men who shared the chaplain's company completely lost their prejudice against the parson and began to treat him as a friend.¹

Some chaplains, carrying this optimism even further, argued that war gave men an insight into the realities of life and demonstrated the relevance of basic Christian concepts to every stage of life. These men felt they understood concepts such as sacrifice, atonement and redemption more fully because of their war service and they hoped the soldiers had progressed with them. Since death continually confronted the troops, chaplains expected that they would be led to reflect on the meaning of life. Gordon described how he impressed the men with the unpredictability of life when he was performing a funeral service after three enemy planes had crossed the lines and killed many Australians. The men were stunned that death should come in such an unexpected way and Gordon noted that they followed the service with close attention. He preached from the text 'in the midst of life we are in death' and expected that the occasion would make a lasting impression on the troops.² Merrington also believed that the constant accompaniment of death stimulated a living interest in religion. When men saw their comrades killed indiscriminately they wished to learn more about the mystery of life and appreciated Christ as a comfort and support.³ A man also reflected on death when he realised that he had killed another human person. One Australian told Nye that when he killed an enemy soldier he experienced the same emotions as when he killed a rabbit for sport. Nye encouraged the man to reflect further and watched as he began to appreciate what it meant to take a human life. Soon the chaplain saw 'that look, often seen, impossible to describe, in the eyes of men who have dealt death to others, faced death for weeks themselves, known death to come suddenly, especially to the man at their elbow'.⁴ Other chaplains

¹C.W. Tomkins, 'Some Recollections of War Service as a Chaplain'.
²Southern Churchman, September 1916.
³ACW, 18 February 1916.
⁴Methodist, 11 December 1915.
examined other Christian concepts and found that the troops re-enacted them in their own lives. Some saw an analogy between the sacrifice of Christ, made for the salvation of his fellow men, and that of the troops. A chaplain wrote that the A.I.F. belief that each soldier's death helped to bring life and security to the people at home was analogous to the doctrine of atonement and would help the troops to understand that doctrine. Another wrote that the men who spoke of a dead mate as on duty elsewhere had a good insight into the doctrine of the communion of the saints. Such chaplains tried hard to make their beliefs relevant to the war situation.

Other chaplains rejected the general optimism, at home and at the front, about the effect of the war on the troops. One explained the unresponsiveness of the troops and their lack of interest in religion by saying that 'in the storm and stress of war men do not talk very readily of their religious feelings' and he expected that they would act on their reflections when they returned home. Kenneth Henderson rejected even this deferred optimism. He denied emphatically that war stimulated religious fervour. Where death was common-place men became callous and treated it in an off-hand way; death lost its sting. Henderson mocked the 'flabby optimism' of home preachers: 'the battlefield does not give to ninety-nine men out of every hundred any immediate apprehension of the Divine. Very much the reverse is the truth.' Henderson's chaplain-general, Riley, agreed. On his return from a visit to France and Egypt in 1916 Australians asked him if the presence of danger and the nearness of death changed soldiers from sinners to saints. He replied that he had no evidence of such a change. The committed Christians benefited from their war experience because the realities they had glimpsed fleetingly at home impressed

3 PM, 28 September 1917.
4 Kenneth T. Henderson, Khaki and Cassock, p.79.
5 CS, 13 April 1917.
them deeply at the front. Religion meant nothing to the mass of the soldiers who took no notice of the efforts of the chaplains despite the risk of injury and death. Riley distinguished a third class of man for whom the war demonstrated the irrationality of the Christian position. They asked why the Christian god permitted the Christian nations to wage such a barbaric war. Riley, in his characteristically honest fashion, admitted that the question had no easy answer. In fact he believed that an answer would not emerge until after the war when the outlines of God's plan became visible. While sceptical that good would come from the war on an individual basis Riley, as a Christian, expected that the overall result would be good; that was how God ordered things.¹

Henderson did not stop at the rejection of the 'flabby optimism' but examined the troops' philosophy and found that they embraced not Christianity but fatalism to carry them through the horrors and dangers of war.² The outlines of this philosophy were simple: as a shell or bullet whistled overhead a man relaxed with the thought 'if you're number isn't on it, you're alright'.³ If a man's number came up he was powerless before his fate and accepted it stoically. The fatalist believed that there was an appointed time for each man to die and as the war dragged on the old hands resigned themselves to the thought that no-one could last long as a soldier. Fatalism was akin to the Christian doctrine of God's providential arrangement of each man's life and both doctrines performed a like function in easing the strain of uncertainty and preventing men from succumbing to fear. Yet fatalism was the antithesis of Christianity because it rejected the existence of a personal god and left the determination of each man's life to other 'forces'. A correspondent in the Church Messenger explained that the fatalist position rejected the doctrine of free will and so hindered moral effort and encouraged men to incur great and, at times, awful risks.⁴ Fatalism killed faith

¹Ibid.
²Henderson, Khaki and Cassock, p.79.
³Ibid., p.74.
⁴CM, 19 April 1918. The article is unsigned.
in God. If the bulk of the troops were fatalists, as Henderson believed, the optimists would have a hard time of it because fatalism and Christianity were incompatible. However, the optimists prevailed amongst the chaplains because the alternative was so frightening. If the troops rejected Christianity they also rejected salvation and most chaplains, with their deep love of the troops, could not consign the bulk of them to perdition. They saw incipient Christianity in the men where perhaps none existed because they could neither damn the heroes they loved nor reassess the faith that demanded their damnation.

The chaplains were not always well placed to understand the general mood of the men of the A.I.F. Some ministers and other committed church people served in the ranks and their reflections reinforce the chaplains' views. A Presbyterian minister, John Smith, disagreed with the way the chaplains approached their work. Smith, who had been ordained in Western Australia in 1903, enlisted in an English regiment soon after the outbreak of war and fought in many battles. He was wounded, captured by the enemy and escaped. He fought on in the ranks until the Armistice and then accepted a chaplaincy in the A.I.F.\(^1\) His comments were influenced by his English experience but he had kept in touch with the Australians and knew many of the A.I.F. chaplains. He believed that the troops regarded the chaplain as an unnecessary evil because he showed little enthusiasm for the fighting, adopting instead a 'mother's meeting spirit'.\(^2\) Smith demanded a more virile approach:

> when the blast of war has called forth the nation's best, yea, when the Church itself has realised that the cause is God's, and has sent forth her men to slay are there not for the Padre also certain muscles of the mind which should stiffen, should there not be some sting

\(^1\)Presbyterian Church of New South Wales, *Minutes of Assembly*, 1919, p.139.

\(^2\)J. Smith, 'The Black Dragoon, An Appreciation and a Criticism of the Padre in the Great War', AWM, Uncat. MS.
Smith congratulated his church on sending some of her older men because the troops would listen to those who were too old to fight but who seemed to regret that 'they could not get a hand in at the real thing'. On the other hand, he believed 'that no young Padre \[would\] ever gain \[the soldier's\] esteem or have any influence on the things which tell'. Smith saw no flaw in his logic: the Church blessed the war and encouraged Australians to take a full part in it; the troops, therefore, condemned as hypocrisy any uneasiness a chaplain displayed about the real business of war, killing the enemy. He wanted churchmen to face the problem realistically and criticised those who held a romantic view of war.

G.K. Tucker served in the ranks for some months and his experience showed how easily a chaplain could lose touch with the men. Tucker found, when he joined the AMC after vainly trying for a chaplaincy, that his experience as a curate at St George's, Malvern, had not prepared him for his new life. Of his closest friends in the AMC, one sold newspapers in Toorak Road, another was a porter at Flinders St railway station, another was a builder and a fourth a farm hand in Gippsland. All of them, Tucker included, disliked the religion the chaplain forced on them. Tucker described church parade as worse than useless. We could not hear a word of the prayers, the singing was shocking, as there were not enough books to go around. It was very hot standing in the sun...one cannot blame the men for growling at being forced to attend such an uninspiring service. Soon, however, Tucker was promoted to a vacant chaplaincy and apparently forgot such criticisms. His promotion carried him

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 [G.K. Tucker], As Private and Padre with the A.I.F., London, n.d., [1919], p.18. The book was compiled from letters Tucker wrote to his mother.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p.23.
some of the way to Malvern. He relished the new comfort and freedom: 'oh, the joy of a room to myself, of a soft bed with clean sheets, of meals decently served'.¹ When he and his troops arrived in France he travelled in the luxury of a first class railway compartment while the men were herded into horse trucks.² Tucker pitied the men and realised how far he had moved from them. His conscience nagged: 'I cannot but help feeling I should be with them'.³ Instead, he fitted into the normal chaplain's round and filled his days with official duties, censoring the mail and holding church parades.

Others criticised the chaplains who held themselves aloof from the men and associated with the officers. A lay-reader from Ballarat, F.J. Haase, complained about Anglican chaplains who, he said, were not sufficiently devoted. At night they relaxed with the officers while the troops thronged to the Y.M.C.A. tent where they absorbed 'a decided non-conformist atmosphere'.⁴ Haase believed that through this neglect the Anglican church would lose her grip on the men. He asked the church to set up tents to counteract the Y.M.C.A.; he thought of such tents as providing 'a place where our own men could congregate in a free, brotherly way, and come in contact with our own clergy, attend our own services and receive our own Church teaching'.⁵ This exclusive element would not have appealed to the troops but they agreed that a chaplain's rank too often separated him from the men he served. Few men looked on the chaplain as a brother, almost all saw him as a superior military officer.

¹Ibid., p.34.
²Ibid., p.48.
³Ibid.
⁴CS, 8 December 1916.
⁵Ibid.
The bulk of the A.I.F., however, were not committed church people and their reflections give a clearer indication of what the ordinary Australian thought of the church and clergymen. Unfortunately, the evidence is not extensive. Bill Gammage examined the letters and diaries of one thousand members of the A.I.F. and found that the authors rarely mentioned religion or the work of the chaplains. From this he concluded that the Australian soldier was indifferent to religion.¹ Likewise the battalion historians, who often wrote their histories many years after the war, when time might have softened harsh judgments, largely ignored whatever contribution the chaplain made to the life of the battalion. Chaplains achieved only brief appearances in the *Official History*; the reader glimpses a chaplain only when he performed an individual act of bravery during the course of a battle.² Despite the sketchy nature of the evidence, however, the main areas of the relations between chaplains and troops are discernible.

The attitude of the Australian soldier towards authority has passed into legend. He refused to look on his officers as god-figures to be followed blindly and unquestioningly. He generally refused to salute, or rather, gave the salute to the man who had won his respect by his bravery and resourcefulness. Australians expected a 'fair go' from their officers and expected that relations between officers and men would be regulated by the principles of openness, equality and honour.³ This value system placed the chaplains in an invidious position. As officers they received all the rights and privileges of rank but because they took no part in battle they were unable to win their spurs with the other officers. Gammage stated that 'the average Australian soldier' distrusted and sometimes detested the chaplains because 'they were officers, enjoying the privileges of leaders but not the concomitant risks and responsibilities of battle'.⁴ What

¹Gammage, *The Broken Years*, p.xiv.
²This omission in an *Official History* so complete in every other detail supports Mr Bazley's contention that a separate volume on the chaplains had been planned.
⁴Ibid., p.xiv.
evidence there is supports Gammage's assessment. The popular chaplains were those who shared the risks with the troops and brave chaplains won more enduring reputations at Gallipoli where, of necessity they lived with the troops, than in France. Fahey, Clune, McKenzie and Gillison were the famous padres because they went everywhere with their men. Some chaplains recognised that the success of their mission depended on their bravery. Henderson wrote that 'all things may be forgiven to the chaplain who shows himself prepared to share [the troop's] dangers; nothing can mitigate the failure of the man who is not'. Macaulay agreed that when the troops were in the line the chaplain laid the foundations for his work amongst them.

The second criterion by which a chaplain was judged was the extent to which he was prepared to endure the rigours of the digger's life. He was expected to share the discomfort, the cold, the mud, the lack of sleep, without too much fuss; his influence waned if he carved out too comfortable a billet for himself. The chaplain who stayed with the troops for a short time exercised little influence over them. Since, however, even continuous service chaplains needed to serve only for a year there was considerable movement among the chaplains. Dr Leonard Mitchell of the AMC said that as a result of the continual resignations and reshuflings the troops dubbed the chaplains 'Cook's tourists'. N.K. Harvey recorded that the 9th battalion had nine different chaplains at various times as well as long periods without a chaplain at all. Before long

1McKenzie was the Salvation Army chaplain and, nicknamed 'Fighting Mac', he became one of the most famous men in the A.I.F. He was a feature of later Anzac Day marches in Sydney. See 'Lieut. Colonel' Bond, The Army that Went with the Boys. A Record of the Salvation Army Work with the Australian Imperial Force, Melbourne, 1919, pp.92-118.

2Henderson, Khaki and Cassock, p.144.

3PM, 14 September 1917.

4CS, 12 July 1918.

5Norman K. Harvey, From Anzac to the Hindenburg Line. The History of the Ninth Battalion AIF, Brisbane, 1941, p.273. Chaplains are included in a final chapter entitled, 'Et Caetera'.
the troops thought of the chaplain as a visitor and made little effort to become acquainted with him. Often, no doubt, the young men of the A.I.F. failed to understand that a chaplain's powers of endurance were limited by age and previous life-style. Many chaplains broke down in health. Others took advantage of their option after a year's service. McBain, Stewart and Lundie asked to be relieved of their posts as soon as Rentoul could find men to replace them.\(^1\) McPhee requested repatriation, saying that no chaplain should leave his parish for more than a year.\(^2\) Fahey, on the other hand, decided to stay with his brigade so long as any of them survived.\(^3\)

Members of the A.I.F., therefore, used the same criteria to judge chaplains as they used for all other officers. They made no special allowance for a chaplain as a representative of the church. The authority of the church carried no weight with the troops; the chaplain was an individual and as such he was judged. The church, as an institution, was not respected. In fact, as representatives of the church, chaplains found it harder than other officers to win the respect of the men. Chaplains saw a close connection between religion and morality and often made themselves responsible for the morals of the men who were already suspicious of churchmen as 'wowsers'. The historian of the 11th battalion remarked that 'the troops were generally a good deal disgusted at being lectured and spoken to as if they had the mentality of little children, but they accepted these homilies woodenly and kept their remarks for afterwards'.\(^4\) Chaplains were at a further disadvantage because at least some of the troops believed that a chaplain had no place in the army at all. Paradoxically, their respect for the church was such that they believed a clergyman polluted himself by becoming involved in war. Another battalion historian

\(^1\)PM, 7 July 1916.
\(^2\)PM, 18 February 1916.
\(^3\)Advocate, 25 December 1915. Fahey returned to Australia in June 1918. There is an account of his Perth welcome-home in WAR, 15 June 1918.

summed up this feeling: 'a padre was often a good fellow, but rather out of place on the field of war'.

Chaplains found the question of morality a particularly vexed one; the troops rejected the authority of the church to decide what was right or wrong. The chaplains eventually came to understand that the soldiers elaborated a different code of ethics from that of the churches. The soldiers anticipated what came to be known as 'situation ethics' by refusing to take notice of a set of laws imposed from above. The soldier asked who his actions hurt; if they hurt only himself there could be no wrong. If he hurt another, however, deserted a mate in need, for example, then he had infringed the moral code. A young Sydney Methodist, F. Bowden Fletcher, showed how persuasive the A.I.F. morality could be. In an article for the Methodist he described the rake's progress to which many young soldiers succumbed. Early in his army career the youth caught the habit of swearing from his seniors and, once acquired, found the vice hard to check. He fell into the habit of drinking even more easily. After a hard, hot day of drill and exercises the recruit turned from the lukewarm water of questionable purity on offer in the camp, to the more palatable and much cooler beer. His reliance on alcohol increased at the front where he depended on rum for warmth and comfort. Finally, the monotony of army life and the relative uselessness of money at the front led the youth to gamble, even though in civilian life he may have abhorred the vice. After a short time in the army, therefore, the upright young man adopted the vices, swearing, drinking and gambling, which Methodists believed set him on the road to perdition. In Cairo, moreover, the young man saw such a multitude of prostitutes that he began to lose his horror of such women. Fletcher wrote that the chaplains were almost powerless to prevent this degeneration. While they performed useful work in organising entertainments, they did not have 'the necessary grip of the boys to stay the effects of the degenerating influences of their environment'.


2 Methodist, 3 February 1917.
Fletcher painted such a dismal picture of the moral scene that, had the censor been aware of Methodists' sensibilities, he would not have passed the letter for publication. Because fear of moral laxity caused Methodist parents to hesitate before allowing their sons to enlist, Fletcher's letter was almost certainly 'prejudicial to recruiting'.

In a second letter, published a few months later, Fletcher faced the problem of the moral condition of the men and showed how much of his church's views he had rejected in favour of the A.I.F. code of ethics. He did not modify his belief that the majority of the troops transgressed the church's prohibition of drinking, swearing and gambling and that 'according to our religious tenets they should be damned'. However, he refused to believe in the wholesale damnation of men who, eagerly and willingly, accepted death to rid the world of the greatest menace to Christianity. His conversion was complete as he now admired what the A.I.F. represented. The Australians had seen through the petty and had grasped the broader principles of brotherhood. They rejected 'the ridiculous squabbles of State versus State, of sect versus sects, quarrels over theological arguments and forms of worship'. Fletcher argued that the Australian soldier had thrown off institutional Christianity with its emphasis on precept and command and had rediscovered primitive Christianity whose supreme law was the law of love. This ardent young Methodist now rejected the right of the church to determine what was necessary for salvation although Australian churchmen had traditionally emphasised the closeness of the link between religion and what they understood as correct moral behaviour. The A.I.F. view marked a significant departure from the standards of Australian Christianity. One correspondent described Fletcher's doctrine as Mohammedan.

Fletcher correctly discerned that brotherhood formed the basis of the A.I.F.'s 'religion' or code of ethics. The troops

---

1 *Methodist*, 9 June 1917.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 *Methodist*, 23 June 1917.
opposed whatever tended to minimise the spirit of unity and
they paid no heed to the importance of the difference between
the various churches; they resisted and rejected
denominationalism. However, the troops exempted Catholics from
this general rule because over the years Catholic churchmen had
refused to mix with other churchmen even to the extent of
paying for a separate education system. Catholics were
perceived as different. The men lumped the Protestant
denominations together and would not tolerate tendencies
towards separatism. Some chaplains appreciated the strength of
the troops' rejection of denominationalism; Rolland believed
that the man who could not co-operate with other chaplains
should not be appointed.³ Others, however, were not so
perceptive. When one chaplain preached on the superiority of
the doctrine and government of the Church of England the troops
made their boredom evident. The bewildered chaplain
reprimanded the congregation for its inattention and from that
time 'ceased to exercise any influence over the troops'.²

A chaplain's willingness to participate in a united
service became the yard-stick of his enthusiasm for
co-operation with the other denominations. The three
Protestant chaplains-general drew up a form of united service
in 1913 but some chaplains refused to use it.³ The troops
resented any attempt to separate mates according to whether
they were Anglican or Presbyterian. They regarded such labels
as almost an accident of birth and reasoned that if they had
to endure church parade it would be easier with their mates.
Methodist and Presbyterian chaplains happily agreed to conduct
united services, possibly because they believed all Protestants
subscribed to much the same creed and possibly, too, because
they enjoyed the additional status of leading a united service.
When a chaplain preached to a united congregation he no longer

---

¹F.W. Rolland, undated report to Director, AWM, Uncat. MS.
²H.B. Collett, The 28th, A Record of War Service with the
Australian Imperial Force 1915-1919, vol.1. Egypt, Gallipoli,
Lemnos Island, Sinai Peninsula, Perth, 1922, p.44.
³Defence Department, A.I.F. 1914-1917, MP943/5, 82/1/143,
'form of service drawn up by Chaplains Clarke, Rentoul and
Holden sanctioned', AA, Melbourne.
felt that he was a member of a minority group but was at one with the mass of the Australian troops. Many Anglicans, however, refused to compromise and held out for their own separate parades. The issue was sometimes resolved by a trial of strength of personalities. On the first Sunday aboard the troopship, J.L. Rentoul, ever a formidable opponent, found that his Anglican colleague intended to follow the advice of his 'northern archbishop' and hold a separate Anglican service. Rentoul remonstrated with the man. The army knew nothing of archbishops, there would be one parade and it would be united. Rentoul prevailed.¹ Sometimes the troops perceived that Anglican chaplains themselves differed on the question. The Anglican chaplain at the 1st Australian General Hospital at Heliopolis approved of united services and participated in them. His replacement, however, an Anglican of 'higher' theology insisted on holding a separate Anglican parade. The Presbyterian, Shannon, resented this 'holier-than-thou' attitude and reported with satisfaction that when the Anglican withdrew from J.B. Rentoul's united parade the troops voted with their feet, twenty followed the Anglican and the other 1,300 remained with Rentoul.² Possibly, the Anglicans who insisted on separate parades were born in England where 'non-conformity' was regarded with suspicion and contempt.³

Until January 1918 individual chaplains made up their own minds about the united service in accordance with their convictions but not in accordance, always, with the troops' wishes. Monash finally settled the matter by directing that all Protestant church parades be united. He decreed that Protestants should attend parade by unit or formation and not by denomination. Monash did not allow for ambiguity: 'to put the position still clearer, the desire is that services should

¹PM, 20 October 1916.

²PM, 24 March 1916. J.B. Rentoul was a cousin of the chaplain-general, J.L. Rentoul. Another distant relative, T.C. Rentoul, a Methodist, also served as a chaplain.

³See Chapter 3 for the percentage of Englishmen amongst Australian Anglican chaplains.
be arranged by unites [sic] and not by denominations'. He expected a small number of conscientious objectors amongst men and chaplains who would argue that they could not worship with fellow Protestants but he asked officers to satisfy themselves that each man's scruples were genuine. He required that a chaplain who discouraged men from attending a united parade 'be brought under notice'. Some Anglicans in Australia, when they eventually heard of Monash's directive, regarded it as the most blatant interference by the army in church matters. That Monash cut through denominational distinctions showed how determined he was that his men should not be divided and how genuine was the Australian desire for non-sectarian religion.

Those chaplains who adopted the A.I.F. viewpoint and accepted the non-sectarian religion, gained new insights into their religion. As Fletcher did on moral matters, many chaplains learnt important lessons from the troops. They mixed with clergymen from other denominations and removed the barriers of suspicion, mistrust and fear that had been erected between the churches in Australia. James Green, a loyal Methodist, shared quarters for a time with a Capuchin friar who, in civilian life, taught theology. The two men spent much of their time together discussing their different theological positions and Green observed that they agreed on the essentials although the Capuchin communicated the truths of Christianity by symbols while Green relied on 'the fine eye of faith'.

1 Memorandum from General Monash on the question of combined services, 11 January 1918. Department of Defence, General Correspondence, 1917-29, MP367/1, File 431/8/1584, AA, Melbourne. Monash was a Jew. Birdwood had written to Pearce about combined services in 1916. He admitted he was 'no theologian, and am not prepared to enter into controversies on the subject with the Bishops, but I must say it always seems to me as a broad-minded view to take that we all worship the one and same God, and that it only seems right to do so together'. Letter from W. Birdwood to G.F. Pearce, Pearce Papers, AWM, MS.2222, Third Series.

