Launceston Wesleyan Methodists 1832 – 1849

Contributions, Commerce, Conscience

by

Anne Valeria Bailey

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Tasmania
October 2008
This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 and later.

Anne Valeria Bailey, October 2008

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree in any tertiary institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due acknowledgment is made in the text of the thesis.

Anne Valeria Bailey, October 2008
Abstract

This thesis argues that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists 1832-49 were a highly unusual global group. With an elite component, they went far beyond the normal range of colonial Wesleyan Methodist establishments. They have slipped through the net as regards their rightful place in history. What is being rescued from obscurity is this Society, which passed through initial missionary and strategising moves to community involvement, consecration of wealth, status, commercial success, banking involvement and then finally political involvement. It is argued that, in the short time frame designated, it was unusual for a first generation Wesleyan Methodist group to have achieved so much. The thesis is presented in two parts.

For an understanding of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, the first part lays out the background of the formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Society, showing the varied influences that came to bear on John Wesley’s patchwork of developing theology, as well as Wesley’s evangelical economic principles. These economic principles are shown to have altered in the early nineteenth century with the rise of the Wesleyan Methodist middle class man. With the rise of evangelical international missionary enterprise, Wesleyan men of commerce understood that they had to consecrate their wealth to fund missionary endeavours of the Society. The Wesleyan Methodist mission trajectory to the South Seas is discussed with the failed early colonial missions of Sydney and Hobart.

The second part details successful missionary endeavours towards the developing merchant town of Launceston. These endeavours began with the coming of Philip Oakden in 1833, and the forming of an elite within the Society who were prepared to shoulder financial responsibility. The Wesleyan Methodist spirit of egalitarianism in a penal situation is discussed, with a demographic study as well as a discussion of the global shift in liturgy. The Wesleyan Methodist conscience is explained through an examination of a particular spiritual diary. The acquisition of status is explained through land and property ownership, jury list membership and involvement in philanthropic and civic activities. With the establishment of
status, the thesis makes a strong case for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist contribution to banking, and this is verified with a banking table. Emphasis is given to the extraordinary involvement of Philip Oakden in the establishment of the second tier imperial bank, The Union Bank of Australia (the predecessor to the ANZ Bank). Political involvement for the Wesleyan Methodists in the 1840s is charted giving regard to the Teetotal Society and some growing resentments which led to the formation of the London Agency and Anti-Transportation Leagues, both of which had considerable Wesleyan Methodist input.

The thesis contributes to the body of knowledge regarding worldwide Wesleyan Methodist establishments before 1850. It is the first time that a group of Australian colonial Wesleyan Methodists has been examined in such detail for their contributions and achievements. The thesis concludes that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, 1832-49 were an outstanding group who far surpassed normal Wesleyan Methodist establishments.
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John Wesley
Introduction

Histories of Methodism worldwide do not incorporate the Australian colonial experience of groups and establishments. This has been left to local authors. Leading British historian David Hempton emphasises the need for individual studies of small group Wesleyan Methodist establishments and makes a plea ‘for sophisticated local studies showing what the Methodist message was, and how it was heard and appropriated’. He sees this type of study as a counterbalance to the larger histories which lack the finer detail. In this thesis, it is argued that between 1832 and 1849 the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist group in Van Diemen's Land with its elite component, though numerically small, went far beyond the range of Wesleyan Methodist colonial establishments. What is being pinpointed and rescued from historical obscurity, is a highly unusual, globally networked, self-reliant, Wesleyan Methodist society, which passed through the initial missionary and strategising moves to community participation, consecration of wealth, status, commercial success, banking involvement and then finally political connections.

It will be argued that in the short time frame designated, it was unheard of for a Wesleyan Methodist group to have achieved so much, particularly in the areas of banking and political involvement. These were not normally pre-eminent concerns for Wesleyan Methodists, particularly not in a first generation group. Other Wesleyan Methodist groups, for example Nova Scotia, needed two generations to have achieved so much. Allan B. Robertson’s study of Wesleyan Methodist businessmen in Nova Scotia also noted that Methodist merchants of Nova Scotia ‘have not received the attention their influence should merit’. The behaviour of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite was sufficiently startling for them to have been given more regard by historians. The study commences in 1832 because that year details the early tentative moves of the successful


mission into Launceston. This study ends in 1849 as by then many of the Launcetown Wesleyan Methodist elite had dispersed and gone their separate ways. Although the dynamic group had evaporated and fragmented by 1849, their influence and achievements lasted much longer. The biographical appendix will demonstrate that the dispersal of the group was due to movements to Port Phillip and abroad, mainly for insolvency, death and further commercial opportunities. As well, there were withdrawals from the Launcestown Wesleyan Methodist Society.

The normal Wesleyan missionary spirit, rigorous mental attitude and whirlwind energy will be shown to be intertwined with dynamic entrepreneurial, commercial and community interaction. At the same time, we must acknowledge the duality which Wesleyan Methodists had inherited from John Wesley, the constraint of the Stewardship of Wealth followed by the Consecration of Wealth. Hempton’s question about what it was in the local conditions that enabled Wesleyan Methodists to make gains, is a springboard for the thesis. It was, of course, a fact that Van Diemen's Land was a penal colony where at any given time half the population were convicts or ex-convicts. This situation initially produced a strong egalitarian spirit in the Wesleyan Methodists and later political pressure towards Anti-Transportation.

The contribution of this thesis will be to show that this group were significantly unusual in their achievements. They have slipped through the net as regards their rightful place in Wesleyan Methodist historiography. No attempt has been made to accord to this small but potent group recognition of their contributions to the life of Launceston, as well as recognition of the forces that drove them. Up to the present, no colonial Australian Wesleyan Methodist group has been examined so closely for its socio-economic political connections and achievements, together with the underbelly of its behaviour. There has been no appreciation of what a powerful group they were in Launceston, Van Diemen's Land, in the period detailed. This thesis will address the question of how the pre-

---

3 1832 is the year when Francis French commenced preaching in the open air at the foot of Windmill Hill in Launceston.
eminence of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists of 1832-1849 came about.

**Historiography**

Various histories in Australia have been written about the Wesleyan Methodists as pious groups, and biographical studies have been written about individual Wesleyan Methodists such as Philip Oakden, Henry Reed and Walter Powell, the latter acknowledging commercial and spiritual contributions. No Australian historians have written about the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists in anything but a chronological and uncritical style, with an understandably biased and commemorative emphasis. As Hempton writes, ‘Methodist history can no more be brought to life by the celebratory interests of its staunchest defenders, than by savage attacks’. Tasmanian Church histories by the Rev. C.C. Dugan, R.D. Pretyman and M.E.J. Stansall emphasise the ministerial and chapel circuit development without exploring the contributory role of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite of that period. These partisan Wesleyan Methodist historians could have augmented their histories with more detailed background of the inherited forces and values that drove the actions of the group and also given an understanding of the penal circumstances which surrounded them. It is possible that these explanations were not forthcoming because the audience for these histories was already indoctrinated into the behaviour and surrounding circumstances of the Wesleyan Methodists. Although Lester Hovenden’s thesis about Methodism in Launceston 1864-1891 is outside the parameters of this thesis, it does acknowledge the energetic contributions of such figures as John Gleadow, Isaac Sherwin and John Crookes who remained active into the late nineteenth century.

---

Further, the Australian Wesleyan Methodist Magazine *The Spectator*, sees the group as a strong force with a high profile and connections to public influence, but fails to develop the idea, particularly that of their commercial influence. However, it is reassuring to note that *The Spectator* recognised the Launceston Methodists as being politically in the forefront of the anti-transportation fight. The hint of prosperity is also repeated by Alex Tyrell when he quotes the Rev. Joseph Orton as referring to his ‘brethren and opulent friends at Launceston’. Patricia Grimshaw’s review of *A Sphere of Benevolence* asks for ‘a fuller insight into Orton’s personal relationships and greater detail on the private aspects of his public performances’. This thesis produces a slice of that insight into Orton, particularly into his handling of the Crookes case and the liturgy struggle. Individual Launceston Wesleyan Methodists have also been discussed for their personal achievements. One such case is Sir Hudson Fysh’s book about his grandfather, Henry Reed, where he concentrated upon Reed’s achievements without positioning him in a strong group. Another book about Henry Reed, by his widow Margaret Reed, is slanted and sanctimonious, without any elaboration of his commercial activities, except for the telling reference to the day in 1831 when Henry Reed met Mr. Buckle, a leading London metropolitan merchant, and how ‘this small circumstance had a great bearing on his future success’. It concentrates on conversion, Evangelical experience and good works, though it does refer to Reed’s strong objections to debt, as well as the Stewardship of Riches as understood by the Wesleyans. Additionally, in this book, the publication of some of Henry Reed’s correspondence from the 1860s to 1870s gives an excellent and incidental look into Henry Reed’s mind; the tenor of these letters is carried along the same lines as the general