2 Ibid.

3 I have not discovered any Capuchin friars amongst the chaplains of the A.I.F. but there were three regular Franciscans (O.F.M.). Green's Capuchin may not have been an Australian chaplain.

4 Methodist, 19 February 1916.
Australia, Catholic priests and Protestant ministers rarely chanced to meet one another and several chaplains made the most of the opportunity that service with the A.I.F. presented. Some deep friendships sprang up between Catholic and Protestant chaplains; the troops delighted at such displays of brotherliness. Ambrose Cull wrote of the friendship between Bladen (Methodist) and Goidanich (Catholic):

men of different faiths but exactly the same immortal type — helpful in difficulties, comforting in sorrow, perenially cheerful in periods of peace. They jibed at, joked with and thoroughly understood each other...in their example, their character, their splendid attitude in all circumstances, hundreds gained a new conception of religion.

Australians learnt, perhaps to their surprise, that religion need not be a series of bitter and rancorous fights with one denomination at the throat of another. Stevenson made a hopeful point for the future of Catholic/Protestant relations when he wrote of his closest friend, a Catholic chaplain killed in battle: 'I shall never believe that a Church which can produce such men is altogether evil'.

A Catholic chaplain, Murphy, who returned to his South Australian parish after three years with the A.I.F. said that he would try to cultivate the same friendly spirit among clergymen that had existed at the front. Murphy had worked in that parish for sixteen years and only his experience abroad taught him how much he could gain from contact with his Protestant counterparts.

Despite this atmosphere of friendship and co-operation some chaplains were unable to throw off the old animosities and embrace the A.I.F. spirit. Often jealousy, or at least the competitive spirit, motivated these men; they could not look on with equanimity while another church received, apparently, more

---

1Ambrose Cull, At All Costs, Melbourne, [n.d.], p.67.
2PM, 1 March 1918.
3Southern Cross, 25 January 1918.
favours or more honours. They Church officials at home bickered about the number of chaplains each church was allowed to send; when clergymen visited the front they often reminded chaplains of the spirit that animated the Australian church. Kenneth Henderson, in a frank letter to his wife, criticised the 'bluddy [sic] clerical tourists' for reintroducing the old spirit of animosity. He doubted if they learnt much about the A.I.F. The itinerary in France never varied:

> they lunch with Birdwood, are taken on a drive or two with his chauffeur, [sic] taken down a German dug-out at Fricourt, shown some smashed wire at Marnetz...taken to some Church parades and given a chance to make fools of themselves (called 'talking to the lads' or in the case of Methodists 'the dear lads' (pause for silent vomiting [sic] and go home to foam at the mouth and talk about what they saw...at the front').

Henderson was particularly critical of Rentoul and suggested that 'old Larrie will go back bewailing the bigotry of chaplains because the Church of England can't see its way to entirely dispensing with itself'. He concluded his diatribe against the visitors who brought the spirit of animosity from Australia, with the remark that 'there's never been the smallest friction amongst the men on the job'. While this observation was largely true, the behaviour of some chaplains contradicted it. R.H. Moore told his senior chaplain, Maitland Woods, how he had spent most of a day caring for a wounded man only to find a Catholic chaplain, MacDonnell, 'pinch' the body...

---

1. In a report submitted to the Governor-General on his return from the front J.L. Rentoul said that although 'a larger proportion of deaths, torpedoings and hospital suffering fell to the lot of our Chaplains' they received 'the very scantiest recognition' winning only two Military Crosses. Report forwarded to Director, AWM, May 1920, Uncat. MS.


3. Ibid. N.G. Holden acted as Chaplain-General Holden's batman and kept a diary which supported Henderson's opinion of the clerical tourist. Holden travelled to England in luxury having a 'combined bed and sitting room, a bath room and a private corridor'. Although he was away for six months he spent only twenty-five days in France. Diary in possession of Mr Harold Holden, Kew.
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at the last moment and claim credit for the work.\(^1\) Neither Moore nor Maitland Woods treated the matter lightly and Maitland Woods regretted that Moore did not send in a report of the incident as soon as possible so that Woods could have 'rushed it through at once in the interests of our Church'.\(^2\)

Such competitiveness was at odds with the spirit of the A.I.F. which Crotty captured with a story. A newly arrived chaplain approached a soldier and asked what was the religion of the other chaplain with the brigade. The reply came swiftly: 'there ain't no religion out here, sir, we're all brothers'.\(^3\)

Many chaplains believed that the diggers could teach Australian churchmen a lesson. Chaplains thought they knew now what the average Australian expected from the church and they wanted the churches to change to accommodate the new ideas. They feared, however, that churchmen who had watched the progress of the war from Australia would not understand the need for change and thus would resist it. Tucker doubted if the new ideas would be accepted because few senior Anglicans had accepted chaplaincies: 'because we hold no leading positions at home we will carry very little if any weight'.\(^4\) The chaplains feared that their experience would be wasted when they returned to Australia, 'a subject on which I and many out here feel keenly'.\(^5\) Dean Talbot was one of the few senior

\(^1\)R.H. Moore to Maitland Woods, letter dated 12.14.18 but almost certainly 12 November 1918. R.H. Moore Papers, Battye Library, MS.1210A, Folder 9 'Chaplaincy in the Australian Imperial Forces. Correspondence 1918-19'. Father O'Grady, editor of \textit{WAR}, described Moore as 'An undoubted hater of the Irish and the Catholics' when he learnt of Moore’s appointment to the A.I.F. He hoped that 'his experiences at the war will make a man of him, and a gentle one at that'; \textit{WAR}, 24 November 1917.

\(^2\)Maitland Woods to R.H. Moore, letter dated 19 November 1918, ibid.

\(^3\)H. Crotty, \textit{The Vision and the Task}, Sydney, 1921, p.107.


\(^5\)Ibid., p.152.
Anglicans to work as a chaplain and his experience was openly rejected when he sought to lead churchmen to a more tolerant attitude towards strikers in New South Wales during the great strike of 1917.\(^1\) At the provincial synod Talbot spoke against Radford's aggressive anti-strike motion and although the motion was amended synod rejected the substance of Talbot's speech. His 'stupidity' amazed his colleagues and a clerical editor criticised his 'self-contradictory' statement.\(^2\) The same man referred to Talbot's conciliatory speech at a Town Hall meeting as 'ludicrous' and lamented its 'utter absence of logic or thought'.\(^3\) Many Protestant chaplains argued that their churches needed to become more real, more modern, less respectable and more brotherly if they were to appeal to the men of the A.I.F. Chaplains looked at the need for reform through the eyes of A.I.F. men. They distinguished between religion and the church. Neither the men nor the chaplains had any quarrel with the first; they all concentrated on the latter. Green wrote that the men thought the church as an institution had 'humbugged' them and interfered in the relation between man and God.\(^4\) The church had 'built up a vast super-structure of respectability' which men found daunting.\(^5\) The men wanted to abolish the super-structure and looked for a simpler, stronger religion. Stevens also wanted fundamental changes: 'we shall have to modernise our theology, open wider the doors leading to church life and membership, and not be so insistent upon unanimity of

\(^1\)For an account of the tensions aroused by the great strike see Dan Coward, 'Crime and Punishment: The Great Strike in New South Wales, August to October 1917' in John Iremonger, John Merritt and Graeme Osborne, Strikes, Studies in Twentieth Century Australian Social History, Sydney, 1973, pp.51-80.

\(^2\)PM, 24 August 1917. 'Free Lance' in the Church Messenger said he had heard Talbot's speech to synod and said it was a 'feeble effort'. If Talbot had won the sympathy of the 'labourites' that was no great achievement because 'to be popular with the (mis) leaders of Unionism in Australia at present is to be ipso facto in the wrong'. 'Free Lance' was the Rev. Frank Lynch who recruited so strenuously in 1915. CM, 24 August 1917.

\(^3\)PM, 14 September 1917.

\(^4\)James Green, News From No-Man's Land, p.111.

\(^5\)Ibid.
belief in inessential things'. The men accepted Christ and held his name and ideals in universal esteem but criticised and rejected the church. Stevenson argued that if the church was to cater for returned men it would have to change: 'at the front here, what the boys respond to is that which is real. When you are living the life of a mole in a damp gun-pit on short rations, and the nights made hideous by the rats, any other sort of religion is a mockery'. He wanted the church to offer more truthfulness and simplicity.

After a few weeks with the troops Padre Gault lost the apprehension he had felt in his initial contact with them. He made many friends and was accepted as a valuable member of the A.I.F. Not all chaplains enjoyed such success; those who failed to accept the role the A.I.F. cast for them, failed also in their mission and exercised little influence over the men. The successful chaplains adapted their Christianity to the A.I.F. code; to some extent, they were converted by the men they came to convert. These men felt they understood the needs of the ordinary man and agreed with him that there were deficiencies in church life. Significantly, these men predominated amongst the few chaplains who left the ministry on return to Australia. The successful chaplains appreciated the need for unity and sincerity in church life and wanted churchmen to understand that upright moral conduct was not

---

1PM, 28 September 1917.

2PM, 12 January 1917.

3I have checked most church records until about 1930 and have discovered very few chaplains who left the ministry. Henderson and Dexter had left the regular Anglican ministry for a time at least. J. Wilson left the Methodist ministry in 1920 and stood as a parliamentary candidate for the 'Farmers and Settlers' Party. He was amazed, he said, by the 'lack of chivalry' in the church and concluded 'thank God for men whose spirits are not cramped by the religious machine'. Sydney Morning Herald, 4 March 1920. I am indebted to Miss J. Templeton for this reference.
shared exclusively by church-goers. The tragedy for these chaplains was that while they believed they had learnt from their war experience they found that the war experience of the church leaders had confirmed them in the prejudices abhorred by Australians.
Was it right or wrong for a man to defend a woman who was assaulted by a brute? He should hope that no Christian minister would hesitate to take off his coat.

Pacifists, who rejected war as a method of settling international disputes, won few recruits amongst Australian clergymen. For this reason a chapter on Australian clerical pacifists must necessarily rely on the ideas of one or two men. There simply were no others. However, these men deserve attention, if not for the excellence of their often naive and simplistic arguments, at least for the light they throw on the orthodoxy of their colleagues. Furthermore, the respect they earned throws light on the tension orthodox clergymen experienced in their reaction to war. Many clergymen loathed violence, regretted war and found difficulty in reconciling the belligerent statements of their leaders with the Gospel teaching of Christ. Canon Hart, of Melbourne, was such a man. War revolted him and the huge casualty lists depressed him. Hart found the war a continual emotional strain.¹ Men of his kind respected the pacifists, although they could not agree with them, and they ensured that other churchmen tolerated pacifism. Indeed, the pacifists were so obviously guided by simple Christianity and were so patently sincere that most Christians chose not to debate the issues of the war with them. This toleration meant that the prevalence of orthodoxy derived from conviction rather than from a fear of the consequences of unorthodoxy. On the other hand, the Christians who disagreed with the churches' political judgments aroused considerable antagonism. A few examples of the experiences of these men are included in this chapter to emphasise the respect the pacifists commanded.

A Methodist minister from Hay, B. Linden Webb, gave the most complete account of Christian pacifism in Australia in the war years. He preached three lengthy sermons on the topic early in 1915 and later published them as a pamphlet.² Webb, who was born at Bathurst in 1883, graduated from Sydney

¹T.B. McCall, The Life and Letters of John Stephen Hart, p.47.
²B.L. Webb, The Religious Significance of the War, Sydney, n.d. [1915]. The pamphlet was published with the assistance of Sydney Quakers.
University before studying for the ministry at Newington College. He worked as a probationary minister in Sydney and Bowral until 1911 when he married and spent a year in England. On his return to Australia, Conference sent him to Hay in southern New South Wales. He was a devoted and popular minister in a small circuit of forty-five adult church members.

Webb managed to avoid all reference to the war in his preaching until the first national day of intercession, 3 January 1915, when, as he was expected to preach about the war, he delivered his first pacifist sermon. Webb chose the text, 'my kingdom is not of this world' which was appropriate to his view that there was a clear distinction between church and state. The state regulated its behaviour according to its worldly ideals and only promoted the material well-being of its citizens. Such materialism was unchristian; the state disregarded Christian ideals and had not entered the war to defend them. While the majority of Christian leaders spoke of the Empire's defence of Christianity against German paganism Webb argued that the Empire fought to protect and further its materialistic aspirations. He accused churchmen of 'sheer hypocrisy' when they suggested otherwise. He warned his

---

1 Few Methodist ministers possessed University degrees. See Chapter 1 for a discussion of the more typical educational background.

2 Methodist Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Conference, 1968, p.64.

3 The President of the New South Wales Conference reported after a visit to the Riverina: 'our Hay people are not numerous, but they are intensely loyal to their church...the Rev. B.L. Webb, B.A., is greatly respected and his earnest ministry much appreciated'. Methodist, 25 September 1915. See also the Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting of the Hay Circuit of the Methodist Church held on 8 October 1914 for membership figures. The minutes are in the possession of the Methodist Historical Society of New South Wales, Castlereagh St, Sydney.
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congregation that they did not discharge their loyalty to Christian principles by following the state blindly. No Christian could accept the worldly, materialist beliefs of the state and still adhere to the spiritual ideals of Christ.¹ Webb rejected the general clerical view that the war would transform society. Other churchmen taught that the war would lift the nations to a higher plane of Christian awareness. They hoped to see selfishness supplanted by concern for others, love of pleasure supplanted by self-sacrifice and the pursuit of wealth supplanted by patriotism. Webb said that such spiritual diseases required spiritual remedies and that churchmen, by relying on worldly assistance contributed to the growth of the nation's faith in materialism. War could never lead to a heightening of national spiritual life; rather it degraded whatever spiritual awareness existed. War made devils rather than saints.² However, Webb did not fear that war disproved the truth of Christianity. He spoke of the 'real' church as opposed to the visible church. The 'real' church consisted of a small remnant of true believers who kept Christ's principles alive despite the indifference of their fellow Christians who constituted the visible church.³ The remnant would survive all assaults. Although the world passed by, the true believers constantly illustrated the value of Christianity by the purity of their own lives. The leaders of the visible church obscured the Christian message insofar as they embraced the ideals of the world.

In his second sermon Webb dealt with the problems war raised for the Christian.⁴ He relied on the doctrine of free will to reconcile God's love for man with the fact of war.⁵ He concentrated, however, on the temptations to despair that the war prompted, revealing the depths of his own loathing for war.

¹Ibid., p.15.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., p.19.
⁴Webb preached his second pacifist sermon on 15 February 1915. It is placed third in the pamphlet and is the shortest sermon.
⁵Webb, The Religious Significance, p.43.
He pictured the soul 'amazed' and 'stunned' by the jarring discord of war, the 'cold breath of the nightmare horror'.

The church leaders contributed to the discord with their foolish optimism in the face of enormous moral wrong, congratulating themselves at the slight increase in church attendance and the supposed higher level of public morality. Webb warned that such improvement might be only temporary, 'a very little advance in spiritual truth', and regarded such improvement as inconsequential before the horror of war. Webb fought despair with a deep faith in Christ, the redeemer of the old order, and he counselled his congregation to build up a similar faith

which has its strength not in Churches, merely, not in creeds only, not in institutions and laws, not even in national existence, for all these things are unstable, but from those vital spiritual sources which come to us from God in Christ.

Such a faith enabled the believer to stand with Christ though all the world be against him.

In the third sermon Webb took the church leaders to task. He stated that no churchman was above scrutiny; all must be judged according to the principles Christ had enunciated. If churchmen departed from those principles to embrace the principles of the world, then others must call them back to their duty. Webb showed how churchmen had abandoned Christian ideals even as the war progressed. They greeted the news of war with 'hesitating acquiescence' showing that in an imperfect world, war could be one of Christianity's weapons. From this position they moved, tragically and inexorably, to one of total involvement in the war effort until their pronouncements were

---

1 Ibid., p.46.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p.48.
4 He preached the third sermon on 21 March 1915. It is over 8,000 words in length and would have taken about ninety minutes to complete, if Webb preached all that he wrote.
6 Ibid., p.33.
'not far above the level of the secular press'. He harked back to the pleas for caution and fair-dealing of August 1914 and warned churchmen of the difficulty of assessing guilt before all the facts were known. Current judgments rested on partial knowledge because 'we are only told just so much as the war officials are pleased to tell us'. He agreed that Germany was the aggressor but regretted that this led churchmen to 'rhetorical exaggeration of the wickedness of the hostile nation'. He dismissed the argument, favoured by preachers, that Britain's treaty obligations bound her, morally, to defend Belgium. The parties had signed the treaty seventy-five years before war; the conscience of one generation did not bind the next. In any case, as war and Christianity were incompatible, a treaty which sanctioned war was immoral and did not bind conscience. Webb charged that church leaders lacked confidence in Christianity and that they had weakened the faith of others by embracing the world's philosophy. They hampered the cause of the church. Instead they should have advocated passive resistance, imitating the missionaries who went amongst fierce savages unarmed. When Germany invaded Belgium churchmen should have asked their people not to fight: 'there is no nation in the world (much less the German nation) that in cold blood could ruthlessly attack and hack to pieces a defenceless people'. In such a way would Christianity have triumphed over materialism.

Webb based his pacifism on Christian principles as he understood them. He desired to protect the purity of Christian truth and to advance the witness of the church. He rejected the view that the welfare of the church depended, to some

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p.27.
3 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p.34.
6 Ibid., p.37.
7 Ibid., p.36.
extent, on the prosperity of the state. He distinguished rigorously between the two, defining the church as a group of true believers not necessarily co-extensive with the visible church. He reached his position after earnest thought and extensive reading and asked the congregation not to dismiss his convictions lightly but to think and pray as earnestly as he had done; 'it is of very little moment to the Churches if I am wrong; but if I am right what then'.

The congregation at Hay apparently accepted Webb's sermons in good spirit. They continued to support the minister financially and although in October the quarterly meeting decided to ask Conference for a single man to relieve the strain on the finances no-one criticised Webb. He continued to preach against Christian involvement in the war until November 1915 when the first sign of congregational dissatisfaction became apparent. The Junior Circuit Steward resigned his position and at a special meeting of the church committee he explained that his resignation arose from the disagreement about the war between Webb and himself. The minister then asked other members of the committee if they shared the Steward's views. Of the seven who spoke, three disagreed with Webb, three supported him and one man remained neutral saying that he doubted if any good would come from preaching about the war. Those who opposed Webb's preaching regarded it as 'idealistic and impracticable' while one man who believed the congregation had a right to know Webb's position said that he should not have continued to preach pacifism 'especially as Mr Webb's views were not in accord with

1 Ibid., p.39.

2 Minutes of the Hay Quarterly Meeting held 12 October 1915. The treasurer said 'he could not support a proposal to ask anyone to a position where there was no prospect of adequate remuneration'.

3 Minutes of a special meeting held in the Parsonage on Tuesday, 17 November 1915.

4 Ibid.
those expressed by the leaders of the church.\textsuperscript{1} Webb's supporters 'considered that Mr Webb had followed the right course' or 'sympathised with Mr Webb's ideals, and pointed out the importance of matters on which ministers and people agreed'.\textsuperscript{2} If this meeting of church officials was any guide, the congregation was split equally, an excellent result for pacifism in a small country town. Since the church leaders and journals were rabidly pro-war, the result warns the historian not to assume that church people derived their opinions from the pronouncements of their leaders. The meeting accepted the Steward's resignation but there was no hint of a censure for Webb. At the next quarterly meeting Webb agreed to remain another year at Hay.\textsuperscript{3}

Webb resigned, however, in October 1916 not because of local antipathy but because 'his views on the war were not those accepted by the Methodist church as a whole, and therefore he felt he could not consistently remain a paid agent of the Church'.\textsuperscript{4} He particularly deplored Methodism's support for conscription; his congregation regretted that he felt compelled to resign.\textsuperscript{5} The Riverine Grazier reported that at a farewell gathering held on 30 October, two days after the defeat of conscription, the congregation presented Mrs Webb with a silver tea-pot and a hand-bag while Mr Webb received a cheque.\textsuperscript{6} The mayor told the 'large number of church members' attending of the personal friendship between the minister and

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid. Two of Webb's opponents were members of the same family and a third member of the family resigned the position of choirmaster and enlisted in January 1916. Cf. Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting held 5 January 1916.

\textsuperscript{2}Minutes of the special meeting...17 November 1915.

\textsuperscript{3}He was unanimously invited to do so and his invitation was moved by his principal opponent over pacifism. Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting held 5 January 1916.

\textsuperscript{4}Minutes of a special meeting held on 25 October 1916 in consequence of the Rev. B.L. Webb having forwarded his resignation from the Methodist ministry.

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid. Webb said that 'his resignation was not influenced by any sense of local difficulties'.

\textsuperscript{6}Riverine Grazier, 3 November 1916.
himself 'despite differences of opinion on certain subjects'.

Correspondents in the Methodist treated Webb's pacifism less kindly. 'A.F.C.', reviewing the pamphlet, wrote that while he sympathised in general with Webb's sentiments he regarded his assumptions as unwarranted by the facts and surprisingly narrow for a minister. He disagreed with Webb's fundamental assumption that the state operated on principles opposed to Christianity. Nations survived not by force, as Webb supposed, but only if they were founded on law and order. In enforcing righteousness on the lawless inside and outside their boundaries they conformed to Christ's teaching. 'A.F.C.' discovered an 'absence of clear logical perception and reasoning' which nullified Webb's conclusions. 'Pax', in reply, fleshed out Webb's suggestion that the nations should not have resisted German aggression. While Belgium opposed the German invasion which ruined her towns and ravaged her people, Luxembourg permitted the German armies to pass through her territory and they left people and property undisturbed. 'Pax' congratulated Webb for recalling the church to a sense of duty and reminded the readers of the Methodist that 'national honour' and Christianity were not synonymous. Carruthers, the editor, apologised for printing such a 'pitiful if not puerile plea for pacifism'; he published it only because it came from a minister. The doctrine of non-resistance dominated further correspondence. One writer asked how 'Pax' would counter a grasping land-owner who endangered church property in disregard

---

1 Ibid. Webb moved from the district and experienced great difficulty in supporting his family. He ran a chicken farm and sold fruit and clothing from door to door. In 1917 he came under notice again briefly when he signed the Protestant Ministers' Manifesto against Conscription. After the war he rejoined the Methodist ministry; his career was marred however by continual illness. He died in 1967. Methodist Church of New South Wales, Minutes of Conference, 1968, p.64. I have been unable to locate any surviving personal papers.

2 It has not been possible to discover the identity of 'A.F.C.' It was not Carruthers whose initials were J.E.C.

3 Methodist, 26 June 1915.

4 Ibid., 17 July 1915.

5 Ibid.
of the law;\(^1\) and another asked whether 'Pax' was happy to live in a society protected by armed policemen.\(^2\) Carruthers suggested that if the pacifists relied on the Sermon on the Mount they should follow all its precepts literally. When they demonstrated their readiness to turn the other cheek and divest themselves of property Methodists might take some notice of their literal rejection of war.\(^3\) J.T. Williams asked the editor to compel the pacifist ministers to sign their own names to letters instead of hiding behind noms-de-plume so that congregations would know which ministers to reject when Conference offered them.\(^4\) S.W. Webb supported the suggestion saying that 'those who are not wholeheartedly with the Empire in her distress are against her, and we should know who they are';\(^5\) Carruthers accepted the condition. As the discussion then ceased it may be assumed that the pacifist ministers feared to reveal themselves. Only S.C. Roberts, while denying that he was a 'peace-at-any-price man', protested against this 'unusual condition' in press correspondence and the 'threatened boycott' it implied.\(^6\) The readers of the Methodist had little cause to regret that the discussion was brought to an end. It was not of a high order. Correspondents badgered one another with Biblical texts and interpretations, abused one another but refused to debate Webb's compelling concern: the relationship between church and state, particularly in war-time. Few correspondents gave any evidence of having read Webb's pamphlet.

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid., 14 August 1915.

\(^3\)Ibid., 24 July 1915.

\(^4\)Ibid., 31 July 1915.

\(^5\)Ibid., 14 August 1915.

\(^6\)Ibid.
The only other prominent pacifist minister in the major Australian churches was the editor of the Messenger of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland, James Gibson.  

Gibson was born in Scotland in 1862, studied at the University of Edinburgh and the United Presbyterian Theological Hall and arrived in Queensland in 1888. He spent his first years in the ministry in Bowen and Mackay before moving to a Brisbane church in 1904. He was Moderator of the Queensland Assembly for the first time in 1902, and Moderator-General of the Australian church in 1920. The war so depressed Gibson that he became very ill and took charge of a quiet country parish. Gibson argued the case for pacifism in the editorial notes and comments of a paper that described itself as 'the official organ' of the Presbyterian church in Queensland although that church unequivocally supported the Empire at war. The paper never achieved a satisfactory circulation and ceased publication at the end of 1916.

Gibson's pacifism grew from the belief that the church and the nation were two separate entities operating on different principles. The church consisted of a small number of the elect who conformed to Christ's ideals. The nation represented the old, unregenerate order and resorted to the methods of the old order; war was one of these. The church, representing the new order, rejected the methods of the old. Christ came to

---

1 The task was not an onerous one. Like Angus King in Sydney Gibson was only required to edit a few pages of local church news and comment, the bulk of the paper was sent up from Melbourne, edited by Hugh Kelly. The Queensland version appeared monthly; this gave Gibson more discretion over what to select from the weekly Melbourne edition.


3 Ibid., p.25.


5 Ibid., p.35. Bardon claimed that Gibson found the delivery of casualty telegrams 'imposed...an almost intolerable burden of sorrow and concern'. Ibid., p.33.

6 Presbyterian Church of Queensland, Minutes of Assembly, 1917, p.72. Bardon, op.cit., p.90, mistakenly claims that Gibson ceased to edit the Messenger at the end of 1913.
establish a kingdom where all class, national and racial
discrimination would be eliminated; the church retarded the
advent of that kingdom when it encouraged the divisions of the
old order to flourish. Gibson denied, therefore, that the
coming of the new order would be assisted by recourse to the
methods of the old. He refused to accept the proposition that
the cause of Christianity depended on the Allies' success. He
saw war as the inevitable outcome of the things for which the
old order stood: race rivalries, commercial jealousies, trade
interests, pride and arrogance. The Christian who encouraged
men to fight for such sordid things betrayed his Christianity.

The principal target of Gibson's criticism was not the
nation which answered the call of war according to its lights
but the church which denied its ideals in going to the nation's
help. Church leaders adopted the ways of the old order,
relying on force to make men good, and acquiesced as the church
became one of the many institutions which advanced the aims of
the nation. Christ relied on the spirit of God. Men asked
what use the church was because while it had failed to change
the principle on which the world operated it had compromised
its own principles to advance the old order. Men rejected the
church but venerated the ideals of Christ. Gibson, like Webb,
distinguished between the 'real' church and the visible church,
finding confidence for the future only in the small number of
Christians who actually embraced Christian ideals while the
visible church drifted towards the old order. Hope lay with
a remnant, an elite; the larger organisation, of which Gibson
was an official, endangered Christ's revelation.

Although Gibson's pacifism contradicted the policy of the
Presbyterian Church in Queensland no correspondent ever tried
to defend the official position from his assault. He
generated no debate amongst his fellow church members.

1PM (Q), March 1915.
2PM (Q), October 1915.
3PM (Q), February 1916.
4PM (Q), May 1916.
5PM (Q), March 1915.
A Victorian, P.J. Murdoch, objected to an unfavourable review of his paper 'Christianity and War' given to the Summer School of Theology in November 1915. Gibson disputed much of Murdoch's exegesis; in his reply Murdoch sought to justify his original interpretation. They argued, therefore, about the meaning of Scriptural texts. Murdoch had not heard of Gibson before this but, acting on the supposition that he was a pacifist, he asked him to reflect on the case of a man whose daughter was ravished by a villain; must the Christian remain passive before such an outrage? Gibson rejected this as a 'bogey question' and pointed out that 'the vital matter is, On what basis is life as a whole to be organised?' Murdoch's tired defence was the extent of the orthodox reaction to the most prominent and most consistent pacifist clergyman in Australia.

While Gibson found faith in the concept of a small group of true believers he also tried to impress his pacifism on the Assembly of the Queensland church. These attempts provoked far more discussion than his comments in the Messenger. At the Assembly's meeting in 1915 Gibson dissented from the war motion moved by James Cosh although the motion resembled those moved at church bodies all over Australia. Cosh called on the Assembly to recognise the justice of the Empire's cause, to protest against the 'barbarous and inhumane' methods of the Germans, to encourage all citizens to meet the call of the Empire and to pray to God to watch over the Empire's troops. Gibson moved that the motion be rejected and that a committee be set up to consider a more appropriate one. The Assembly

---

1 Murdoch was minister of the Camberwell Presbyterian Church and author of The Laughter and Tears of God, Melbourne, 1914, a book of war sermons. A prominent Presbyterian, he had been Moderator-General, 1905-1906.

2 PM (Q), December 1915.

3 PM (Q), January 1916.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 Presbyterian Church of Queensland, Minutes of Assembly, 1915, p.18.

7 Ibid., p.19.
agreed but the committee's motion differed from the first only in that its tone was milder and it added the hope that the nation would be 'purged and delivered from many evils' by the experience of war. The motion passed unanimously.

In 1917 when Cosh moved an enthusiastic war motion which deplored the presence of a disloyal element in the community and asked the church 'to support the National Government in every possible way in its endeavours to assist the Motherland in obtaining a decisive victory', S. Martin, a disciple of Gibson, countered with the pacifist position. He contended that the church had no sanction to use material methods to obtain spiritual ends and refused to endorse an appeal to force. Martin won few supporters. Others who spoke against Cosh's motion wished to prevent the church from becoming embroiled in political matters, especially during a federal election. J.C. Milliken expressed the majority view when he objected to 'political and flag-waving matters' being brought into the church. J.B. Galloway sponsored an amendment calling for the creation of a committee to recast the motion so that it would obtain unanimous support. Merrington, who had seconded Cosh's motion, confessed that he was ashamed to belong to an assembly which contained pacifists. He branded two of the speakers against the motion as young men 'who had not offered their services'. Despite this onslaught the Assembly accepted the amendment by sixteen votes to eleven. Cosh viewed this

---

1 Ibid., p.29.
2 Cosh's motion was not printed in the Minutes of Assembly. ACW, 1 June 1917, gave the full text. Gibson apologised for his absence from the Assembly which he said was due to illness. Minutes of Assembly, 1917, p.12.
3 ACW, 1 June 1917.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Argus, 16 May 1917. Minutes of Assembly, 1917, p.28, recorded that Merrington, Gillespie, Laurie and Cosh formally dissented from the Assembly's acceptance of the amendment.
defeat as a slight on his teaching and promptly resigned his position as a lecturer at the theological hall. The compromise resolution accepted the righteousness of the Empire's cause, assigned to God a greater role in determining the outcome and glossed over the local political scene with a call to unity. Cosh objected because the committee had failed to castigate the disloyalists and Merrington asked for a declaration of loyalty to King and Empire. A spokesman for the committee replied that as the people took Presbyterian loyalty for granted a specific resolution was unnecessary. Merrington disagreed with this view because earlier speeches against Cosh's motion 'were distinctly savouring of disloyalty'. Cries of dissent burst upon the speaker but they did not mollify Merrington who had faced the Turkish guns at Gallipoli. He repeated his charge: 'I say deliberately and calmly that the statements made yesterday can be placed alongside the utterances of Dr Mannix and Mr Fihelly, and men of that stamp'. Martin, defending himself against the charge of disloyalty, reiterated his belief that the church, bound by the life and teaching of Christ, could not sanction war as a method of obtaining righteous ends. He protested against the behaviour of those who accused him of disloyalty.

In the Queensland Assembly debates only two speakers espoused pacifism, Gibson in 1915 and Martin in 1917. They won no converts but their theory, which distinguished between the 'real' church and the visible church, enabled them to

---

1ACW, 1 June 1917.
2Presbyterian Church of Queensland, Minutes of Assembly, 1917, p.32.
3ACW, 1 June 1917 and 8 June 1917. ACW reported this debate twice, the second time more fully than the first. Apparently the editor believed that the matter was sufficiently serious as to warrant repetition.
4ACW, 8 June 1917.
5Ibid.
6Ibid., 1 June 1917. J.A. Fihelly was Minister without Portfolio in the T.J. Ryan State Labor government who made allegedly 'disloyal' statements.
7ACW, 8 June 1917.
ignore such signs of failure. They were content to put their views forward in the hope that some few might listen. There was no chance, however, that the Assembly would adopt pacifism as its policy. At the same time Gibson and Martin encouraged others to moderate the extreme views of men like Cosh and Merrington although the compromise motions were no milder than those passed in other church bodies where pacifists, if any, kept their peace. Soon after the 1917 Assembly closed, R.G. Macintyre, the Moderator-General, visited Brisbane to assure Presbyterians of the loyalty of the official church and to heal the rifts amongst ministers. He posed the question that many regarded as the compelling refutation of pacifism: 'was it right or wrong for a man to defend a woman who was assaulted by a brute? He should hope that no Christian minister would hesitate to take off his coat.'

Pacifism held no larger sway in the minor churches than it did in the larger Christian denominations. Although certain 'non-conformists' achieved notoriety for their rejection of war they were no more representative of the majority of the clergymen than was Gibson of the Queensland Presbyterian ministers. The chief spokesmen of the smaller churches supported the war as wholeheartedly as the Anglican or Methodist leaders. T.E. Ruth, the leading Melbourne Baptist, filled the Collins St Auditorium every Sunday with a congregation which heard addresses of the most 'patriotic' kind. Sydney Protestants regarded the Pitt St Congregational church as the centre for united intercession services for victory and peace. However, as in the larger denominations, individual ministers preached pacifism although it contradicted church policy. Charles Strong, the progressive Presbyterian who had been tried for heresy in Melbourne in the 1880s and who had subsequently founded the Australian Church, held staunchly to his pacifist convictions throughout the war despite the hostility of many

1ACW, 15 June 1917.
of his followers. Strong had a deep hatred for war and rejected the 'super-patriotism' and 'war hysteria' that became fashionable in Melbourne. His pacifism offended many of his congregation who had relatives at the front and numbers of church people either resigned or drifted away from the Australian Church. Strong depended on the support of his congregation to a much greater extent than a minister of an 'established' church but he was not prepared to compromise his principles. The Australian Church received its first major check during the war years and thereafter Strong failed to exercise the influence over Melbourne life that had formerly been his. In Sydney the Congregationalist Albert Rivett championed the pacifist cause but received little support from other ministers. Rivett worked largely amongst the supporters of the Peace movements that had existed before the war and made little impact on the wider public. The Quakers maintained their traditional hostility to war. The community respected their position and as they had so few adherents in Australia they were not prominent in any public debate. The daily newspapers reported the sermons of Wright, Carr and company in preference to those of Strong, Rivett or even Linden Webb. Rivett campaigned far more actively against conscription than did Mannix but the newspapers ignored him in favour of the famous prelate. The 'non-conformist' pacifists commanded

---

1 C.R. Badger, Charles Strong and the Australian Church, Melbourne, 1971, p.145.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., p.149.
5 Rivett edited a monthly journal, The Federal Independent with which is incorporated the Murray Independent, A Journal of Applied Christianity, which was pacifist and anti-conscriptionist. See also Eleanor M. Moore, The Quest for Peace As I Have Known it in Australia, Melbourne, n.d. [1949?], pp.29-30.
6 Rivett died while speaking at a large public meeting organised by the Anti-War Committee in 1934. See Egon Erwin Kisch, Australian Landfall, Translated from the German by John Fisher and Irene and Kevin Fitzgerald, with a Foreword by A.T. Yarwood, Melbourne, 1969 (1937), pp.85-9.
7 See Chapter 7 for the number of anti-conscription rallies Rivett addressed.
little respect from the daily press because they were presumed to have little influence.

The pacifist ministers achieved some degree of notoriety during the second conscription campaign when, on the eve of polling day, they published a manifesto urging Christians to vote against the Government's proposal. The ministers noted that the leaders of Protestantism supported conscription on religious grounds. The pacifists offered a contrary interpretation of Christ's teaching. They accused their brother ministers of allowing the state to dominate the church and they foresaw the emergence of a new religion where 'patriotism is the virtue which takes the place of Christian Brotherhood; the State replaces God, and the National flag replaces the Cross. Its supreme law is not the law of God, but the military safety of the country.'\(^1\) Of the nine signatories three represented miniscule denominations;\(^2\) there were also two Methodists, one Presbyterian, one Baptist and two Congregationalists.\(^3\) It is impossible to determine if the manifesto affected in any way the outcome of the election but voters, at least, realised that Protestant clergymen were not unanimous in their support for conscription. The manifesto attracted some correspondence in the church newspapers and some comment from clerical editors but the ministers failed to alter church opinion. In their terms, the flag continued to triumph over the cross.

---


2 The Society of Friends; the Australian Church; and the Rev. F. Sinclaire's Free Religious Fellowship. Sinclaire was not a pacifist although he was a dedicated anti-conscriptionist. See *Fellowship*, August 1916, where he writes of pacifism as 'the plain and unsophisticated answer'.

3 B.L. Webb and the Presbyterian A.J. Prowse had already resigned from the ministry.
Pacifists earned the respect of many of their fellow Christians by their sincerity and their clear commitment to Christian principles. They were a small, scattered group with no great influence; they did not, therefore, threaten the official position. Even as staunch a pacifist as Linden Webb was not forced out of the Methodist ministry; he retired voluntarily because he could not reconcile his official position with his private beliefs. Another class of Christians dissented from their church's political judgments. As their dissent attracted greater comment than that of the pacifists these men encountered more opposition from churchmen. Paradoxically, church leaders tolerated religious disagreement more easily than political dissent. A very few examples of political dissent are included here to contrast the two reactions and to illustrate again how minimal was the reaction the pacifist provoked.

No Catholic pacifist emerged in Australia during the war years but Catholic dissenters abounded. Wealthy Catholics in Sydney and Melbourne disagreed profoundly with Mannix. Men such as Judge Heydon, Sir Thomas Hughes and Mr Benjamin Hoare suffered indignities when they attempted to debate the issues of conscription and the war with Mannix, although Hoare found that 'the sense of an imperative duty unflinchingly done is my consolation'. An extreme example of the bitterness dissent caused shows how other Catholics suffered at a more personal level. Dr H. Roger Cope spent two years on active service with the A.I.F. and then returned to his native Crookwell. Cope deeply resented the comments of the local priest, Father Vaughan, who scoffed at the commemoration of Anzac Day saying

---

1For example Mannix said of Heydon that 'he was a second or third class judge of some kind or another...he was not an Irishman...if he came to address the Catholics in Sydney he could not get as many to listen to him as would fit in a lolly shop'. Argus, 21 November 1917. Disagreements within the Catholic church will be discussed more fully in Chapter 10.

2Argus, 12 April 1917.

3Letter from H. Roger Cope to Dr Gallagher, bishop of Goulburn, 18 November 1917, copy sent to Kelly, 3 December 1917, Kelly Papers, SDA, File '1917'.
that 'in his opinion we [are] only celebrating our disgrace'.

Cope kept his peace, genuflected and quietly left the building. Cope's anger erupted, however, when, during the second conscription campaign, Vaughan used his pulpit to advocate a 'no' vote. The doctor stood up in the body of the church and reminded Vaughan that he had come to worship God, not to listen to a political harangue. Cope did not record Vaughan's immediate reaction to this interruption but when he went to confession to prepare for his Christmas communion Vaughan refused to absolve him saying that if the congregation saw Cope at communion they would presume the right to express their views in church too. Cope treated this denial of the sacraments as a matter of the gravest importance, as indeed it was. A Catholic believed that his salvation depended upon the reception of the sacraments and Cope pointedly asked if Vaughan's politics were to be preferred to the salvation of his soul. Cope appealed to Kelly to settle the dispute even asking him to send a priest to give him absolution. At first Kelly counselled patience and silence but when Cope appealed again Kelly delivered his judgment. Cope had placed himself 'out of court' by admonishing a priest in public and Kelly would take no further interest in his case.

The conscription debate provoked similar bitterness and petty tyranny amongst some Methodists in Adelaide. Albert Morris, the Methodist minister at Brompton, spoke in support of the 'no' cause during both campaigns. His views failed to attract wide publicity but they drew comment from church
members. The 1918 Conference moved Morris from his important city parish to Snowtown, an insignificant outpost on the Yorke peninsula. Although Conference broke no law in moving Morris it was church custom for a minister to spend three years at each post; Morris had been at Brompton for only two years and had accepted the unanimous invitation of his parishioners to remain for a third year. When Conference's appointee to Brompton took his first service angry Methodists picketed the building and only twelve 'loyal' church-people attended the morning service while four attended in the evening. Meanwhile, Morris held over-flowing open-air services in Brompton Park. The agitation continued for a month until a committee rescinded Conference's decision and reinstated Morris. Meanwhile, Morris had sought to enlist in the A.I.F. to prove his loyalty and had been rejected as unfit. He resumed his ministry grateful for the encouragement of his parishioners who had demonstrated their support for a minister's right to exercise private judgment.

There is little in this chapter to alter the impression that Australian churchmen were substantially united in their support for the Empire at war. Very few ministers indeed

---

1 No speech of Morris' was reported in the Advertiser during either campaign.
2 Advertiser, 11 March 1918.
3 Ibid., 14 March 1918.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., 11 March 1918.
6 Ibid., 18 March and 5 April 1918. The South Australian Methodist paper, the Australian Christian Commonwealth, played down the incident at Brompton. The only report to appear gave the reasons why the commission had decided to allow Morris to remain at his post. The report insisted that 'the statements which have appeared in the press regarding the antagonistic attitude of the Conference towards Mr. Morris, so far as the Conference is concerned, have no basis in fact'; Australian Christian Commonwealth, 12 April 1918.
adopted a pacifist position but such was the unease on the part of thoughtful clergymen about the activity of the church in war-time that the pacifists enjoyed a measure of support or protection that was denied others who disagreed with church policy. The pacifists won few converts and went unnoticed by most Australians except within the small circles of congregations. Their pacifism was millenial or utopian; they preached about an ideal order and rarely submitted positive programs aimed at ending the war. They failed ultimately, however, because most Christians believed in the Empire's cause. Churchmen often reacted violently against those who threatened the unity of the church; their toleration of the pacifists showed that they did not see these men as a threat. The pacifists failed but their faith in the concept of an elite allowed them to accept the failure with equanimity.
Chapter 10

PEACE

Is it peace? Is all well?
Is the battle all done?
Nay, nay, the great conflict is but begun.

Emotional exhaustion settled over Australia as the results of the second conscription referendum were announced. Never before had Australians experienced such conflict and bitterness, even hatred. They yearned for the days of unity, for August 1914, when the whole nation had apparently spoken with one voice. The Governor-General, for one, tried to capitalise on the desire for consensus by assembling representatives of all parties, classes and groups to promote recruiting. He soon discovered that the bitterness would not be healed by polite talk in vice-regal drawing rooms. Church leaders had an even more pressing reason to foster unity because, despite the traumas of the conscription years, they still believed that victory depended as much on the spirit at home as on the performance of the troops at the front. God would grant peace only when the nations repented and acknowledged his rule. A society split into warring camps would not find favour with God and churchmen laboured to heal the divisions. Their efforts met with little success. The evil spirit of sectarianism, which they had encouraged, assumed a life of its own and refused to do their bidding. Often personal tragedy led to a desire for peace and unity. Bishop Stretch lost a son at the front and, reflecting on the sacrifice of so many noble young lives, he asked 'is not this the time when we should bury our differences in their grave?' He had no stomach, now, to debate about who was loyal and who disloyal; he simply wanted the war to end. He hoped Australians would 'deserve success by union with each other, and with God'. Significantly, in 1918, churchmen spoke more of peace than of victory.

1 Scott, Australia, pp.446-58.
2 CS., 19 April 1918.
3 J.N. Stretch, Address delivered at the Opening of the First Session of the Nineteenth Synod of the Diocese of Newcastle, 30 April 1918, Maitland, 1918, p.12. Many Australian Protestant clergymen shared the bishop's tragedy. Clergymen boasted throughout the war years of the large number of enlistments from the 'manse' or 'rectory'. It is as well to remember that often added to a minister's public anxiety about the nation and the war was a private anxiety about the fate of his sons at the front. See Appendix C for an indication of the extent of this enlistment.
New movements for the reunion of the churches flourished in this climate of yearning for peace. Some churchmen, influenced by the vast area to which the churches ministered and the limited nature of denominational resources, had pressed the logic of union for years. The chaplains' discovery that the troops abhorred denominational divisions added weight to these arguments. So in 1918 the new Moderator-General of the Presbyterian Church, John Walker, a returned chaplain, invited the Assembly to discuss the amalgamation of the Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational churches.¹ He told the Assembly that the men at the front disregarded religious distinctions, believing that the prayers and blessings of Anglicans and Catholics were as effective as those of the Methodists or Baptists.² The men would ignore the old divisions when they returned.³ Walker also believed that a united church would be more powerful 'in stemming the varied tides of evil', would attract large numbers of people who had lost contact with the churches and would remove the duplication and waste of resources that prevented the churches from spreading effectively over the vast continent.⁴ Walker had high hopes for the new church; he saw it as a virile, united national and spiritual Church, transparently free from petty aims, inspired by warm Evangelical faith and love, and, above all, distinguished by self-sacrifice, sympathy, helpfulness and active charity.⁵

In fact, Walker became so enthusiastic that he anticipated union with the Anglican and ultimately the Roman and Greek churches.⁶ The Assembly agreed with him and brought unity into the realm of practical action by adopting an 'Outline of

¹⁷PM, 18 October 1918. Walker delivered his address to the General Assembly on 26 September 1918. Because he was so 'long-winded' (Presbyterian Banner, November 1918), the PM spread it over several instalments.
²⁷PM, 18 October 1918.
³Ibid.
⁴⁷PM, 25 October and 1 November 1918.
⁵⁷PM, 25 October 1918.
⁶⁷PM, 1 November 1918.
Doctrine and Polity' as the basis for union and sent it to the state Assemblies for their opinions. The Presbyterians, haunted by their failure to influence the community, saw union as a means of achieving a more effective church.