---

11 Margaret S.E. Reed, *Henry Reed, an eventful life devoted to God and man, by his widow, with a preface by General Booth* (London, 1906), p. 41.
anxieties and constraints which governed the Wesleyan Methodists. As in many Wesleyan Methodist memorials, the spiritual assessment has been skilfully adjusted by Mrs. Reed to suit her requirements.

In the wider historical field in Tasmania, Lloyd Robson has viewed the Wesleyan Methodists’ role as mainly endeavour in the field of hospitals and gaols, whilst admitting to ‘their large prosperous numbers’. Hartwell, in his economic history, has ignored the commercial contributions of men such as Henry Reed and Philip Oakden in favour of the Hentys as the only viable merchants in Launceston. Philip Oakden’s part in establishing the Union Bank of Australia has been thoroughly defined in An Early Tasmanian Story, as well as his Wesleyan Methodism, and much less so in Butlin. Frank Broeze highlights the importance the Union Bank of Australia played in the economic life of Launceston, Hobart and surrounding areas of Port Phillip, but does not highlight the Wesleyan Methodist connection of Philip Oakden. However, Broeze does note and understand the pious Evangelical connections common to other directors of the Union Bank of Australia. Colin White’s review of Mr. Brooks and the Australian Trade emphasises that ‘it is a traditional business history, more descriptive than theoretical, but a major addition to the body of relevant case studies…it also has the value of highlighting the serious principal – agent problem created by distance, and it unfolds the history in terms of commodity exchange between Britain and the colonies’. It is the understanding of the commodity exchange that is of value to this thesis. Surprisingly, John West

---

12 Ibid, Chapter 10.
14 Robson, History, p. 283.
16 Anne Bailey and Robin Bailey, An Early Tasmanian Story with the Oakdens, Cowies, Parramores, Tullochs and Hoggs (Melbourne 2004), Chapter 5.
18 Frank Broeze, Mr. Brooks and the Australian Trade: Imperial Business in the Nineteenth Century (Melbourne, 1993), p. 100.
does not bother to highlight the founding of the Union Bank in his *History of Tasmania* or pinpoint individual Wesleyans.\(^{20}\)

Michael Roe in *Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia: 1835 – 1851* quotes Henry Reed as being described by the Rev. Nathaniel Turner as a ‘wonderful trophy of saving mercy’,\(^{21}\) and he confines his views on the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist group to commenting on a liturgical dispute with the Rev. J. Orton.\(^{22}\) Admittedly, it is difficult in wider histories to focus on small groups, and John Barrett in *That Better Country*\(^ {23}\) is only able to comment in generalities. Despite a strong Methodist background, he does not seem aware of the strength of early Launceston Wesleyan Methodism and focuses more on educational contributions and generalised inter-faith disagreements.

Alison Head’s excellent thesis on the Wesleyan Methodists of Port Phillip, 1836-50, is confined mainly to the British Wesleyan Missionary Society background of the Port Phillip establishment as well as the founding of the Buntingdale Aboriginal Mission. Its parameters do not extend to the sponsorship and encouragement from the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists in the period 1836 onwards.\(^ {24}\) Renate Howe in her article on the social composition of the Wesleyan Church in Victoria during the nineteenth century does make the corroborative statement ‘that successful Wesleyan business-men saw conflict between the business world and their religion’.\(^ {25}\) She refers briefly to Walter Powell as the epitome of the successful Wesleyan Methodist business man; nevertheless, she does not make the connection that Powell was nurtured in the cradle of Launceston Wesleyan Methodism between 1836 and 1844. This gave him the impetus, precepts and guidelines to become a successful businessman in Port Phillip. The Rev. Irving Benson also praises Walter

---

\(^ {20}\) John West, *History of Tasmania: with Copious Information Respecting the Colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia &c, &c* (Launceston, Tasmania, 1852).