Catholic leaders took no part in discussions on unity but they did react to the general desire for more amicable relations between the churches. They regretted their alienation from the general community and sought to recreate the spirit of harmony that had characterised the relations between Catholics and others in the early years of the war. The new Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Cattaneo, convened a meeting of archbishops to discuss 'the best means of re-establishing calm and avoiding further causes of trouble'. After 'mature discussion', the minutes of which, unfortunately, are not available, Mannix proposed the following motion:

in view of the present difficulties it is necessary that the bishops and clergy should use prudence and caution in dealing with public questions. Public declarations must be well-weighed, especially when relating to conscription, recruiting, the Irish question and other matters concerning the participation in the war of this country: care must be taken to avoid saying or doing anything which in present circumstances might estrange anyone, and everything must be avoided which can give cause for the accusation against Catholics of disloyalty to the Empire and to the legitimate aspirations of the country. The Archbishops do not think it necessary to make public declarations concerning this but will communicate these deliberations to their own Suffragans.

1PM, 11 October 1918 and Presbyterian Church of Australia, Minutes of General Assembly, 1918, p.24.

Cattaneo sent an account of the meeting to Cardinal Gasparri who passed it on to the Count de Salis, the British envoy at the Vatican; de Salis relayed the information to Australia. Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence File, Secret and Confidential Series, Third System, 'Archbishop Mannix', 1920-21, CRS A1606, item no.F42/1, AA, Canberra. The meeting took place on 15 May 1918.

3Ibid. The language sounds stilted and quite unlike Mannix whose command of English was masterly. However Cattaneo translated Mannix's motion into Latin for Gasparri, who translated it into French for de Salis, who translated it into English for Hughes.
The archbishops decided not to publicise Mannix's motion because, while they genuinely desired to promote peace, they wished to spare Mannix certain humiliation. Had the press, particularly the *Argus*, learnt of the resolution they would have rightly treated it as a rebuke for Mannix. This would have angered Mannix's supporters and increased the strife the archbishops were anxious to avoid. It is not certain that Mannix proposed the motion on his own initiative; it is certain that the Vatican hoped to persuade Mannix to present a gentler face in public. An official of Propaganda reminded him 'that the office of a Pastor is to pacify souls, to allay discords and to prevent them arising or becoming embittered'. He was also warned 'to prevent arrogant discussions and unpleasant and dangerous friction' in the future. Apparently the Commonwealth government initiated some of these attempts to restrain Mannix because when the Vatican requested that its future communication with the Apostolic Delegate be in code, the Colonial Secretary, who mediated in messages between the Vatican and the Commonwealth, recommended that the Commonwealth grant the request. He reasoned that 'having regard to the importance attached to securing assistance [from the] Vatican in dealing with Mannix it seems that [it is] politically advantageous [to] accord this favour'. Mannix may have taken some notice of his own motion and the advice from Propaganda because he was far less prominent in Australian public life in 1918 perhaps because he had fewer opportunities for the public stage. He made no further statements about the morality of the war. In view of Cattaneo's insistence that Mannix moderate his

---

1. Letter from Cardinal Gasparri to Count de Salis, 30 June 1918. File quoted above. The letter states that Cerretti had warned Mannix after the first referendum that he must not arouse public animosity but that notwithstanding this Mannix assumed the same attitude during the second referendum. 'The same deplorable consequences followed'. The Sacred College of Propaganda then warned Mannix as quoted.

2. Ibid.

3. Cable from Secretary of State for Colonies to Prime Minister, 5 April 1918. Prime Ministers Department, Correspondence File, Secret and Confidential Series, Third System, CRS A1606, SC L42/1, 'Diplomatic Representation of Britain at the Vatican', AA, Canberra.
aggression Mannix may have taken some satisfaction from the refusal of the Lord Mayor of Melbourne to allow a public reception for Cattaneo at the Town Hall. The Apostolic Delegate experienced Melbourne bigotry at first hand and Mannix could flay the bigots and prove his loyalty to the Delegate at the same time.¹

Catholic leaders extended their quest for peace by trying to reduce the antagonisms amongst Catholics. Since the first referendum when the Catholic body split into two bitterly opposed groups, of Mannix's supporters and opponents, the church lacked harmony and unity. Kelly made explicit mention of these divisions in his 1918 Lenten pastoral letter. He listed four current dangers to the faith of Catholics: ignorance of their religion, mixed marriages, defective religious education and 'divisions and dissensions in the body of the faithful'.² Kelly attributed the divisions to the divergencies in opinion upon matters of free discretion...the traditional attitude of the richer and professional classes as critics of their pastors...local interests...political predilections...party hero worship.³ However, he singled out the 'richer and professional classes', writing of their 'defection from religious duty and discipline' caused by their association with 'non-Catholics' whose standards they often adopted.⁴ He reminded his flock of the example of Christ and the apostles and appealed to them all, rich and poor, to draw together and give witness to the traditional unity of the church.⁵

Melbourne Anglicans, too, sought to heal the conflict in society but they thought of the wider community rather than restricting themselves to church interests. The experience of the rejection of conscription and the increase in the number

¹Advocate, 23 March 1918. See also Argus, 13 May 1918 where Mannix made a forthright attack on the Lord Mayor for refusing to receive Cattaneo.
²FJ, 14 February 1918.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Ibid.
of strikes convinced Anglicans that the divisions in society were based on class and they feared that the church was 'divorced from the working classes'. Anglicans believed that they could promote social harmony if they understood the aspirations of workingmen. They devoted the Lent of 1918 to an examination of social issues in a series of sermons entitled 'Problems in Australian Social Life'. In the final sermon Lowther Clarke speaking, he said, as an Australian citizen interested in the welfare of Australia and convinced that the church could help reduce the conflict, pledged the church's commitment to social issues. He stated that the clergy would study the questions, speak only when they had gained some appreciation of the situation, avoid abuse and base their observations on truth and justice. However he postulated that agreement was impossible unless all parties accepted certain common Christian principles, although he used 'Christian' in the broadest possible sense. The archbishop borrowed St Paul's analogy of the body to show that every member of society contributed to the welfare of the whole. Thus he objected to the system of grouping men into unions or societies for mutual protection because such a system accepted conflict as inherent to society's organisation. Clarke invited the hostile classes to amalgamate and co-operate.

Churchmen approached the problems of a divided and bitter society in different ways. Some sought to reduce denominational divisions, others sought to allay fears of Catholic disloyalty, others sought to introduce Christian principles to solve complex social problems. They aimed, in these ways, to promote the harmony and consensus which they believed should flourish in any well-ordered society. These attempts failed. Churchmen discovered that the conflicts within their society could not be talked away by pious exhortations to unity. Even the conflict

---

1 Professor Meredith Atkinson used the expression at the 1918 synod. *Argus*, 9 October 1918.
2 CM, 31 May 1918. Clarke preached the sermon on 24 April 1918.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
over which they did have some control, sectarianism, continued to grow despite the eirenic inclinations of some. Sores that had been deliberately opened up and played upon could not be healed overnight.

Relations between the Catholic church and the Protestant churches improved only marginally, if at all. Protestants institutionalised their opposition to 'Roman Catholic domination' in associations known as the League of Loyalty and the Protestant Federation. Such bodies were not connected in any way with a particular Protestant church; they received strong backing from individual church leaders. At a League of Loyalty rally at Goulburn the Anglican bishop, Radford and a prominent Presbyterian, Angus King, shared the platform.¹ Radford asserted that the state could never rely on Catholic loyalty because Catholics denied that the civil government had 'a divine mission to administer justice' and insisted that they were beyond the law.² Radford seemed to say that because Catholics refused to submit to the state in all matters they were destined ever to be alien to it. Angus King concentrated on the practical side of Catholic attempts at domination. Catholics would wreck the national education system because, like the Germans, they believed that the purpose of education was to mould the will of the child.³ In Germany such doctrines produced a 'devil-possessed' nation: Australia was warned. Catholics also sought to control the executives of the trades unions and use the working man, who was loyal but gullible, as a disruptive force in the community.⁴ King summoned his audience to war:

¹PM, 6 September 1918.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
he was a man of peace so far as religion was concerned, but when he saw a church using its spiritual influence and power on behalf of a political conspiracy to undermine the Great Empire and this Australia to which he belonged, then he was a man of war.¹

However, King restricted the weapons of this war to literature and prayer. The organisers of these associations held similar rallies throughout Australia in 1918 and attracted large audiences to listen to their confused theology and bitter invective. The Methodist Conference in Victoria bestowed its official blessing on this kind of activity and urged all Methodists to join the local branch of the Protestant Federation.² The Conference also decided to publish a handbook to help teachers to explain to their Sunday-school children the dangers of Roman efforts to 'regain the temporal power'.³

Individual church leaders continued to be disputatious. In October, for example, when peace seemed likely in France, a bitter feud broke out between the Anglican and Catholic bishops in Gippsland. Cranswick, the Anglican, treated his synod to a comprehensive attack on Australian Catholics. He dealt with 'the unchristian utterances of Catholic leaders, loaded as they are with...personal and uncultured vituperation', the failure of young Catholics to enlist in the A.I.F., the determination of Catholic leaders 'to foist the problems of poor, priest-ridden Ireland upon Australia', the Catholic quest for power, the tyrannical marriage laws and the corrupt doctrine that made liberty of thought and action impossible.⁴ Phelan, the Catholic bishop of Sale, replied in kind in several instalments. He particularly objected to the phrase 'priest-ridden' in reference to Ireland.⁵

Despite the intricacies of doctrine involved in these debates Protestants 'proved' Catholic disloyalty most persistently by charging that Catholic young men had refused to enlist throughout the war years. The figures released by

¹Ibid.
²Methodist Church of Victoria, Minutes of Conference, 1918, p.82.
³Ibid., p.83.
⁴Advocate, 26 October 1918.
⁵Ibid.
the Defence department formed the only solid basis from which conclusions could be drawn. These figures consistently showed that Anglicans and Presbyterians were over-represented in the A.I.F. and that Catholics and Methodists were slightly under-represented.\(^1\) The real argument involved the interpretation of these figures. The extent of the over-representation of the Anglicans suggested that many recruits gave their religion as 'Church of England' to avoid the opprobrium or the bother of having to admit to 'no religion'. Methodists defended their bad showing by claiming, with some justification, that careless clerks wrote Anglican even when a man claimed to be Methodist.\(^2\) Catholics cast doubt on the figures of the other denominations by claiming, again with some justice, that Protestant recruits were, on the whole, only nominal members of the various churches and rarely what Catholics called 'practical', or church-going. Protestant clergymen exaggerated when they claimed to have sent their young men to the front. Often they had no influence over them at all.\(^3\) J. Wilson, a returned Methodist chaplain who campaigned strenuously for conscription,

\(^1\) The Defence department gave figures of religious affiliation for the first 209,500 members of the A.I.F.: Church of England: 50.95 per cent; Roman Catholic: 18.57 per cent; Presbyterian: 14.94 per cent; Methodist: 13.11 per cent. Advocate, 30 June 1917. An ardent Presbyterian compared the numbers embarking with the A.I.F. against the numbers in the denomination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Embarkations</th>
<th>Nos. in Denomination</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>106,740</td>
<td>1,710,443</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>38,904</td>
<td>921,425</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>31,299</td>
<td>558,336</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth. etc.</td>
<td>27,466</td>
<td>718,926</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He then argued that the Presbyterians had made the greatest contribution. On these figures such reasoning must be specious. PM, 13 July 1917.

\(^2\) In several instances, Carruthers claimed, Anglican priests had delivered casualty telegrams to Methodist homes. This showed that the clerk had incorrectly entered the denomination when the man enlisted. Methodist, 7 July 1917.

\(^3\) For example, the minister of St David's Presbyterian Church, Haberfield remarked that over 120 men 'who took some part in Church life' were at the front as were another thirty 'who used to attend the services'. PM, 1 March 1918. An Anglican bishop told me that his father's name appeared on the honour boards of three different denominations in Geelong. He played tennis at each church.
provided more impressionistic testimony of Catholic enlistment. He claimed that the number of Catholics at the front was lamentably small.\(^1\) Carruthers expected people to take notice of Wilson's remarks because of his 'wide experience' at the front.\(^2\) It was difficult for Catholics to counter these continual accusations of their failure to enlist. A Sydney priest compiled a list of the recruits from each Sydney Catholic high school and the awards they had won. St Joseph's College, Hunter's Hill, headed the list with over 400 old boys in the A.I.F.; Sydney Catholic boys had won nineteen Military Crosses and one Victoria Cross.\(^3\) The priest stated that 'the blood of our Catholic soldiers [has] mingled with that of other denominations to flow in one indissoluble stream as a type of unity of sacrifice and unity of patriotic aspiration'.\(^4\) He asked was it fair 'to brand as disloyal, to stigmatise as unpatriotic' the church whose youth had made such a contribution.\(^5\) The editor of the *Daily Telegraph* agreed: such a record would delight any section of the community and few could surpass it. He advised Catholics not to blame Protestants for the myth of Catholic disloyalty. Catholic prelates had fostered the myth by their disloyal statements and had 'slandered their own adherents'.\(^6\)

Reflections on the loyalty of the Catholic hierarchy were not warranted in an overall view of the war but they became commonplace in 1918. Even the ultra-loyalist Michael Kelly found himself reviled as a traitor though he had consistently supported the Empire and had co-operated with most local

---

\(^1\) *Methodist*, 23 March 1918.

\(^2\) Ibid. Wilson's impressionism does not accord with Robson's figures which show that Catholic enlistment remained fairly constant throughout the years of war. L.L. Robson, 'The Origin and Character of the First A.I.F., 1914-1918: Some Statistical Evidence', *Historical Studies*, vol.15, no.61, October 1973, pp.740-1.

\(^3\) *FJ*, 18 July 1918.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) *Daily Telegraph*, 11 July 1918.
patriotic movements. In May 1918 Kelly wrote a pastoral letter, 'in time of war', in which he condemned attempts to introduce conscription in Ireland. He wrote of remnants of 'old policies working for the impoverishment, debasement and enslavement or extermination of true Irishmen' and insisted that the British government disavow such policies. Turning to Australia, he deplored the 'unwise bigotry' of the Public Instruction Act as 'unnecessary, unjust, unpatriotic and inexcusable' because he believed there would be no victory abroad until justice prevailed at home. The Allies should not fight for justice for Belgium and deny it to Ireland and Australia. Kelly regarded his advice as patriotic: 'no further time may be lost at home if our cause is to be upheld abroad'. He re-emphasised the loyalty of Catholics who were 'doubly bound to every patriotic duty - naturally and religiously'. He saw his pastoral as an exercise in patriotism. Others disagreed. They accused Kelly of sanctioning 'conditional enlistment' whereby Catholics would withhold their service from the A.I.F. until Irish problems were solved and educational justice granted to Australian Catholics. The editor of the *Argus* minimised the importance of the problems Kelly had identified. They were 'small, insignificant subjects of dispute

1Kelly was also unpopular with the Irish extremists who referred to him as a 'seoinin' or 'West Briton'. Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence File, Secret and Confidential Series (second system): 'Sinn Fein Propaganda in Australia 1917-1918', CP 447/2, item SC 417/2', AA, Canberra. An anonymous letter [from the Irish National Association to ?] dated 1 November 1917. The letter also stated that the Sydney clergy could not speak publicly in favour of the Irish cause because of Kelly, 'a notorious recruiting sergeant'. The fact that the government encouraged its counter espionage organisation to investigate allegedly Sinn Fein activities, shows how seriously it viewed the threat of disturbance. The head of the Counter Espionage Bureau was Sir George Steward, the Governor-General's Official Secretary. This was an anomalous situation. See Christopher Cunneen, 'The Role of the Governor-General in Australia, 1901-1927', Ph.D. Thesis, A.N.U., 1973, pp.426-8.

2FJ, 9 May 1918.

3Ibid.

4Ibid.

5Ibid.
in comparison with the success or defeat of Germany, in the struggle whether might or right shall rule the world'.

He declared that because of the doctrine of conditional enlistment the loyalty of Catholics was 'up for sale':

so far as the Roman Catholic Church can exert its influence, there shall be no more enlistments to reinforce our Australian soldiers... until both these questions are settled.

A cartoon in the Daily Telegraph pictured Mannix standing beside Kelly who was ringing a hand-bell to draw attention to a sale. Behind, a placard announced 'for sale hire or exchange our goodwill [and] influence towards recruiting'. Kelly held a copy of the pastoral in his hand. Church leaders, too, joined in the outcry against 'conditional enlistment'.

The archbishop was amazed at the furore his letter provoked. On several successive Sundays he tried to explain the letter and so undo some of the harm. He pleaded the reasonableness of his demands for Catholics who were entitled to share what all citizens enjoyed. His pastoral had exhorted 'our Government and fellow citizens to remove disabilities from everyone in Australia' but had said nothing about conditional enlistment.

His critics, he claimed, were not friends of Australia, of goodwill among citizens or of recruiting. The pastoral upheld the duty of winning the war and showed how it might be done. On other occasions Kelly pleaded his personal patriotism. When war broke out he accepted 'his duty as one prominent in society to lend all the aid he could to kindle enthusiasm'. He had done his utmost for the troops, boarding them in his house at Manly while they watched for enemy vessels, visiting them regularly at Liverpool, even sleeping

---

1 Argus, 7 May 1915.

2 Ibid.

3 Daily Telegraph, 9 May 1918. This cartoon is reproduced in P.J. O'Farrell, The Catholic Church in Australia, between pages 214 and 215.

4 FJ, 16 May 1918.

5 Ibid.

6 FJ, 13 June 1918.
there to help quell the riots, attending recruiting meetings and sending between forty and fifty chaplains to the front.\textsuperscript{1} His pastoral was patriotic because in it he suggested how to extend and preserve Catholic enthusiasm for the war. Kelly's self-justification became obsessive: he was deeply wounded by charges of disloyalty. This defence passed unnoticed by his detractors and eventually Kelly abandoned his efforts and limited his discussion of the war to general themes. He was ever conscious of the danger of misinterpretation and in his sermon on the anniversary of the war he spoke briefly and then said he would 'go no further'.\textsuperscript{2} Kelly's troubles exemplify how all Catholics were tarred with the brush of Mannix by 1918. In arguing his case for greater Catholic integration into the body of the community Kelly neglected the precision of language that the troubled times demanded. The attacks on the pastoral showed him how the gulf between Catholics and others had widened since the outbreak of war. He had predicted in August 1914 that the war would draw all Australians together. He now realised how inaccurate his prediction had been.

While these sectarian battles raged several skirmishes broke out within the individual churches which showed how remote was the possibility of domestic peace and how powerful were the tensions the war had caused. The Catholic division into supporters and opponents of Mannix had political and social implications because Mannix found most of his support amongst working men. The tendency of Mannix's supporters to suspect wealthy Catholics was far more evident in Sydney than in Melbourne, possibly because of the divisive influence of Maurice O'Reilly, the rector of St John's University College. O'Reilly castigated those Catholics who supported conscription as the wealthy associates of the Liberal party who had as much love for Labor as they had for Beelzebub.\textsuperscript{3} They lived 'aloof from the body of their co-religionists, from whom they are separated by a gulf that is unbridged by any sympathetic

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{2}FJ, 8 August 1918.
\textsuperscript{3}WAR, 2 February 1918.
understanding of the aims or of the ideals of the masses'.

The wealthy Catholics retaliated by trying to veto O'Reilly's invitation to Mannix to open the new wing of St John's College. Mannix opened the wing but failed to attract the huge crowd he would have expected in Melbourne. Notable absentees were the university academics, Catholic and Protestant, and the Apostolic Delegate. Later at Balmain Mannix contrasted the welcome he received from workers with that he received from the rich. He congratulated the working class for their generosity and said that other Catholics put their hands in their pockets and left them there. O'Reilly condemned wealthy Catholics who were reluctant to finance Catholic causes. He ran the St John's appeal for two and a half years and raised only £9,000. The spectators at the opening ceremony donated £1,630 of which only £754 came from the laity. The absence of large gifts throughout the appeal

1Ibid.


3The editor of Freeman's Journal had expected 100,000 people to attend; (FJ, 14 February 1918). In the event 18-20,000 people witnessed the ceremony; FJ, 14 March 1918. The Daily Telegraph, however, estimated the crowd at 40,000; Daily Telegraph, 11 March 1918.

4FJ, 14 March 1918. Mannix said that 'one looked in vain for a Catholic man of standing [in New South Wales] who has got a university education and has got to the front rank in politics and in public life, and who has not denied the faith he has been brought up in or denied the country to which he or his father belonged'. Daily Telegraph, 11 March 1918.

5Ibid.

6Ibid.

7FJ, 13 June 1918.

8Ibid.
showed that wealthy Catholics rejected O'Reilly's claims for money. In Victoria 171 people gave £100 each to the Newman College appeal while only three New South Welshmen donated a similar amount to St John's.¹ O'Reilly abandoned the appeal saying that he objected to 'bleeding the workers to educate the rich'.² Kelly had appealed in vain for peace amongst Catholics.

The clearest indication of Anglican frustration was a doctrinal skirmish that developed in Melbourne. Although the members of the church's high and low parties had lived together peacefully for years it is hardly surprising that they came to blows in 1918 given the prevailing atmosphere of tension that the war generated. The feud so dominated the Melbourne scene that for some months war news all but disappeared from the *Church Messenger*.³ The place of the Virgin Mary in the devotional life of Anglicans was the first subject of dispute. The argument dragged on over four months so that when the archbishop intervened at synod, tempers were already frayed almost beyond endurance. Archdeacon Hindley likened the synod to a barrel of gun powder and warned members against causing an explosion.⁴ The synod ignored his advice. The low party attacked Clarke's stand on auricular confession and threatened to withhold funds until he adopted a more satisfactory position. The debate was frequently interrupted by applause or by cries of dissent.⁵ The low party campaigned to elect sympathisers to Clarke's council, even issuing a how-to-vote card.⁶ At the final session of synod, Langley, a

¹Ibid.

²Ibid. Perhaps the wealthy Catholics were not entirely to blame. H.M. Moran, a close friend of O'Reilly's, noted that 'his organising powers were feeble'. H.M. Moran, *Viewless Winds*, p.187.

³The controversy raged throughout the winter months. See, for example, *CM*, 23 August 1918, where the controversy over the Virgin Mary occupied six pages.

⁴*Argus*, 12 October 1918.

⁵Ibid., 9 October 1918.

successful low candidate for the cathedral chapter, introduced a motion to remove the Rev. C. Barclay from St John's church Melbourne. Langley claimed that Barclay had instituted requiem masses for the dead, regular auricular confession and a branch of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. Synod passed the motion against most strenuous opposition.¹

While other clergymen refrained from such unedifying displays of partisan spirit they continued to criticise the church which they believed had failed the people in the time of crisis. Hugh Kelly lamented that 'the war [had] produced no general deepening or enrichment of spiritual life' but blamed the church for its failure to impress men with the truths of the war.² Bishop Stephen, reflecting on the chaplains' experience, regretted that Australians knew little of prayer or the traditions of the church. He concluded that 'there must be something seriously wrong with ourselves and with our methods'.³ A.R. Osborn believed that 'few Presbyterians, whether minister or laymen, view with satisfaction the position of our church'.⁴ Presbyterians showed no interest in the working man and failed to warn society of the twin dangers of the growth of Catholicism and irreligious socialism.⁵ None of these critics suggested how the church could make good its failure.

Churchmen remained critical of the moral condition of society. Some criticised Hughes when he apparently broke a

¹Argus, 12 October 1918. The fighting continued to dominate Anglican life in Melbourne for years to come. When Clarke appointed J.S. Hart Dean of Melbourne his 'low' council closed St John's College where Hart was warden thus effectively depriving the Dean of any income because the Deanery was an unpaid position. Hart was extremely embarrassed. (T.B. McCall, Life and Letters of John Stephen Hart, p.55.) When Donaldson nominated for the vacant archbishopric in 1921 Synod refused to appoint him, although he had such a high reputation amongst Australian Anglicans. He returned to England after this rebuff. (Who's Who, 1922, p.79.)

²PM (V), 2 August 1918.


⁴PM, 28 June 1918.

⁵Ibid.
pledge to retire from political life if conscription were defeated a second time.\(^1\) Brandt spoke of 'the evident lack of morality in public life' and said that the Prime Minister's behaviour 'must have made every patriotic Australian ashamed'.\(^2\) Wright rejected such arguments, saying that 'it is for the Government to decide and ourselves to support' at least until the end of the war.\(^3\) The people still took little notice of calls to prayer. Fitchett visited Melbourne's beaches on the special New Year's day of prayer promulgated by the King and discovered that Australia's response to the King's command was 'casual, indifferent and fragmentary'.\(^4\) When he talked to some of the 30-40,000 pleasure-seekers at the beaches he found that they had never heard of the call to prayer or else had forgotten about it.\(^5\) He lamented that while the nation stood 'alone and naked in the presence of God' the majority of the people devoted themselves entirely to pleasure.\(^6\) Carruthers agreed with this conclusion when he heard that 100,000 people visited Sydney's Easter show on Good Friday.\(^7\) Feetham deplored 'the deformities of character' of a 'rich, pleasure-loving, self-indulgent people'.\(^8\) He had heard that wounded, returned servicemen were commonly insulted when they wore their uniforms in the streets.\(^9\)

\(^1\)Hughes had said that his government would 'decline to take responsibility for the conduct of public affairs' if conscription were defeated. Scott, *Australia*, p.431. He retained the Prime Ministership.

\(^2\) *PM*, 24 May 1918. Brandt was speaking at the State Assembly.

\(^3\)SDM, February 1918.

\(^4\)Southern Cross, Melbourne, 11 January 1918.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)Methodist, 6 April 1918.


\(^9\)Ibid.
The frustration of a lengthy war led some churchmen and church bodies to adopt extreme positions on questions of morality. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, for the first time, accepted prohibition of alcohol as its official policy. Some Anglican synods passed resolutions in favour of prohibition, at least until the end of the demobilisation period after the war. The government abandoned its scheme to augment war funds with a state-run lottery because churchmen objected so strenuously. A Bulletin correspondent was disgusted:

groans about gambling are at this stage of proceedings about as relevant as snuffling over the army desecrating the Sabbath. The whole world is gambling hard 24 hours a day. Life is being gambled with.

Churchmen in Victoria waged a fruitless campaign against army treatment centres which issued preparations to soldiers designed to prevent venereal diseases. Worrall, the President of the Victorian Council of Churches, led the campaign warning that a government that provided 'youths in their teens with what is really an incentive to moral degradation' could expect no support from the Council which represented 'a constituency of hundreds of thousands of people'. In a pathetic letter to the Acting Prime Minister, Worrall wrote that he had given all his sons to the army because God expected the utmost sacrifice from all in return for a splendid moral victory. In Worrall's case God had made great demands: one son killed, another wounded and a third surviving over three and a half years.

1 Presbyterian Church of Australia, Minutes of General Assembly, 1918, p.29.
2 For example, Church of England in the Diocese of Adelaide, Year Book...1918-1919, and the Diocesan Kalendar with Reports of the Proceedings of Synod, Adelaide, 1919, p.154, and Church of England in the Diocese of Tasmania, Year Book...1918 with the Official Records of the Proceedings of the Diocesan Synod at the Third Session of Its Twentieth Synod, Hobart, 1918, p.52.
3 Argus, 19 April and 4 May 1918.
5 Letter from H. Worrall to W. Watt, 16 August 1918. Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence File, Secret and Confidential Series, Third System, CP447/2, item SC 15/22, 'Venereal Diseases', AA, Canberra.
His wife, worn out by worry and anxiety, had died. Now the government nullified Worrall's sacrifice by its cowardly action and encouraged 'the forces of devilry' in the land. Worrall asked if the sacrifice had been justified in view of the community's indifference to reform and renewal. Many other churchmen asked this terrifying question in the last months of the war.

Australians celebrated the announcement of the armistice with enormous enthusiasm and joy. Church leaders agreed that the victory belonged to God. They had relied on God's providence throughout the war; when victory came they naturally returned thanks to God as the source of it. Some churchmen saw an element of the miraculous in the victory. Green declared that '[God] reinforced the spirit of the warriors, gave discernment to the command, [and] rallied the moral strength of the allies'. From these divine interventions Green concluded that 'the imminent God breaks through the veil to succour and support His children, to keep His promises and to vindicate His cause'. Other preachers connected prayer and the victory. Cranswick had warned his synod that, 'until our people turn to God [in prayer], we cannot expect him to bestow on us the gift of peace'. He found the event justified his prediction. The war had ended because King and Commons had united in prayer on 4 August 1918.

The effect was almost instantaneous. During the three months that followed, events of a truly wonderful nature pursued each other...until our enemy was beaten to his knees.

---

1 Letter from H. Worrall to W. Watt, 7 February 1919. File quoted above. Worrall's tragedies did not move Watt who minuted in the margin of the letter, 'no action'.


3 Ibid., p.29.


5 G.H. Cranswick, Presidential Address...to the Third Session of the Fifth Synod, 18 June 1919, Sale, 1919, p.11.
Churchmen's belief in the 'God who judgeth the earth' endured through four years of war; victory 'proved' God's providence.

Most churchmen interpreted victory in a spiritual rather than in a political or secular sense. Fitchett rejoiced to be alive at 'one of the supreme moments of secular history' understanding the armistice as 'a victory for righteousness; for freedom against despotism, for the rights of the weak against the ruthless greed of the strong - for the laws of God'.¹ The armistice was 'one of the most dramatic illustrations in human history of the reign of the moral law in secular affairs'.² Clarke spoke of the triumph of right over might³ and Rentoul thanked God for using the Empire 'in the interests of His kingdom of equity and mercy'.⁴ Carruthers wrote that in the victory God showed his people that selfishness, greed and ambition led to destruction and that Christ's way of the cross alone led to universal happiness.⁵ Angus King found it hard to conceal his elation; 'our mouths are filled with laughter', he wrote, because of 'the victory of the spiritual over the material, of heaven over hell, of God over the devil'.⁶

Churchmen had interpreted the war in these spiritual terms since its outbreak in August 1914. They had also insisted that victory depended on the people's repentance and renewal. The event contradicted this aspect of their interpretation. As we have seen, clergymen lamented the unregenerate condition of Australian society even as late as October 1918. God had given the victory without first requiring the nation to reform. Few clergymen, in their sermons, referred to this discrepancy between prediction and event. S.M. Johnstone, an Anglican and one of the few to attempt to reconcile the two, rejoiced that God had not exacted the full price before granting the victory:

¹Southern Cross, Melbourne, 15 November 1918.
²Ibid.
³Argus, 13 November 1918.
⁴Argus, 14 November 1918.
⁵Methodist, 9 November 1918.
⁶PM, 15 November 1918.
shall not the fact that national victories have been vouchsafed to us before national repentance was marked in us, melt us from our coldness and indifference to the Creator.  

Even those who recognised the inconsistency saw in it additional reason for praising God.

Australia's reaction to the signing of the armistice filled churchmen with new confidence. They found evidence that Australians were, in fact, a God-fearing people in the large numbers who attended the church and open-air services that formed part of the peace celebrations. People also offered their thanks to God by spontaneous hymn-singing at the informal demonstrations that sprang up during the first days of peace. Churchmen rejoiced that the people acknowledged God's over-ruling providence so readily. The editor of the Spectator reported that he had spoken at two services which the people had attended in their thousands. The congregation gave close attention to the doctrine of the sovereignty of God and he believed that 'never have preachers had such audiences in Australia'. The editor of the Church Standard examined the statements of public men in regard to the armistice and found that most acknowledged God's role. The speakers did not need to explain their views; they assumed people knew Christian doctrine and accepted it. They spoke 'without any sense of restraint, with a freedom and naturalness that find expression in the simplest and best words often taken direct from the Bible'. The editor remembered the pre-war situation when little reference was made to God from public platforms and when Parliaments opened without a prayer. Now that people publicly acknowledged God he was confident 'that a good foundation has been laid for our country's future'. Yet it is doubtful that a new spirit was abroad in Australia. Churchmen had rejoiced

1Church of England, Diocese of Sydney, Minutes of Synod, 1918, p.22. Johnstone preached the synod sermon 30 September 1918. 
2Spectator, 20 November 1918. 
3CS, 29 November 1918. 
4Ibid. 
5Ibid.
at the large congregations who came in response to the grim news of the outbreak of war. Such increases proved to be temporary. At the end of the war people wished to express their emotions of relief and joy after such a long period of anxiety and to honour the memory of thousands of their young countrymen who had died. They realised that 'mafficking' was inappropriate at such a solemn moment and turned to churchmen who used the beautiful and solemn language of the Bible. The people did not pledge themselves to continue the church-going habit in more normal times.

Preachers stressed that the arrival of peace did not mean that the Christian's war against evil was also at an end. The victory against Germany did not usher in the millennium. Thomas urged a congregation assembled on the steps of Parliament House to continue the battle 'for the supremacy of right and the conquest of self'. Talbot agreed: 'the age-long struggle for the increase of the rule of God in human life would still continue'. J.L. Rentoul gave the most emphatic expression to this point of view. For four years churchmen had said that God had permitted the war to wean the people from their materialism. Soon after the announcement of the armistice Rentoul rejected this interpretation. He denied that war had an overall good effect. Indeed war was 'inevitably horrible' because it involved

the utter break-up of home life, and social conditions, the wholly abnormal condition of camp life and camp leave, and of strange and perilous and non-moral surroundings.

Such conditions made 'war moralities and their results proverbial'. Rentoul suggested that because the moral guardianship of the troops had been deficient the church would

---

1 The dawn service on Anzac Day is an example of this desire for solemnity. The service is almost a-Christian but parts of it are conducted by a clergyman because he can say things that would sound silly coming from a more 'secular' man.

2 Adelaide Advertiser, 14 November 1918.

3 Daily Telegraph, 11 November 1918.

4 PM (V), 6 December 1918.

5 Ibid.
need to work very hard 'to win back into their former relationship with our Christian faith and ethics and life and work many thousands of men'.

Rentoul rejected the idea that war had a 'morally and spiritually cleansing and purifying result in itself' because such a belief was incompatible with Christianity: "the kingdom of heaven"...does not come by external "tour-de-force", nor by any kind of external weapons or catastrophe". No churchman had suggested, even in the heat of the moment, that the war would inaugurate 'the kingdom of heaven' but they had suggested that it would bring men nearer to God by making them more aware of his plans and values. Nor had churchmen said much about the harmful effects of war while it was in progress. Other clergymen spoke of the duty of helping the returning soldiers to resettle. McAuliffe asked Australians to insist that their 'noblest and best citizens' receive common justice and fair play. He hoped that the troops would infuse the comradeship of the trenches into Australian life 'and dissipate the cobwebs of bigotry and suspicion'. A writer in the Presbyterian Messenger warned the troops to be careful during the relaxed and, therefore morally dangerous, time. 'Make up your mind that by God's help you will return to your land and your home with hearts true and clean', the writer concluded. Other preachers requested people to pray that a peace worthy of the sacrifice of heroes would be drawn up.

Peace in France was not followed by peace in Australia. The political and sectarian warfare continued despite the

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 *FJ*, 21 November 1918.
4 Ibid.
5 *PM*, 13 December 1918.
armistice and the universal joy it brought.  

Phelan, the bishop of Sale, preaching at the service of thanksgiving at St Patrick's, Melbourne, showed that he was not prepared to bury the bitterness. He spoke of the heroic deeds of the Australian troops, more praiseworthy because the men had enlisted freely, without the need for compulsion: 'their gift of sacrifice and life was a free gift; no cruel law dragged them from their parents and friends'.

When Phelan spoke of the dead he reminded Catholic mothers that their sons, who almost universally received confession and communion before battle, were assured of salvation. The mothers of other Australians had no such consolation. The war had shown 'what little use [on the battlefield was] the Bible-reading clergyman who had no power to forgive sins'. Furthermore, the Catholic mother could follow her son beyond the grave with her prayers; the Protestant mother was taught that her prayers were useless. Worrall was no more eirenic when, having paid tribute to those who had made the supreme sacrifice, he thanked God that they had not listened to mischievous politicians and cowardly ecclesiastics who counselled them to stay at home. Such bitterness could not be eradicated by the signing of a peace treaty at home or abroad. The experience of war had deeply divided the Australian people: churchmen had contributed to this division. The conflict would be worked out only over a long period of time.

---

1 Even as the Senate celebrated the announcement of the armistice 'an echo of the bitter controversy [of conscription] was heard'. Scott, Australia, p.477.

2 Advocate, 23 November 1918.

3 Ibid. Phelan referred to the Catholic doctrine that there was no salvation outside the church. His expression of such a doctrine at such a time was deplorable.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 Argus, 13 November 1918.
Chapter 11

EPILOGUE AND CONCLUSION

Is that what we were fighting for?
Is that what we were promised?

Archbishop Mannix in Advocate,
19 July 1919.
In July 1919 Melbourne Catholics organised a series of mammoth receptions for their returning soldiers, sailors and nurses.\(^1\) When Mannix rose to speak at the first reception, he was cheered to the echo by the 4,000 ex-servicemen present.\(^2\) Framed by the flags of Ireland and Australia, Mannix used the occasion to taunt those who had reviled him as a traitor.\(^3\) He thanked the men for the spontaneous enthusiasm they had shown for him. It proved that the troops, who were best entitled to judge, did not think of him as disloyal. He declined to speak of the 'glories of war' because he perceived that men who had experienced war's horrors would not wish to hear a civilian describe its glories. That topic he reserved for the people 'who never meant to go to the front', and suggested that despite such talk of the nobility of war, the troops had returned home sadly disillusioned.\(^4\) They had enlisted to serve the highest ideals of honour and justice but those ideals 'were hard to find in the council chambers or on the battlefields of Europe'.\(^5\) They had enlisted to protect the rights of small nations but the fate of Ireland showed how lightly those rights were treated. They had fought to impose the rule of law over the rule of force; their war, they had been told, would end all war. Mannix suggested that their efforts were wasted:

\[
\text{You went to fight that the world might be free and better, and that the will of the people might prevail...you have been reading of the wrangling and the lust for trade and territory at the Peace Conference; you have seen the terms of the treaty, and you have been asking yourselves, Is that what we were fighting for? Is that what we were promised?}^6
\]

\(^1\)Advocate, 19 July 1919. This was one of a series of displays of Catholic cohesion designed to reassure Catholics of their strength within the community.

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)As Mannix walked to the stage he was preceded by soldiers carrying the Australian and Irish flags. The crowd sang 'God Save Ireland' and 'The Dear Little Shamrock'.

\(^4\)Advocate, 19 July 1919.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Ibid.
He expected that the men would be disillusioned, too, by aspects of Australian life that had been affected by the experience of war: 'we are sorry that Australia is not in every respect quite what you expected to find it on your return'.  

If Mannix was disappointed in the outcome of the war, how much more disappointed and disillusioned were the churchmen who had higher expectations of it. In the early days of peace churchmen of all denominations seemed to regret their wholehearted endorsement of war. Their predictions were seen to have been quite inaccurate.

The influenza pandemic that had killed millions of people in all parts of the world invaded Australia almost as soon as the armistice celebrations finished. Clergymen, who had hoped that the celebrations would stimulate a growth in church-going amongst the people, watched ruefully as governments proscribed large gatherings, church services included. Only thirty people attended evening service at St Paul's, Melbourne, on 2 February 1919; Scots and Wesley were closed. At the Independent Church the choir was replaced by a quartet, the members of which stood twelve feet apart to comply with the regulations. Few suburban churches held services. Families whose sons had survived the war were now overwhelmed by a new anxiety as they waited for the pandemic to strike and perhaps rob them of their sons as they were in sight of their homeland.

At first the government tried to limit the extent and virulence of the pandemic by placing all its victims in quarantine. To be effective the quarantine needed to be very

---

1 Ibid.

2 J.H.L. Cumpston, Influenza and Maritime Quarantine in Australia, Melbourne, 1919, p.iii, gave some figures of its virulence. In Philadelphia the pandemic caused 261 deaths per 100,000 of the population, in South Africa 826 white deaths and in New Zealand 517.

3 Argus, 3 February 1919.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 See Prime Minister's Department, General Correspondence File, Annual single number series: 'Quarantine: clergymen visiting patients at quarantine station', CRS A2, item 1918/3627, AA, Canberra.
strict; clergymen were shocked to find that they, like all others, were denied right of entry to the quarantine stations. Catholics, in particular, protested against these regulations. When a Catholic nurse, Sister Egan, died without the consolations of the last sacraments the protests became almost hysterical. The president of the New South Wales branch of the Catholic Federation, P.S. Cleary, admitted that he found difficulty in voicing his protest 'in temperate language'.

The Catholics of East Maitland, under the chairmanship of Father O'Gorman, did not try to restrain themselves. They saw the incident as another example of governmental persecution. They noted that Henry VIII and Cromwell were 'honest enough to proclaim what they meant, while the Win-the-War Government of Australia tried to cover their bigotry with lying and hypocrisy'. The East Maitland Catholics assured the government that 'the Catholic patients will receive the consolations of their religion though you [place] all the Masons in hell at the quarantine gates'. Mannix believed that 'nothing but physical violence would prevent a Catholic priest from administering the Sacraments'. Kelly determined to demonstrate the point of this remark by demanding admission to the quarantine station. He presented himself at the gates at the head of a party of church dignitaries but was turned away by a dour sergeant. Kelly declared that if he 'knew that there was a person dying here now you would have to lay hands on me to keep me out'; he left quietly. When the leaders of other churches joined in the Catholic protest the government relented and allowed clergymen to minister to the sick.

---

1 Ibid. Letter from Australian Catholic Federation (NSW), 9 December 1918.
2 Ibid. Letter 9 December 1918.
3 Ibid. Catholics throughout New South Wales sent letters and telegrams in what seemed very much an organised campaign held at church meetings on Sunday 8 December.
4 Argus, 9 December 1918.
5 Argus, 10 December 1918. Kelly gave the government advance warning of his move in a telegram dated 7 December 1918.
   Cf. file quoted above.
6 Argus, 11 December 1918. J.C. Wright protested claiming 'that the best medical opinion today holds that ministrations to the spirit assist rather than retard ministrations to the body'. Letter dated 5 December 1918, file quoted above.
were disturbed that the government had not recognised the importance of religion and the necessity of making provision for it. They had hoped, particularly in the light of the armistice celebrations, that the war had driven that lesson home.

A second incident connected with the pandemic revealed the extent of sectarian bitterness provoked by war. So great was the number of persons requiring hospital treatment in Melbourne that the government decided to open an emergency hospital in the Exhibition Buildings. Because of the extreme shortage of nurses the new hospital was drastically understaffed.\(^1\) Mannix offered the services of nuns and brothers to take over the hospital and thus release the nurses for other work; the Victorian minister for health, John Bowser, eagerly accepted Mannix's 'generous offer'.\(^2\) Worrall, the watchdog of Protestant interests, objected: 'the garb worn by the Nuns and Brothers, the ceremonies they observed, the customs they follow, should not be introduced into a State hospital'. He described the religious as a 'sacerdotally trained band of anti-Protestants'.\(^3\) When the Mother Rectress arrived to assume command of the hospital the matron refused to receive her and declined to surrender control of the building.\(^4\) The government bowed to Protestant pressure and withdrew Bowser's acceptance of Mannix's offer.\(^5\) Catholics were shocked by this successful display of bigotry directed against persons

---

\(^1\) The hospital opened on 4 February 1919 and was prepared to care for 2,000 patients if necessary. The initial staff included a matron, eight nurses and twenty-four voluntary helpers. *Argus*, 5 February 1919. On 15 February 1919 the *Argus* announced that 'nurses and all classes of women helpers are still required'.

\(^2\) *Argus*, 15 February 1919.

\(^3\) Ibid., 17 February 1919.

\(^4\) Ibid., 18 February 1919.

\(^5\) Ibid., 21 February 1919.
for whom they had the deepest respect. How hollow now seemed Kelly's prediction that the war would draw all citizens closer together, reduce sectarianism and open people's eyes to the justice of Catholic education claims. Catholics perceived that the war had achieved precisely the opposite. The disillusionment churchmen now expressed derived from their earlier 'flabby optimism'. The war had apparently not advanced the spiritual condition of the nation.

The 'flabby optimism', so destructive in the long run, derived from churchmen's initial reaction to the news of war. They had not expected war; it caught them unprepared. They had little chance to assess the situation calmly or in the light of full information. They realised the nation's leaders relied on them to support the war, calm the people and encourage them to do their duty. So churchmen discussed the war in the general framework of their belief in God's oversight of the world and decided that because God permitted the war he must have determined that good would come from it. In their sermons clergymen did not concentrate on the causes or the Christian justification of war but instead consoled themselves by outbidding one another with a list of the good things God would provide as a result. They predicted that religion would supplant materialism, that a new spirit of harmony and co-operation would emerge within the nation, and that a new awareness of the value of sacrifice, duty and self-abnegation would grow. They accepted war and encouraged their congregations to accept it too. When churchmen did search for the causes they found them within the framework of their Christian beliefs. They agreed that sin was responsible; God sent war to punish the nations which had departed from his law. The catalogue of sins included the world-wide faith in progress, materialism, rather than faith in God, France's separation of church and state, Portugal's crimes against the church, Germany's higher criticism, and, at home, intemperance,

1 In this incident the interests of the patients suffered because of the insistence of churchmen that no church should gain an advantage over any other.

2 The phrase was Kenneth Henderson's; cf. Khaki and Cassock, p.79.
impurity and birth control. Churchmen, in other words, 'theologised' the war and its causes. They discussed these in terms of absolute, divinely sanctioned moral imperatives. They concentrated on the spiritual welfare of the nation and ignored the fact that the means of achieving a good end, destruction, pillage and death, contrasted starkly with that end. Only after the war did a prominent clergyman admit that spiritual truth was not nourished by chaos. Clergymen, however, had made their prediction and had thrown themselves wholeheartedly into the cause of the nation at war. They supported the nation not only because they believed their role was to strengthen the people in time of crisis but also because Christian theology prepared them to accept events and see them as from the hand of God who permitted calamities because of the ultimate good that would be derived from them.

This doctrine tempted churchmen to be passive before all subsequent events. Australian churchmen succumbed to the temptation. In 1917 and 1918, for example, they took no part in the growing debate about a negotiated peace. In fact, they scorned such interference with the course of events. Instead they reiterated that peace would not come until the nation had reformed and they concentrated on reform, personal and national. Churchmen became spectators of the course of the war rather than participants although the Bible praised the man who co-operated with God's plans and who sought to shape events. Clerical passivity, therefore, was not wholly derived from the theology churchmen used to justify the war. It thrived as much on churchmen's remoteness from the place where decisions were taken as from a theological predisposition to leave all to the hands of a beneficent God. When churchmen praised the Empire's war leaders and England's politicians they had little immediate experience of these men and almost no influence over their ultimate decisions. The course of the war was entirely out of the hands of the Australians. If Lord Kitchener decided that more men were needed, then more men must be found because Kitchener was a reliable, famous man in the best position to assess needs. Who in Australia could dispute his assessment? The majority of Australian opinion-makers suffered from this remoteness. Even the prime minister, Hughes, found himself advocating wildly different estimates of what was 'essential'
or 'the minimum number required' because he accepted the War Office's figures at face value. He believed they must be accurate. Significantly the Irish prelates in Australia betrayed fewer of the effects of remoteness because they were not prepared, particularly after the Easter rising, to rely on the word of the Empire's leaders. The perils of remoteness, allied with a theological predisposition to complacency, led to churchmen's reluctance to question, to criticise, to offer alternatives. Australian churchmen appeared acquiescent about the events in Europe.

These two factors, a tendency to see secular events in a theological framework and a remoteness from the centre of activity, inhibited churchmen from elaborating a sophisticated theology of war. They also ignored many of the peripheral but important moral questions associated with its conduct. The questions that engaged some British clergymen simply did not arise in Australia. There was no satisfactory discussion of retaliation, of pacifism or, in relation to conscription, of conscientious objection. There was no discussion of the propriety of the means used to defeat Germany. Was the blockade moral? Could Allied soldiers use gas as German soldiers had done? Could the Empire engage in reprisals? In a rare foray into these matters the editor of the Church Standard commented on the action of an English trawler skipper who allowed the crew of a ruined German Zeppelin to drift at sea. He refused to rescue them as they had pleaded. The editor applauded this stand saying that 'if we have little chivalry for them now, it is their perfidy which has extinguished it'. This inversion of Christian teaching provoked only one critical letter. For the rest, Australian clergymen avoided all these

1 See Albert Marrin, The Last Crusade. The Church of England in the First World War, Durham, 1974, passim.
2 CS, 11 February 1916.
3 CS, 18 February 1916. The writer reminded the editor that the Christian should return good for evil.
questions. Instead they relied on denunciations of the enemy's methods and catch-cries about the 'barbarous Hun'. They kept, too, to the well-worn track and continued to debate the moral questions with which they were familiar: temperance, purity and the elimination of gambling. They devoted much of their energies to these sins although others saw them as trivial compared to the catastrophe of war. Even many of the chaplains were unable or reluctant to pronounce on the moral questions which confronted men at the front. They also concentrated on the evils of drinking, gambling, swearing and whoring.

Such a concentration on the sins with which they were familiar derived in part, at least, from the common church belief that since sin had caused the war only the absence of sin would bring peace. Many believed that reform in Australia must precede victory at the front; the campaigns for temperance and purity were not simply opportunistic. In this respect Australian clergymen threw off their passivity, sought to shape events to conform with the predictions they had made and did not shirk from the comment and action necessary to produce reforms in Australian life. The support that many clergymen gave to conscription should be seen in the light of their commitment to reform. They believed that to serve one's country was not only a duty but also a great moral good which would benefit the serviceman as much as the country. They had appealed to young men to enlist voluntarily and were dismayed when some rejected these appeals. They could not see that their view of war was simply one of a number of alternatives and that not everyone shared it. They perceived moral blindness in others and agreed that the State could compel men to enlist.

\[\text{It is possible, although unlikely, that the Australian censors proscribed such reflections. Dan Coward has asked 'to what degree and in what areas are the newspapers of 1914-1918 rendered unreliable as a historical source' because of the censorship. More research is needed before this question can be answered satisfactorily. Dan Coward, 'The Impact of War on New South Wales', Ph.D. Thesis, A.N.U., March 1974, p.73. Church editors were at least aware of the censorship provisions as this 'Special War Notice' shows: 'It is imperative that all allusions to the war - however apparently harmless -...should not contain information that may, directly or indirectly, be of the slightest service to the enemy'. CM, 26 March 1915.}\]
to bring about in them the regenerating effects of war. Clergymen believed that the young Australians who participated in the Empire's just war would grow in moral stature, and, should they die, they would have an excellent chance of eternal salvation. The rejection of conscription on two occasions offered clergymen proof positive that the nation was unregenerate and it mocked their expectations that Australians would be refined in the crucible of war. This atmosphere of frustration and anger encouraged the emergence of futile sectarian wrangles.

The war caused some churchmen to reflect on the extent of their influence over society, although, since they refused to discuss many of the issues war raised, they limited the possibility of influence from the outset. They acted more positively in domestic matters but even here their influence was not extensive. Clergymen appeared frequently at recruiting rallies, for example, and spoke forcefully. It is not possible to determine whether their presence made any difference to the numbers of recruits secured. No politician or recruiting organiser regarded the clerical presence as indispensable although it was presumed to add some indefinable quality to the force of the appeal. In any case, the local clergyman was looked on as a community leader and he had an assured place beside the mayor and the local member of parliament. Clergymen campaigned strenuously for a 'yes' vote at both conscription referenda. They addressed themselves almost solely to church people, speaking at church gatherings and during services, and writing in religious newspapers. They justified their intrusion into the nation's political life by declaring that they dealt only with the moral aspects of the question: thus they restricted themselves to church audiences. They showed a reluctance to meddle with politics, although few other Australians, Mannix included, could see the force of their distinction. The defeat of conscription caused them to lament the churches' small influence over the moral decisions of the Australian people. The failure of other church campaigns reinforced this fear. Clergymen had sought to encourage greater church attendance; there was no change during the war years. Even the special intercession services lost their attractiveness as the war became commonplace. Churchmen urged
the abolition of many peace-time pleasures, sport, theatre and other mass entertainments: they achieved minimal and tardy success. They achieved more success in their attempts to curtail drinking: their efforts were assisted by the patronage of the King and the Czar of Russia. They failed when they tried to prevent soldiers from enjoying civilian recreations.

Clergymen failed most significantly, however, in seeking to convert Australians to the clerical view of the war. Most Australians endured the war patiently and rejoiced profoundly at its conclusion; they ignored its redemptive value or its capability for good. They would not have understood the archbishop who prayed that peace be delayed until God's plans for national renewal had borne fruit. Nor would they have understood the church leader who hoped to see Australians in action so that the people would appreciate the 'seriousness' of war. So indifferent were the people to such abstract theory that clergymen sought the state's assistance to induce them to attend church on national days of prayer. These requests for state aid indicated the extent of the failure to interest their fellow citizens in their view of the war. Australian churchmen supported their society's determination to wage war; they hardly, if at all, altered the nature of that determination even in those areas where they believed they should exert influence.

The experience of the chaplains supported this general conclusion about the extent of a clergyman's influence. The chaplain found that he failed when he relied on the authority of the church to gain a hearing; the men would listen to him only if he had won their respect personally. He must be brave, honest and just; he must share the dangers of their lives and not expect deferential treatment. The members of the A.I.F.,

1Sir Joseph Carruthers, ex-premier of New South Wales, and brother of the Rev. J.E. Carruthers argued that the federal government's restriction of racing hindered rather than assisted recruiting, 'especially whilst the Rev. Professor Macintyre was at the head of State Recruiting, more so as he had openly stated that if left to him he would deal severely with the matter'. Prime Minister's Department, General Correspondence File, annual single number series: 'Sport, restrictions on', CRS A2, item 1918/1151, AA, Canberra, letter dated 13 May 1918.
and presumably the wider community from which they were drawn, listened to the man who spoke to them as men, using the words and concepts they understood, and who delivered a message that was relevant to their situation. They rejected the man who relied on the sterile formulas based on the authority of the church and despised the 'wowser' who lectured them and imposed inappropriate restrictions on them. The sensitive chaplains discovered that the men followed their own code of ethics which, although not based on formal religion, required a man to act with integrity. These chaplains learnt that religion did not supply the only motivation and set of rules for right conduct. They glimpsed the wider view of the A.I.F. and appreciated that the church could seem narrow and intolerant. Perceiving that the church was at the periphery of Australian life they argued that to exert greater influence churchmen would have to assimilate more thoroughly the community's admirable values and ideals. On the whole, church leaders ignored these suggestions and wasted the valuable experience of the chaplains gained, often, at high personal cost.

An important element in the reaction to the war was the unanimity expressed by churchmen from different denominations. Protestants maintained this basic unanimity throughout the war years; there were very few disagreements. Catholic preachers supported the nation's initial commitment to the Empire as wholeheartedly as their Protestant counterparts. They suffered, too, from remoteness and from the inclination to view all things in the light of theology; their sermons contained most of the ingredients of the Protestant sermons. They too ignored the complex moral questions. They were as susceptible to Allied propaganda as were the Protestants and their young men enlisted as enthusiastically as the Protestants. Despite these outward similarities the seeds of later disagreements between Catholic and Protestant churchmen were present in their earliest pronouncements. Catholics and Protestants thought of themselves and of the nation in such different ways that disagreement was almost inevitable.

The source of difference was the Catholic theology of the church. Protestants accused Catholics of placing the interests of their church above the interests of the Empire. This was true, but to be fair, the accusation applied to the Protestant
denominations as well. No church suffered a great reduction of men or money as a result of the war: all church leaders determined to continue the peace-time level of church operations. Catholics, however, obviously and consistently gave the church the highest priority, while Protestants did not admit as openly, to themselves or to others, that the church's interests were not always coterminous with the nation's. Catholics, who were conscious of being a minority within the community, inherited from Ireland and perhaps from Rome, a suspicion of the secular state. Because of this they made a clear distinction between the sacred and the profane and accused Protestants, who sought a closer accommodation between the two, of endangering the integrity of the church. Furthermore, Catholic theology encouraged the opinion that salvation only came from the church. So while Protestant preachers accepted war as an opportunity for the renewal of society Catholics prayed merely that it would not harm the mission of the church. Their enthusiasm for the war was, accordingly, less intense. Catholics could not understand why Protestant ministers used their pulpits to advocate war measures; this inability to understand the other's point of view added fuel to the sectarian fires.

While these disagreements existed in the early days of the war they were barely perceptible and the outward impression was of unanimity. As the war progressed and the strain intensified differences became apparent. Catholic leaders refused to participate in days of united prayer and were reluctant to join in community functions. Their aloofness, again in the interests of the church, encouraged others to speak of Catholic disloyalty. The Easter uprising in Dublin, though condemned by Australian Catholics, prompted Protestant extremists to allege the treason of all Catholic priests. The prominence Mannix achieved in the conscription campaigns further alienated Protestants. The fact that sectarianism destroyed what both Catholics and Protestants tried to achieve for Australian society, was ignored in the ensuing bitterness. Catholics were reviled as traitors and Protestants were caricatured as lackeys of imperialist politicians, motivated by envy of the success of the Catholic church. Almost all forms
of communication broke down between Catholic and Protestant clergymen. In the civil sphere, religion became a question when a man applied for a job or asked for a girl's hand in marriage. Antagonisms flowed into the internal life of the churches. Catholics drew together for protection and spurned those of their faith who mixed with Protestants. Protestants attacked their fellow churchmen who seemed to sympathise with Rome or who even remotely appeared to adopt any of her ritual or beliefs. The chaplains had learnt that the members of the A.I.F. deplored sectarianism and refused to listen to the man who preached hatred of his fellow Australians. They expected clergymen to promote peace and social harmony. Sectarianism, therefore, reduced the chances of the spiritual conversion of Australia that clergymen had expected would result from the war. They worked, in fact, against their own prediction.

The upsurge of sectarianism illustrated the tragedy of war which churchmen felt as deeply as any other section of the community. Although they disliked war and believed it was inappropriate to Christian nations clergymen tried to interpret it for themselves and for the nation. Their explanation, hurriedly concocted, fell to pieces before a war of four and a half years duration with its appalling loss of life. As the extent of the sacrifice became apparent churchmen clung more tenaciously to their explanation as they tried to make sense of the carnage. The explanation trapped them and demanded that they accept greater and yet greater sacrifice. They spoke of the young men who were slaughtered at Gallipoli and in France as martyrs from whose seed a glorious new nation would emerge. The reluctance of others to take their place in the firing line retarded the transformation and mocked the explanation. The nation increasingly bore marks of division and conflict, of deterioration rather than improvement. However, despite the failure of the clerical prediction, the

1 Despite this Kelly continued to send stamps to Wright who was an avid collector. Kelly papers, SDA, File, 'Anglican Archbishop of Sydney'.
nation and the churches adapted to peace conditions. The
nation remained much as it had been. Churchmen continued the
cycle of their activities, soon ceasing to lament the lost
opportunity of war. Even the chaplains, who had glimpsed how
the church could inspire the people, settled into the old ways,
with few exceptions. New causes and new fights absorbed
churchmen's attention. The experience of war had revealed
much about the quality of Australian church life and the
relation between the churches and society. Churchmen ignored
many of the fruits of that experience.
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BROWN, George. President of General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australia, 1914-1917. Born England 1835. Worked for 48 years as missionary in the South Sea islands. Also general secretary of the foreign missions of the Methodist church from 1887-1908. He was 79 when he became Methodism's spokesman. Fred Johns' Annual, 1912, p.6.


CATTANEO, Bartolomeo. Apostolic Delegate to Australia from 1917. Born in Novi Ligure, Italy 1866 and educated at the Royal University of Genoa (LL.D) and the Gregorian University, Rome (D.D.). Rector of the College of Propaganda from 1912 to 1917 and then appointed Apostolic Delegate. He left Australia in 1933 and died in 1943. WW, 1922, p.47.


CLUNE, Patrick Joseph. Catholic Archbishop Perth. Born Ireland 1864. At the age of twelve entered a minor seminary and three years later went to All Hallows, Dublin where ordained 1886. Left immediately for Goulburn where he taught for two years; 1893 returned to Ireland to become a member of Redemptorist Order; 1895 began missionary career giving retreats in Ireland and England; 1899 sent to Australia, worked in Perth and New Zealand becoming Rector of the Perth community in 1909; 1911 Bishop of Perth and 1913 Archbishop; 1920 while visiting England acted as a mediator between Lloyd-George and Michael Collins but his efforts failed. A famous preacher although his words looked flat in print. Died in 1935. J.T. McMahon, One Hundred Years, Five Great Church Leaders. Perth, 1946, pp.115-56.
CRANSWICK, George Harvard. Anglican Bishop Gippsland. Born Sheffield 1882, son of a clergyman who came to Australia. Educated at the King's School and St Paul's, University of Sydney. Ordained, 1910 he went to India as Vice-Principal of Noble College then headmaster of a high school; 1914 Rector of St Paul's, Chatswood; 1917 Bishop of Gippsland. WW, 1922, p.66.

DONALDSON, G.A. St Clair. Anglican Archbishop Brisbane. Born England 1863, son of first premier of New South Wales. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (1st in Classical Tripos 1st in Theological Tripos). Ordained 1888 and spent three years at Lambeth as chaplain to Archbishop Benson; 1891 took charge of the church of the Eton mission; 1904 the parish of Hornsey and in 1904 accepted the bishopric of Brisbane; 1905 on the formation of the Queensland province became Archbishop; 1921 nominated for the archbishopric of Melbourne but not elected. Left Brisbane November 1921 to become bishop of Salisbury. WW, 1922, p.79.

DUHIG, James. Catholic coadjutor Archbishop Brisbane. Born Ireland 1871 and arrived Queensland 1884. Educated in Queensland and at Irish College in Rome and ordained 1896. Returned to Queensland and worked in various parishes until appointed Bishop of Rockhampton 1905. Then youngest Catholic bishop in the world; 1912 transferred to Brisbane and succeeded to see in 1917 although had been Archbishop in all but name as Archbishop Dunne was bed-ridden. Died 1965. WW, 1922, p.82.

FEETHAM, John Oliver. Anglican Bishop North Queensland. Born England 1873, son of a clergyman. Educated at Marlborough and Cambridge. Ordained 1900 and worked as curate Bethnal Green before joined the Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd, Dubbo 1907; 1913 elected bishop of North Queensland. A most unconventional bishop, preferring for example, to sleep in the open rather than in a house. Became one of the most popular characters


HEYDON, Charles Gilbert. Prominent Catholic layman. Born 1845; educated Catholic schools and University of Sydney. Called to the Bar in 1875 and became Queen's Counsel 1896. Attorney-General for New South Wales 1893 in Dibbs ministry. Became district court judge 1900, President of Arbitration Commission 1905 and judge of Industrial Court 1908. WW, 1922, p.127. Heydon was one of seven laymen invited by Kelly to luncheon welcoming first Apostolic Delegate to Australia; FJ, 11 February 1915.


HOARE, Benjamin. Prominent Melbourne lay Catholic. Born Chesham, England, 1842, baptised Anglican in village church. Arrived Australia as a boy and began in newspaper work in Portland. After some time in Adelaide, went into part ownership of the Geelong Evening Times. When this closed down joined Daily Telegraph, Melbourne, edited by W.H. Fitchett and owned by Presbyterian Church. Transferred as leader-writer to Age 1890 and remained there for many years. A convert to Catholicism and a very active Catholic. One of his sons was ordained and worked as a chaplain with A.I.F. Published War Things That Matter, Melbourne [1918], and was devoted to cause of Empire. Benjamin Hoare, Looking Back Gaily, Melbourne, 1927, passim.


KELLY, Michael. Catholic Archbishop Sydney. Born Waterford, Ireland 1850, ordained 1872. From 1891 to 1901 Rector of Irish College Rome and procurator for Irish and Colonial Bishops; 1901 Cardinal Moran selected Kelly as coadjutor archbishop; succeeded to see 1911. Died 1940. H.M. Moran mentioned his 'long addresses which touched on all subjects without illuminating them' (Viewless Winds, p.159) and P.J. O'Farrell described him as a man 'of no great ability'. (Catholic Church in Australia, p.205.) WW, 1922, p.147.

KING, Angus. Presbyterian minister, Sydney. Born Wishaw, Scotland, educated Glasgow University (B.A.) and Glasgow Free Church College (theology). At end of training left for Australia, ordained and inducted to Menzies, Western Australia, 1899; 1907 minister of Chalmers Church, Sydney; 1910 transferred to St David's, Haberfield. Edited Messenger, convener of Assembly's Social Service Committee. Died 1924. Minutes of Assembly, 1924, p.5.

LONG, George Merrick. Anglican Bishop Bathurst. Born Western District of Victoria 1875 of English parents. At nineteen began night classes with local vicar to qualify for the ministry. Graduated from University of Melbourne (B.A. 1899), ordained 1900. Worked for three years in Gippsland and although only twenty-eight was then offered leading church in Ballarat and archdeaconries of Wangaratta and Townsville. Became, instead, senior curate of Holy Trinity, Kew. Opened Trinity Grammar, Kew, and became first headmaster. Consecrated Bishop

MACINTYRE, Ronald G. Presbyterian Professor of Theology, Sydney. Born Melbourne 1863, educated there and at University of Edinburgh (M.A., 1885) and New College, Edinburgh (B.D., 1889). Minister at Birkenhead, England 1890-95 and Maxwelltown, Scotland 1895-1903. Accepted a call to Woollahra church 1903 and appointed Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics at St Andrew's, University of Sydney, 1909. Moderator-General of the Presbyterian Church, 1916-1918; Chairman of the State Recruiting Committee 1916; Director of Recruiting for New South Wales, 1916-18. WW, 1922, p.175. Died June 1954.

MANNIX, Daniel. Catholic Archbishop Melbourne. Born Charleville, Ireland 1864, educated Fermoy and St Patrick's College, Maynooth. Successively Professor, Vice-President and President of Maynooth; 1908 appointed to Senate of the National University of Ireland; 1913 arrived in Melbourne as coadjutor to Archbishop Carr and succeeded 1917. WW, 1922, p.184. Late in his life Mannix regretted his ability to make enemies. 'I have gone through life denouncing people...I seem to have enemies both inside and outside the Church...I dread to think of the numbers that I have frightened away [from the Church].' J.T. McMahon, College, Campus, Cloister, pp.196 and 199. Died 1963.

MERRINGTON, Ernest Northcote. Presbyterian Minister, St Andrew's, Brisbane. Born Newcastle, New South Wales, 1876, educated at Sydney High School and Sydney University (M.A. 1903, 1st Hons and Medal in Mental and Moral Philosophy). Studied theology at St Andrew's, Sydney, New College, Edinburgh and Harvard (Ph.D. 1905). Ordained 1902, minister at Kiama.
1905-1908, lecturer in philosophy Sydney University 1907-1909; minister at St Andrew's Brisbane, from 1910. Moderator of Queensland Church 1916-1917; elected President of Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League (Queensland), 1917. Author of The Possibility of a Science of Casuistry (1902) and The Problem of Personality (1916). Chaplain with A.I.F. 1914-1915 and 1918. WW, 1922, p.192.

MOORE, Robert Henry. Anglican Rector Fremantle. Born 1872 Ireland, educated at Drogheda Grammar School and Trinity College, Dublin (B.A. Hons, 1895). Ordained 1897; worked as junior curate at St Luke's, Belfast; 1898 volunteered to work in Western Australia and assigned to Kanowna, a town of 12,000 people, mostly gold-seekers, 412 miles inland from Perth; 1901 transferred to Boulder; after four years went to Northam. Became canon of St George's Cathedral, Perth, 1910; 1911 transferred to Fremantle; 1917 joined A.I.F. as chaplain with 3rd Brigade Light Horse. Synod elected him Dean of Perth 1929. Resigned 1947. Autobiographical note in the Papers of the Very Rev. R.H. Moore, Battye Library, MS.1210A.

O'REILY, John. Catholic Archbishop Adelaide. Born Kilkenny, Ireland 1846, educated at St Kiernan's College and All Hallow's, Dublin; ordained 1869. Left immediately for Western Australia where he worked until appointed Bishop of Port Augusta 1887. Became Archbishop Adelaide 1895. Died, after a lengthy illness 1915. Fred Johns' Annual, 1912, p.21. An observer believed that 'no more versatile man has worn a shovel hat in Australia, and none has been more broadminded and tolerant'. Bulletin, 3 December 1914.

O'REILLY, Maurice, J. Rector St John's College, University of Sydney. Born Queenstown, County Cork, 1866, educated at Fermoy and Maynooth where he was a fellow student with Mannix. Worked in England where he acquired an English accent, transferred to Australia, first to St Stanislaus College,
Bathurst and then to St John's (1915). H.M. Moran, said 'it was characteristic of his maladjustment to environment that he invariably provoked reaction wherever he went'; 1915 published an intensely patriotic poem 'Right to the End' which later recanted because of opposition to conscription. H.M. Moran, Viewless Winds, pp.181-7. O'Reilly died in September 1933.

PHELAN, Patrick. Catholic Bishop Sale. Born Ireland 1860, educated at Mount Melleray Seminary and St Patrick's College, Carlow. After ordination went to Melbourne and worked there in responsible positions (Vicar-General, 1908-1913) until appointment to Sale 1913. Often returned to Melbourne to preach at important functions. WW, 1922, p.218.


RENTOUL, John Laurence. Presbyterian Professor of Theology at Ormond College, Melbourne. Born Ireland 1846, son of a clergyman. Educated at Queen's College, Belfast, Queen's University, Dublin and Leipzig University. Academic record distinguished: gold medallist in Literature, History and Economic Sciences at Queen's University. Incumbent at St George's Presbyterian Church, Southport, Lancashire 1872-1879, St George's, St Kilda, 1879-1884; 1883 became Professor of New Testament, Greek Literature and Christian Philosophy at Ormond College and held that chair until death 1926. WW, 1922, p.229. An Anglican said that he lacked 'balance, moderation and a respect for hard facts'. CM, 20 April 1916.


WALKER, John. Minister St Andrew's Presbyterian church, Ballarat. Born Cheshire 1855; arrived Sydney 1876. Studied at St Andrew's, ordained 1882. Occupied many parishes and positions of importance in New South Wales before transferred to Ballarat 1908; 1918–1920 Moderator-General of Church. All of his five sons fought in war and three were killed; 1927 first minister of St Andrew's, Canberra. WW, 1922, p.281.


WORRALL, Henry. Methodist Minister Victoria. Born Lancashire 1862, educated at State schools and Newington College, Sydney (theology). A missionary in Fiji 1886–1899, then returned to Australia and worked in Hobart, Sale, Bendigo and Melbourne. President of the Tasmanian Council of Churches (1904), Victorian Council of Churches (1918), Victorian Methodist Conference (1918). Grand Chaplain of the Loyal Orange Lodge (1911–1920). Three sons fought in war, one was killed and one twice wounded. Fitchett said he had 'the defect of his qualities' and that 'some of his friends think he would be more effective if he was less emphatic'. (Southern Cross (Melb.), 23 June 1916). WW, 1922, p.297.

WRIGHT, John Charles. Anglican Archbishop Sydney, Primate of Australia. Born Lancashire 1861, educated at Manchester Grammar and Merton College, Oxford. Ordained 1885, vicar of Ulverston, St George's, Leeds and St George's Hulme, Canon of Manchester Cathedral 1904–1909. Consecrated Archbishop Sydney, August 1909. WW, 1922, p.298. 'He [was] rather more of the
diplomat than the leader. He held the Church in peace and amity, but he has not led it forward on any great spiritual or moral enterprise.' F.B. Boyce, *Fourscore Years and Seven*, p.151.
APPENDIX B

Chaplains in the A.I.F. 1914-1918

Note: No list of Australian chaplains with the 1st A.I.F. has been published before; I have included the names here because they were so inaccessible. Some entries were incomplete and I have indicated this by N.C. [Not Classified]. Often these men had unusual backgrounds. For example Fr Michael Bergin was perhaps the only member of the A.I.F. never to have set foot in Australia; he was recruited in Cairo.

Abbreviations: Religious Orders

a. Catholic
   C.M.   Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians)
   C.P.   Congregation of the Passion (Passionists)
   C.S.S.R. Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer (Redemptorists)
   M.S.H. Missionaries of the Sacred Heart
   O.F.M. Order of Friars Minor (Franciscans)
   S.J.   Society of Jesus (Jesuits)
   S.M.   Society of Mary (Marist Fathers).

b. Anglican
   B.G.S. Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date of Enlistment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAM D.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16. 8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMSOM S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>1. 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD E.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH F.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHLEY-BROWN W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTIN A.H.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>16. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKHOUSE N.A'B.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>12. 2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAIRD G.M.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>25. 8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER P.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALL S.C.O'B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>25.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY E.S.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>15. 5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATES A.E.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30. 7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATES J.H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>29. 5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH W.S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>16.12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL M.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>25. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNETT T.P.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>17. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENSON J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17. 7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERGIN M. S.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>13. 5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEVERIDGE S.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKWOOD D.B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>20. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLADEN A.P.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>17. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOOD C.F.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARDMAN J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOND E.B.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16. 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOTH J.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>25. 8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSSENCE I.E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>7. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOULTBEE H.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>29. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYER E.M.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>10.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADBURY V.R.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>1. 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY W.G.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16. 5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIER C.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEN F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>17. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREMER F.C.L.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>3. 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENNAN D.A.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>17. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICKLEY M.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>19.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROSnan J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>24. 7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN C.P.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN J.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>25. 9.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRUCE D.  P  Vic  24. 9.16
BRUCE J.K.  P  NSW  1. 1.17
BRUMWELL S.  M  Qld  1. 9.15
BUCKLEY R.  RC  Vic  16. 7.16
BUCKLEY S.L.  CE  Vic  18. 1.17
BURKETT W.E.K.  CE  NSW  18. 9.17
BURVILL W.  CE  Vic  23. 1.15
CALDER J.  P  NSW  16. 1.17
CAMPBELL T.A. (C.SS.R.)  RC  Vic  1. 7.15
CANNER W.  CE  N.C.  16. 5.17
CARGILL W.E.  CE  Qld  1.12.15
CARROLL J.E.  RC  Vic  1. 3.16
CARTER G.W.  CE  Vic  1.12.15
CASHMAN W.P.  RC  Qld  22. 1.17
CHALMERS G.  P  NSW  1. 4.15
CHASELING J.H.  CE  NSW  1. 6.15
CLACK N.A.  RC  Vic  1.10.16
CLARK A.  P  NSW  15.11.16
CLARKE H.A. (O.F.M.)  RC  N.C.  1. 3.16
CLARKE W.G.  M  SA  22. 6.17
CLEVERDON F.T.  M  Vic  1. 3.16
CLOSE W.N.  RC  Vic  16. 7.15
CLUNE F. (C.P.)  RC  NSW  1.10.15
CLUNE P.J.  RC  WA  22. 8.16
COLES H.H.  CE  SA  1. 9.16
COLLICK E.M.  CE  WA  1. 7.15
COLLINS D.J.  CE  NSW  1. 5.17
COLMAN M.  RC  N.C.  1. 9.15
COLWELL F.  M  NSW  17. 3.15
COPE J.L.  P  Vic  20. 9.15
COSIER H.E.  M  NSW  4.11.18
COULCHER E.H.B.  CE  Qld  23. 8.18
CRANSTON G.  P  NSW  1. 9.15
CRAWFORD R.J.W.G.  P  NSW  12. 6.17
CREAN J.W.  M  WA  1. 7.15
CROOKSTON J.  P  Vic  1. 3.16
CROTTY H.  CE  NSW  1. 3.16
CUE J.J.  CE  Vic  1. 3.16
CUTRISS G.P.  OPD  N.C.  1. 3.16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAIMPRE P.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>16.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAINS J.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALE J.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIDSON A.I.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIES A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVISON R.B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>27.8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMPSEY J.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>20.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT O.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVINE W.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEWHURST B.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>21.8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEXTER W.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONOVAN P.J. (M.S.H.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS W.K.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>1.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOW D.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>17.6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWLING F.V.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1.7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNBAR W.J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNFORD F.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWYER F.P.G.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDDES W.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS C.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>25.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPERSON O.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA A.F.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAHEY J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERNIE E.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>20.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILLODEAU A.M.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>10.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINIGAN R. O'D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOD J.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBES A.E.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1.8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREMAN H.J.C.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>12.6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORREST J.A.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>12.6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSYTH S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>28.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX T. (S.M.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>15.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOYSTER R.C.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS W.C.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>24.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAZER W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREER D.L.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>11.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRENCH F.R.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>6.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRY A.S.J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>6.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIR T.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>4.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALLOP A.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>24.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARLAND D.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>21.3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAULT J.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILBERT P.J. (M.S.H.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILDER G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILES R.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>15.4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLISON A.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOIDANICH E.O.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>19.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDBING-BIRD C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>18.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLLE A.E.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN A.J. (M.S.H.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>20.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>16.7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON G.A.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON H.K.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORRIE L.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>15.6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY W.J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN H.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN W.G.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREGG-MACGREGOR A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRESHAM F.W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREVILLE A.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>25.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY W.J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIBBLE A.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>22.7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFIN C.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>10.10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFIN P.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITH M. Ede B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNSON W.N.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWYNNE W.P.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>12.7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>8.2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL L.G.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALPIN J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANLIN J.F.Y.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>9.12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANRAHAN J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>25.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANRAHAN T.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>7.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAREWOOD E.J.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>19.4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARPER H.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>20.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIS R.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey F.W.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden H.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>28.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard A. St.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes P.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearne J. (S.J.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath H.F.T.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>25.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson K.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henneell E.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>30.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy D.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>27.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy J.F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry R.C.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>16.9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks W.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins W.N.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1.6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hines J.S.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>17.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinsby M.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirst R.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoare N.F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>18.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden A.T.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holliday W.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homersham A.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>9.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>23.1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope P.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>1.6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston A.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howes W. (C.S.S.R.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>15.7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter D. De V.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>24.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huthnance J.F.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inamells F.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin W.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16.4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey J.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins C.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>20.1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop W.B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson W.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>9.6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston G.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones H.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian E.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice T.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>26.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly J.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>7.4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly V.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>13.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENDREW G.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>20.11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNEDY J.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILGALLIN F.D.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>12.7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILLIAN P.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>8.5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING A.J.B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING F.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>25.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING J.E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>11.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING T.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBLE G.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBTON A.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>4.9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPTHORNE A.E.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>6.5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWS E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE J. (M.S.H.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4.5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGATE R.M.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>10.12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE MAITRE E. (C.P.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS F.G.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINTON H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONERGAN C.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>9.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG G.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOVE F.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>2.12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNDIE J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNCH C.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>17.2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNCH P.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKEHAM E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>23.10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALCOLMSON J.A.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>25.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALEY M.R.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>20.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMBRINI P.S. (O.F.M.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANGAN W.B.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNING T.M. (C.M.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS F.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>22.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUND L.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>6.7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXTED S.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXWELL A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>16.5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACAULAY C.J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACAULAY R.W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>25.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCauliffe E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBAIN S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>17.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCABE P.E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>20.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClemans W.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>16.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCOOK A.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW 1.3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONALD D.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N.C. 1.9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONALD D.P.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW 16.7.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDONNELL J.B.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW 16.12.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDONNELL P.P. (C.P.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW 29.4.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEVOY J.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic 1.9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACGOUN J.H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW 1.3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGRATH D.F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>SA 1.11.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKAY G.J.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C. 1.9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKENNA M.F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic 16.12.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKENZIE W.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C. 25.9.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKEON E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C. 23.9.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLEAN D.F.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N.C. 17.3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLEAN R.W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SA 1.7.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNICOLL D.S.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C. 1.9.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQUEEN M.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPHEE J.C.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SA 8.9.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACPHERSON A.S.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic 1.6.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVITTIE T.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW 16.12.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCER H.F.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA 16.10.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRINGTON E.N.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Qld 8.9.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICKLEM P.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld 16.4.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILES F.J.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>Vic 14.9.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER J.K.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW 23.10.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER W.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA 20.9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLS A.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Qld 1.3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILNE F.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic 20.1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL A.H.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic 25.9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE P.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW 1.6.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE R.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE W.A.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA 23.10.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORHOUSE W.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRIS M.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORSHEAD H.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic 16.7.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOULTON E.S.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C. 1.11.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULLINS T.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW 17.3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURPHY C.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C. 8.5.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURPHY J.D.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>SA 17.3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSCHAMP E.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas 1.12.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESBITT W.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C. 11.3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVILLE C.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>3. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLLS J.E.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>12. 6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIELD J.H.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>27. 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGHTINGALE F.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMAN K.D.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>27.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYE E.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>23.10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKLEY R.C.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'BRIEN M.I.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>10. 8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CALLAGHAN R.D.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNOR F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'DOHERTY P.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1. 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'DONNELL T.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'DWYER W.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>20. 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'HALLORAN F.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'HARE P.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAMES B.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'REGAN C.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>28. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBORN J.E.N.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>29. 8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'SULLIVAN H.E.A.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>23.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATerson J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17. 5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATON F.H.L.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>11. 7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATON F.J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARCE E.A.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1. 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEL H.D. (B.G.S.)</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>10.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS H.S.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>20. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS T.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>19.12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY C.J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETHERICK E.G.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>17.12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILLIPS E.O.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>19. 5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTEDRIGH G.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>12. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTMAN J.C.F.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>15. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITT-OWEN R.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANE A.C.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>8. 9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLORMEL J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>30.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTLE H.T.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16. 8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER T.S. (C.M.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICKETT G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>13.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCTER H.A.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1. 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRYOR E.T.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULSFORD F.E.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>2.7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYKE H.A.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACKLEYFT R.C.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>8.7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSAY J.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>26.8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKIN F.W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>15.6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVERY J.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>7.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDHEAD P.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDMOND J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>18.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REID G.R.S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>25.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTOUL J.B.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>11.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTOUL J.L.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENTOUL T.C.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETTIE F.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>5.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REYNOLDS T.D.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD R.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>8.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDS W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>12.11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND G.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDDLE T.J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>23.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RILEY C.O.L.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>31.7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTSON B. (C.P.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16.11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTSON H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTSON T.G.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>23.10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBINSON T.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>13.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBSON W.M.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGERS C.W.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>9.6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGERS E. Jellicoe</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>20.9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLAND F.W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWE G.E.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWELL R.J.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYAN W.A.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>25.1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMWELL F.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16.12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT W.J.B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT-MACDONALD J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>1.6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXTON H.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>20.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHANNON W.F.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>20.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAW G.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEDDEN C.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>17.5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERRIS D.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>16.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE K.S.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17.3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLACK W.L.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>1.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMILEY J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16. 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>22. 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH M.J.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>14.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH S.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>19. 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH W.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>16. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH W.W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNELL J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>16. 5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENCER P.A.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATT G.W.B.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>19. 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STERLING P.F.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS W.J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>17. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENSON A. McE.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART D. Macrae</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>13. 6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STODDART A.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>8. 9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAHAN W.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>11. 7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDES E.J. (S.J.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>16.10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALBOT A.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR H.R.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>23. 10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEECE A.H.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>16. 11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY T.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>11. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGHE P. (S.J.)</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>20. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLHURST A.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>9. 6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMKINS C.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>11. 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONGE A.W.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREGEAR C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>11. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRON M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>16. 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUBMAN F. De M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>QC</td>
<td>16. 7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCKER G.K.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>17. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUGWELL F.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>25. 7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER R.C.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>17. 12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URE R.D.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>28. 4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICKERS L.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>8. 5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINE H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>16. 7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WADDY P.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>17. 3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALDEN G.T.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>16. 11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER E.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>31. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>25. 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALSH E.C.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>19. 6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTON H.C.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD F.G.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>19. 6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD H.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>7. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB A.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB T.T.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>16. 9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIR D.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>21.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE A.E.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIELAND B.C.</td>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>20.11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS F.P.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS R.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON B.C.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>20. 9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON J.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>12. 2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON T.H.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>15. 5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD T.P.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1. 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD T.P.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16. 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODS W.M.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1. 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAY F.W.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>1.12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIGHT A.E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>30. 5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEO E.S.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>23. 8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG H.P.</td>
<td>CE</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>27. 9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZUNDOLOVICH P.E.</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1.12.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Australia, Department of Defence, Staff. Regimental and Gradation Lists of Officers, 1914-1918, Melbourne, 1918. [These were issued monthly.]
APPENDIX C

List of the Sons of Australian Anglican Clergymen who served in the War

Note: This list is not complete but is included to give some idea of the 'private anxiety' many clergymen suffered during the war years.

ROLL OF HONOUR

Arnold, William Arden Egerton, son of Rev. J.W. Arnold, Panmure, V.
Ash, Basil Drummond, son of Rev. C.D. Ash, Southport, Q.
Atkinson, Lieut., son of Rev. J.C. Atkinson, Clayton, V.
Brain, Edward George, son of Rev. Alfred Brain, Stratford, V.
Champion, G.S., son of Rev. A.H. Champion, Bungendore, N.S.W.
Collisson, Frederick Norman, son of Rev. R.K. Collisson, Crafers, S.A.
Debenham, Lieut. Herbert, son of late Rev. J.W. Debenham, Bowral, N.S.W.
Drought, Capt. Charles, son of Canon Drought, Toorak, V.
Elliott, Angelus Basil, son of Rev. R. Elliott, Bombala, N.S.W.
Gribble, Norman, son of Rev. A.H. Gribble, Coonamble, N.S.W.
Hart, Christodas Frederick, son of Rev. F.W. Hart, Bellingen, N.S.W.
Howell-Price, Lieut.-Co. Owen Glendower, M.C., son of Rev. J. Howell-Price, Waterloo, N.S.W.
Kelly, Lieut. George E.E., son of Rev. R.H.D. Kelly, Millthorpe, N.S.W.
Kemmis, William Scott, son of Canon Kemmis, Glen Innes, N.S.W.
Lane, Lieut. Clement Frederick Wills, son of Rev. H.W. Lane, Coburg, Vic.
Macartney, Capt. George, son of late Rev. H.B. Macartney, Caulfield, V.
Maryon-Wilson, Augustus George, son of late Rev. G. Maryon-Wilson, Campbell Town, Tas.
Moncrieff, James Bain, son of Rev. S.S. Moncrieff, Mitchell, Q.
Oakes, Arthur Wellesley, son of Archdeacon Oakes, Kelso, N.S.W.
Penty, Robert Eric, son of Rev. R. Penty, Sydney, N.S.W.
Phillips, --, son of Rev. W.A. Phillips, Glen Huntly, V.
Ritchie, Harold, son of Rev. W.J. Ritchie, Newcastle, N.S.W.
Rose, Harald Herbert, son of Rev. H.J. Rose, Strathfield, N.S.W.
Rushforth, Norman Mervyn, son of Canon Rushforth, Murrurundi, N.S.W.
Stephenson, Lieut. Keith Robert, son of Rev. A.R. Stephenson, Box Hill, V.
Willcox, Christopher, son of late Archdeacon Wilcox, Wangaratta, V.

ON ACTIVE SERVICE

Aldis, V. de Lisle, son of Canon Aldis, Westmead, N.S.W.
Anderson, Sleeman and Ralph, sons of the Bishop of Riverina, N.S.W.
Armstrong, John Henry Brian, son of the Bishop of Wangaratta, V.
Baber, A.H., son of late Rev. Charles Baber, Petersham, N.S.W.
Baglin, Eric William Senior, son of Rev. J.T. Baglin, Footscray, V.
Best, Cecil Paul, son of Rev. Joseph Best, Croydon, N.S.W.
Bishop, Selwyn T., son of Archdeacon Bishop, Kyneton, V.
Blackburn, Col. C. Bickerton and Captain Arthur Seaforth, V.C., sons of late Canon Blackburn, Woodville, S.A.
Brain, Alfred William, son of Rev. A. Brain, Stratford, V.
Brazier, Colonel, son of late Rev. Amos Brazier, Melbourne, V.
Brett, Reginald, son of Rev. R.M. Brett, Healesville, V.
Bryant, Stephen, and John, sons of Rev. H. Bryant, Burwood, N.S.W.
Caffin, S., son of Rev. Alfred Caffin, Ascot Vale, V.
Carr, Howard James Christopher, son of Rev. H.J. Carr, Dunolly, V.
Carver, Bartram, Ashley, and Charles, sons of Canon Carver, Goulburn, N.S.W.
Caton, William Calus Pelham Clarke and James Hubert Henry, sons of Rev. John Caton, Coburg, V.
Chase, Theyre Peltham and Cedric Weigall, sons of Rev. A.P. Chase, Elsternwick, V.
Clarke, Major Cyril Lowther, son of the Archbishop of Melbourne, V.
Clark-Kennedy, Allan Gordon, and Frank George, sons of Rev. W.F. Clark-Kennedy, Mulgoa, N.S.W.

Claydon, Sidney and Stewart, sons of Rev. E.H.B. Claydon, Burwood, N.S.W.

Colisson, Donald Marsden Reginald, son of Rev. R.K. Colisson, Crafs, S.A.

Cooke, Reginald, son of late Rev. R.W. Cooke, Bright, V.

Cooper, Arthur Edward Hamilton, son of the late Bishop Cooper, Armidale, N.S.W.

Corlette, Major Jno. C., son of late Rev. Dr. Corlette, Ashfield, N.S.W.

Corlette, Bernard Christian, son of Rev. A.C. Corlette, Sutton Forest, N.S.W.

Crigan, Wakefield Clifford and Alexander Henry, sons of Rev. H.H. Crigan, Murrumburrah, N.S.W.

Crisford, Edgar, son of late Rev. E. Crisford, Gordon, N.S.W.

Cross, Major Kenneth Stuart, son of Rev. G.F. Cross, Williamstown, V.

D'Arcy Irvine, Tom G. and D.C., sons of Archdeacon D'Arcy Irvine, Sydney, N.S.W.

Debenham, Major Frank, son of late Rev. J.W. Debenham, Bowral, N.S.W.

Dickinson, —, son of Rev. R.B. Dickinson, Surrey Hills, V.

Drought, Lieut. John Smergen, son of Canon Drought, Toorak, V.

Edwardes, Hugh Basil Knox, and Cedric Alban Napier, sons of the Rev. W. Harry Edwardes, Newcastle, N.S.W.


Ellis, Gover Blom, son of Rev. Walter Ellis, Auburn, N.S.W.

Ethell, Joseph, son of Rev. A.W. Ethell, Laidley, Q.

Eva, Rev. Austin F. (chaplain), son of late Canon Eva, Maryborough, Q.

Fielding, Lieut. Morris Glanville, son of Rev. S.G. Fielding, Paddington, N.S.W.

Garbett, Lieut. Alan M., son of Rev. M.G.H. Garbett, Raymond Terrace, N.S.W.

Garland, David James, son of Canon Garland, Brisbane, Q.

Glover, Lieut. Harry, son of late Rev. Jas. Glover, Goulburn, N.S.W.

Godby, Capt. William H., son of Dean Godby, Melbourne, V.

Good, John Brenton, son of Rev. John Good, Carlton, V.

Green, Rev. Walter Arthur Gerard (chaplain), son of Bishop Green, Ballarat, V.

Gribble, Rev. A.H. (chaplain), son of late Rev. J.B. Gribble, Yarrabah, Queensland.

Gribble, Clement, son of Rev. A.H. Gribble, Coonamble, N.S.W.

Grime, Augustine George, Lieut. Cyril Gurney, Captain Edward Greenway, and Claude Vivian, sons of Rev. Sydney C.J. Grime, Newcastle, N.S.W.

Groser, --, son of Canon Groser, Midland Junction, W.A.

Hancock, J., son of Canon Hancock, Essendon, Vic.

Hart, A.S., son of Rev. S. Hart, Picton Lakes, N.S.W.

Haviland, Edwin Ernest and Athol Charles, sons of Archdeacon Haviland, Cobar, N.S.W.

Hayman, Edward Osborne and Philip Barclay, sons of Archdeacon Hayman, Melbourne, V.

Heffernan, William Benjamin, son of Rev. E. Heffernan, Mittagong, N.S.W.

Holliday, Rev. W.M. (chaplain), and H.A.S., sons of Rev. H.T. Holliday, Bexley, N.S.W.

Hough, R.J., son of late Canon Hough, Randwick, N.S.W.


Hudson, Cedric, son of Rev. W. Hudson, Clifton Hill, V.

Hunt, Lieut. Randall, son of Rev. H.F. Hunt, Allora, Q.

Jenkyn, Cyril, son of Canon Jenkyn, Ipswich, Q.

Jobson, Hubert Clifton, son of Rev. H. Jobson, Warialda, N.S.W.

Kelly, Rev. Maurice (chaplain), son of Rev. R.C. Nugent Kelly, Hobart, Tas.


Kemmis, Geoffrey Scott, son of Canon Kemmis, Glen Innes, N.S.W.

Killworth, George, son of Rev. A. Killworth, W., Maitland, N.S.W.

King, R.V., son of Rev. R.R. King, Gordon, N.S.W.

Lane, George Odiarine Gabriel, son of Rev. H.W. Lane, Coburg, V.

Langley, Aylmer John, son of late Bishop Henry Langley, Bendigo, V.

Langley, Frederick Barker, son of the Bishop of Bendigo, V.

Lasseron, --, son of late Rev. D. Lasseron, Lithgow, N.S.W.

Linton, Rev. Hugh (chaplain), son of late Bishop Linton, Riverina, N.S.W.

Louch, Lieut. Thomas Steane, son of Archdeacon Louch, Albany, W.A.
Madgwick, John Sydney, son of late Rev. E.D. Madgwick, Cook's River, N.S.W.

Manning, Hubert Selwyn and Alfred Crosbie, sons of late Rev. Dr. Manning, Sydney, N.S.W.

Martin, Roy, and Cyril, son of Archdeacon Martin, Marrickville, N.S.W.

Martyn, Herbert W., son of late Rev. W.M. Martyn, Taralga, N.S.W.

McIntosh, Lieut. A.M., son of Rev. George McIntosh, Chatswood, N.S.W.

Miller, R., son of Rev. H.F. Miller, Gisborne, V.

Moberly, Neutral Bay, N.S.W.

Mullens, Cedric Southcote, and Rev. Frederick Barker, sons of the late Rev. F.B. Mullens, Ryde, N.S.W.

Newth, O.A., son of Rev. J.A. Newth, Sydney, N.S.W.

Noake, Cyril and Rev. Arthur (chaplain), sons of Rev. R. Noake, Enmore, N.S.W.

Oberlin-Harris, J.R., son of Rev. J. Oberlin-Harris, Pymble, N.S.W.

Osborn, Rev. J.E. Norman (chaplain), son of Canon Osborn, Lutwyche, Q.

Pain, Lieut. Kenneth Wellesley, son of the Bishop of Gippsland, V.

Parish, W.O., son of Rev. Dr. Parish, Beverley, W.A.

Penty, Basil, son of Rev. R. Penty, Sydney, N.S.W.

Raymond, H., son of Rev. A.R. Raymond, Maffra, V.

Regg, Cyril, son of Archdeacon Regg, Morpeth, N.S.W.

Richmond, Rev George S. (chaplain), son of Rev. F. Richmond, Wollstonecraft, N.S.W.

Riley, --, son of the Archbishop of Perth, W.A.

Ritchie, Hugh, son of Rev. W.J. Ritchie, Newcastle, N.S.W.

Rooke, Mark, son of Rev. E. Rooke, Toowoomba, Q.

Rose, Bernard, and Lionel, sons of Rev. H.J. Rose, Strathfield, N.S.W.

Rushforth, Cyril Wareham, son of Canon Rushforth, Murrurundi, N.S.W.

Sharp, Lewis Hey, son of Canon Hey Sharp, Sydney, N.S.W.

Shearman, Lieut. Cyril and Stewart Frederick, sons of late Rev. J. Shearman, Liverpool, N.S.W.

Sproule, Capt. G.M., son of late Rev. G. Sproule, Elsternwick, V.

Stretch, 2nd Lieut. Thomas Noel Heath and Hubert Francis Keith, sons of the Bishop of Newcastle, N.S.W.

Sutton, Robert Esmond, son of Canon Sutton, Kew, V.

Taylor, --, son of late Rev. George J. Taylor, Rutherglen, V.
Thomas, C.C.E., son of Rev. C.M. Thomas, Epping, N.S.W.
Thwaites, Berthold, son of late Rev. R. Thwaites, Horsham, V.
Todd, Charles Ord Pym, son of Rev. R.O. Todd, Lidcombe, N.S.W.
Tucker, H. Lyde and Rev. Gerard Kennedy (chaplain), sons of
late Canon Tucker, South Yarra, V.
Tufnell, Brig.-Gen., son of late Bishop Tufnell, Brisbane, Q.
Vaughan, Major Percy W., son of Canon Vaughan, Summer Hill,
N.S.W.
Veal, Lieut. H., son of Rev. E.G. Veal, Dandenong, V.
Wagg, Basil Selwyn, son of Rev. J. Wagg, Mortlake, V.
Watkins, Theo., son of late Archdeacon Watkins, Fremantle, W.A.
Webber, Leonard H., son of late Rev. E.H. Webber, Burwood, N.S.W.
White, Lieut. Newport Benjamin, son of Rev. B. Newport White,
East Melbourne, V.
White, Percival G., son of late Archdeacon White, Muswellbrook,
N.S.W.
White, Selwyn H.V., son of Rev. W.M. White, Mortdale, N.S.W.
Whyte, Alan Lewis and Richard Theodore, sons of Canon Whyte,
Lismore, N.S.W.
Williams, H.G.B. and J.H., sons of late Rev. J.H. Williams,
Peak Hill, N.S.W.
Wilson, Ernest S., son of late Archdeacon Wilson, Dubbo, N.S.W.
Woods, Maitland, son of Rev. W. Maitland Woods, V.D., Ariah
Park, N.S.W.
Woods, Vincent, son of Rev. J.S. Woods, Moreland, V.
Wright, Eric T., and E. Marsden, sons of Canon Wright,
Merewether, N.S.W.
Young, Harry Fleming, son of late Rev. R.W. Young, Burwood,
N.S.W.

Source: Church Standard, 17 November 1916.
Note: These letters are contained in a file in Australian Archives, Canberra. The file is a large one and consists largely of press cuttings recounting the story of Mannix's world tour of 1921. It also contains seven letters which passed between the British representative at the Vatican, Count de Salis, and the Secretary of State of the Vatican, Cardinal Gasparri, relating to Mannix's war-time behaviour. The file is incomplete as allusions to other letters show. It is included here because it shows the force of the Vatican's displeasure with Mannix.

The first letter, written by W. Langley of the Foreign Office before the second referendum campaign in Australia, instructs Count de Salis to acquaint the Vatican with Mannix's activities. Langley alleges that Mannix was disloyal and very unpopular with Australian Catholics. He mentions charges of greater substance contained in a Colonial Office dossier but, unfortunately, a copy of this is not included in the file. Nor is the Vatican's reply to any representation de Salis may have made included.

In the second, Cardinal Gasparri refers to Vatican attempts to bring Mannix into line. The letter is a reply to a further letter from de Salis which is not included in the file. De Salis had complained, apparently, that the Apostolic Delegate, Cattaneo, had allied himself with Mannix. This probably referred to Cattaneo's March 1918 visit to

---

1Prime Minister's Department, Correspondence file, Secret and Confidential Series (Third System): 'Archbishop Mannix 1917-1927', CRS A1606, item SC F42/1.
Melbourne when he was denied a civic reception. Mannix complained strenuously about the Lord Mayor's 'discourtesy'.

The third letter transmits Gasparri's letter to A.J. Balfour, the Foreign Secretary.

The fourth letter, in French, from Gasparri seeks to exonerate Cattaneo from charges of complicity with Mannix by quoting a letter which Cattaneo sent Mannix instructing him to moderate his behaviour.

The fifth merely forwards the fourth to London.

The sixth is a more extensive reply from Gasparri and elaborates the points made in the second and fourth letters. Gasparri mentions that Mannix now seems to have reformed, drawing on Cattaneo's May meeting as evidence. He complains that in some ways Mannix had been provoked. He also warns that the Vatican cannot control Mannix completely because of his local popularity.

In the seventh letter de Salis recounts a private conversation he had with Cattaneo in 1922 in which he congratulated the Apostolic Delegate for the way in which he handled Mannix.

There are no further references to the war years in the file. Unfortunately, other files mentioned in the Australian Archives' guides referring to Mannix and Cattaneo, have been lost.¹

---

¹The lost files are:

Governor-General's Office, General Correspondence, 1917-1927, CP78/22, item 1915-16/178 'Apostolic Delegate from Rome' and item 1918/306 'Irish Convention'.

Governor-General's Office, Correspondence Relating to the War 1914-1918, item 1917/89/1072, 'Mannix, Daniel R.C. Archbishop of Melbourne' and item 1918/89/1000, 'Dr Mannix'.
Sir,

I transmit to you, herewith, copies of correspondence received from the Colonial Office regarding Dr. Mannix, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne.

You will observe that Dr. Mannix is the subject of strong suspicion to the Government of the Commonwealth and that he is also decidedly unpopular in Roman Catholic circles in Australia.

I request, therefore, that you will bring the substance of the enclosed correspondence to the knowledge of the Cardinal Secretary of State and will inform His Eminence that it is quite clear that Dr. Mannix has adopted an anti-British attitude, and you should express the hope that the Vatican may find it possible to take some action which will induce the Archbishop to moderate his utterances. Otherwise the Government of the Commonwealth may find it necessary to take action against him under the Defence of the Realm Regulations, which they are naturally loth to do.

I am etc.,

(SD) W. LANGLEY

THE COUNT DE SALIS, K.C.M.G., C.V.O.,
etc., etc., etc.

Excellency,

In reply to the communication made to me by Your Excellency on the 14th instant, in regard to the attitude adopted by the Archbishop of Melbourne
Monsignor Mannix, in opposition to compulsory service in Australia and in subsequent public demonstrations and also in regard to the part which the Apostolic Delegate is said to have taken in these demonstrations I deem it advisable to give you the following further information.

First of all it must be remembered that when the first Referendum for conscription took place the then Apostolic Delegate published in all the newspapers a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Brisbane, by which the clergy were forbidden to speak in church of conscription in any way whatever. It has been acknowledged that all the bishops and priests without exception conformed to this prohibition. On the other hand Monsignor Mannix on various occasions made public anti-conscription speeches at meetings held outside the churches, and since these speeches gave rise to heated discussions in the press and to dissensions even among Catholics, the Apostolic Delegate did not fail, at the moment of his departure from Australia, to draw the attention of Monsignor Mannix to the matter.

Notwithstanding this Monsignor Mannix assumed the same attitude at the time of the second Referendum last January, [sic] and the same deplorable consequences followed. But as soon as the S. Congregation of Propaganda had news of this (Australia is under the jurisdiction of that Congregation) they reminded the Prelate in a letter dated April 3rd, that the office of a Pastor is to pacify souls, to allay discords and prevent their arising or becoming embittered. At the same time they appealed to his zeal and prudence with a view to his being careful in future, whilst maintaining his freedom of judgment and of private action, to prevent arrogant discussions and unpleasant and dangerous friction.

I must in truth add that personal attacks against Monsignor Mannix on the part of various newspapers and certain political personages, as also the false
interpretation put on certain of his words, have contributed not a little to provoking his resentment.

In regard to the Apostolic Delegate the Holy See will not fail to call on him to furnish an account of what is said to have happened at Melbourne and if the facts should be established as they have been reported it may prove that the Delegate was taken unawares and that he did not realize the political significance which it was intended to attach to the demonstration.

He had in point of fact received instructions to avoid in every possible way language or associations which could imply any kind of interest in political questions at issue in Australia. In any case the Holy See will repeat these instructions so that in future no such incident should occur.

(Signed) P. CARD. GASPARRI

Letter 3

PALAZZO BORGHESE, ROME.

June 30th, 1918.

Sir,

I communicated privately to the Vatican the contents of your despatch No. 40 of the 29th, ultimo, regarding the attitude of Monsignor Mannix, and of Monsignor Cattaneo, the Apostolic Delegate in Australia.

The Cardinal Secretary of State has now sent me a Note, of which copy and translation are enclosed, describing the action taken by Monsignor Carretti [sic] before his departure from Australia, and giving the sense of a letter which the S. Congregation of Propaganda addressed to Monsignor Manniz [sic] on the 3rd of April last. The present Apostolic Delegate,
Monsignor Cattaneo, has been requested to furnish a report on what occurred at Melbourne and the instructions given to him by the Holy See in regard to his attitude in political questions will be repeated.

I have, &c.,
(for Count de Salis)
(Signed) HUGH GAI SFORD

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
A.J. BALFOUR, O.M., M.P.,
&c., &c, &c.

Letter 4
DAL VATICANÓ,
le 10 juillet, 1918.

En se référant à sa Note du 24 juin dernier No.66756 au sujet de l'attitude prise par Mgr. Mannix, Archeveque de Melbourne, dans la question de la conscription obligatoire en Australie, le Cardinal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Sainteté s'empresse d'informer Votre Excellence que, d'après les renseignements qui viennent de lui parvenir, le Delegué Apostoliques en Australie, à peine arrivé à son poste, avait adressé à Mgr. Mannix une lettre ainsi concue:-

"Permettez moi, Monseigneur, de Vous adresser quelques parole confidentielles sur un sujet "qui me parait d'une grande importance. A peine arrivé à mon poste, il m'est impossible sans doute d'avoir des idées précises sur les personnes et les choses. Cependant je ne puis pas Vous cacher que mon attention a été déjà attirée de plusieurs parts sur l'attitude prise par Votre Excellence dans la brulante question actuelle du recrutement militaire. La lettre de mon prédécesseur écrite à ce sujet à l'Archeveque Mgr. Brisbane reste dans toute sa
vigueur et aujourd'hui plus que jamais il faut agir avec une grande prudence. En vous écrivant ce qui précède, je n'ai certainement pas l'intention de juger l'activité de Votre Excellence, mais uniquement de travailler dans l'intérêt de l'Eglise".

Cette lettre, que le Cardinal Secrétaire d'Etat se fait un agréable devoir de communiquer à Votre Excellence avec prière de vouloir bien en informer Votre Gouvernement, dissipera sans aucun doute tous les bruits que des personnalités politiques ont répandu au sujet de l'attitude de Mgr. Cattaneo dans cette importante question.

Le Cardinal soussigné saisit volontiers &c...
&c.-

(Signé) P. Card. Gasparri

A Son Excellence
Mr. Le Comte de Salis
Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre
Plenipotentiaire de S.M. Britannique
près le Saint-Siège.

Letter 5 Palazzo Borghese, Rome.
July 11th, 1918.

Sir:-

With reference to my despatch No.68 of the 30th, ultimo I enclose copy of a further Note from the Cardinal Secretary of State on the subject of the attitude taken up by Archbishop Mannix in regard to compulsory service in Australia.

Cardinal Gasparri requests me to communicate to you copy of a letter which the Apostolic Delegate on his arrival in Australia addressed to Monsignor Mannix. This letter, His Eminence has no doubt, will dispose of all the reports
circulated in regard to the attitude of Monsignor Cattaneo.

I have, &c.,
(For Count de Salis)
(sd) HUGH G AISFORD

The Right Honourable
A.J. Balfour O.M., M.P.
&c., &c., &c.

Letter 6

VATICAN.
August 22nd, 1918.

Excellency,

With reference to the confidential communication which Your Excellency made to me with regard to the Archbishop of Melbourne, Monsignor Mannix, and more particularly with regard to several speeches made by him, I think it opportune in the first place to refer to the Note on this subject which I had the honour to address to Your Excellency on the 24th of June and to the further one on the 10th July.

In the documents referred to I took the opportunity of stating the repeated recommendations which have been made to the Archbishop, more especially those sent to him through the S. Congregazione de Propaganda. And with regard to this I may observe that the letter of the S. Congregazione, forwarded on the 3rd of April of this year, cannot have reached him before the middle of June, while the speeches to which Your Excellency has drawn attention must have been made very much earlier.

Some, in fact, were pronounced during the struggle on the first Referendum for military conscription, that is to say in 1916, and others
on the occasion of the second Referendum and of the general strike, that is, during the first months of this year. [sic]

It is necessary therefore to wait some time longer to see whether Monsignor Mannix will take heed of the recommendations made to him. From a Report of the Apostolic Delegate, dated 28th May, 1918, recently received, it is apparently to be hoped that the Archbishop of Melbourne will, in the future keep to the line [sic] of prudence and moderation which have been recommended to him.

Indeed, Monsignor Cattaneo informs me that, on account of the present delicate political situation of Australia and the irritation caused by the struggles for and against conscription, he has thought it opportune to convocate in Sydney all the Archbishops in order to exchange ideas as to the best means of re-establishing calm and of avoiding further causes of trouble. The meeting took place on the 15th of May and after mature discussion Monsignor Mannix himself proposed the following deliberation which was unanimously approved:

"In view of the present difficulties it is necessary that the bishops and clergy should use such prudence and caution in dealing with public questions. Public declarations must be well-weighed, especially when relating to conscription, recruiting, the Irish question and other matters concerning the participation in the war of this country: care must be taken to avoid saying or doing anything which in present circumstances may estrange anyone, and everything must be avoided which can give cause for the accusation against Catholics of disloyalty to the Empire and to the legitimate aspirations of the country. The
Archbishops do not think it necessary to make public declarations concerning this but will communicate these deliberations to their own Suffragans."

Notwithstanding this decision, which shows clearly by what sentiments the Australian Episcopate is animated, the Holy See will not fail to recommend the most faithful and complete observance of the abovementioned decision and to take care that displeasing incidents are not repeated.

On the other hand, as I already observed in the Note of 24th June, the personal attacks made against Monsignor Mannix by various newspapers and by some political personages, as well as the sinister interpretations given to some of his expressions, have contributed not a little in provoking his resentment.

Attacks and interpretations, however, of this kind have not been wanting latterly and in violent enough form, as is seen in the Australian papers just arrived, with regard to a matter which Monsignor Mannix himself has since publicly explained. I allude to the invitation, sent to him by eminent persons of Melbourne, to be present at a meeting for recruiting, an invitation which he thought well not to accept. His refusal gave occasion to several newspapers of Melbourne and Sydney to denounce him as an opponent of voluntary recruiting, and therefore as a defeatist (disfattista) and disloyal subject of the Empire. To such accusations Monsignor Mannix has replied by letter and by a public speech declaring that he has never deterred anyone from volunteering for the war, and if he refused the invitation already mentioned, it was because, by accepting it, he would have found himself in the company of his own detractors and because the Mayor of Melbourne, who was to preside at the meeting, had refused (contrary to good Australian custom) the request that a public reception might be given in the Town Hall to the
Apostolic Delegate, a reception which, a few days after the Delegate's visit, was conceded to other persons whose special position was much inferior to that of the Representative of the Holy See.

From this it appears evident that in this painful question of the Archbishop of Melbourne personal resentment plays no small part. The Federal Government would therefore be doing good work in using its authority with certain newspapers of Melbourne and Sydney to induce them to moderate their language, not only with regard to the Archbishop of Melbourne but also towards the Catholics, who have more than once been accused of disloyalty to the Empire and of sympathy for the Central Empires on the ground of absurd stories that the Central Empires have promised the Holy Father the restitution of the Temporal Power.

It grieves me to add that the same absurd story has been repeated by a high political personage of Australia, a fact which I have learned from an unimpeachable source.

Finally, it must not be forgotten that Monsignor Mannix, wrongly or rightly, enjoys great influence upon the working classes—proofs of this are the imposing and clamorous demonstrations of Melbourne and Sydney—therefore, severe measures taken against him even by the Holy See, would undoubtedly aggravate the situation and create grave difficulties for the Government itself.

The Holy See is confident that His Majesty's Government will find the foregoing explanations satisfactory and with the fervent wish besides that Monsignor Mannix's line of conduct will henceforth conform to the rules laid down by the Episcopate and approved by the Holy See.

I have etc.

(Sgd.) P. CARD. GASPARRI.
My Lord,

Monsignor Cattaneo, the Apostolic Delegate in Australia, who would appear to have been summoned to Rome to report on the affairs of his mission, called on me a few days ago. Monsignor Cattaneo went out in the summer of 1917, when he succeeded Monsignor Cerretti the Nuncio in Paris.

In the course of conversation I alluded to the difficulties there had been during the first year or so of his appointment and the representations made by the Australian Government respecting the political activities of certain members of the higher clergy. In the last twelve months, that is to say since the visit ad limina of the Archbishop of Melbourne in April, 1921 no further complaints seem to have been made; in fact nothing more from Australia had been heard. I congratulated him.

Monsignor Cattaneo spoke in reply respecting the Irish situation and the agreement arrived at by His Majesty's Government. The proposed settlement was very liberal and in Australia the feeling among the Irish appeared to be that they had got much more than they could have hoped for. His own position in Australia was often made very difficult. For instance, he would be invited as representative of the Pope to be present at the opening of a church or convent or some other function of the most praiseworthy character; before the proceedings were over one of the local clergy, even a bishop, would get up and without warning deliver a speech devoted largely to current politics. The practice was anything but desirable; it was the more difficult to put it down as the people seemed to expect it.

I have etc.,

(Sgd) I. de Salis.

The Marquess Curzon of Kedleston, K.G.

etc., etc., etc.
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