\(^ {22}\) Roe, *Quest for Authority*, p. 131.


Powell as a spiritual Wesleyan Methodist merchant noted for his generosity and philanthropy, without comprehending the forces that shaped him. He does refer to Benjamin Gregory’s book about Walter Powell, *The Thorough Business Man*, which, for this thesis, is an important reference tool. Not only are Walter Powell’s Wesleyan Methodist business principles discussed, but they are backed up by extracts from his spiritual diary commencing in 1846. Barrie Dyster’s article on the Port of Launceston before 1851 is another attempt to acknowledge the opportunistic commercial expertise of Henry Reed and Philip Oakden in the Launceston business world. Nevertheless, he does not seem aware of their Wesleyan Methodism and the part and influence it played in their business matters and success.

When we turn our attention to British histories of Wesleyan Methodism, we find more useful works, though there is not a large field of publications about Wesleyan Methodist groups and individuals and their commercial success. There is of course the tradition of publishing memorials and biographies in *The Methodist Magazine* in the 1800s where prominent deceased lay people are praised for their diligence, active generosity and philanthropy to the Methodist Connexion. Gareth Lloyd comments that ‘their sponsorship was often out of proportion to their numbers’.

George J. Stevenson’s book *City Road Chapel* of 1872, with the considerable anecdotal material and biographical detail of its members, is another example of the persuasive, entrenched approach that celebrated success in commerce, followed closely by philanthropy. One such example quoted was Walter Mariott, a stockbroker, 1783-1815, who for many years gave away half his income to the Wesleyan Methodist cause.

The City Road Chapel and its predecessor John Wesley’s Old Foundry had

---

29 Dr. Gareth Lloyd (Methodist Archives and Research Centre, John Rylands Library, Manchester University), Personal Communication 2 April 2005.
30 George Stevenson, *City Road Chapel* (London 1872).
31 Stevenson, *City Road Chapel*, pp. 572-73.
a congregation and connection with considerable links to the business community and Lloyd considers that the book is particularly valuable because details are included that Stevenson obviously received from eye witnesses, rather than documentary sources.  

Geoffrey Milburn’s *Piety, Profit and Paternalism* gives an excellent picture of Wesleyan Methodists in business in the north of England. It is readily possible from this work to compare similar attitudes and actions in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist group. Milburn describes a Wesleyan Methodist Pocket Book, 1813, with the double page spread of a biblical text on the left page and weekly cash account on the right. He calls this ‘piety on the left, profit on the right’. This was in the spirit of the Launceston group. Milburn also refers to ‘the frankly accepted accommodation between Methodism and the market place’, but he does highlight ‘the fruitful tension’ under which the Wesleyan Methodists existed. He discusses the ever present need in the Methodist Connexion of philanthropy and the Stewardship of Riches. In other words he refers to the Sword of Damocles which hung over the heads of Wesleyan Methodists. Milburn’s large groups of intertwined Wesleyan Methodist businessmen were often enormously wealthy in comparison to the elite Wesleyan Methodist group in Launceston, who were operating on a smaller scale, but in the same spirit and ethos. It is significant in Milburn’s study that, in the forty-six Wesleyan Methodist families, only two were connected to banking; these were the Skinner family of Stockton-on-Tees and Thomas Thompson of Hull. The rest of the families covered the normal range of ship owners, colliery owners, builders, drapers, bakers

---

32 Dr. Gareth Lloyd, personal communication, 2 April 2005.
and manufacturers. Generally, it seems the Wesleyan Methodists were not involved to a great extent in banking in England in the 19th century, however in Cornwall, Wesleyan Methodist William Carne and his son Joseph were an exception. William Carne was a personal friend of John Wesley and the principal supporter of Wesleyanism in his own neighbourhood. He was a partner in the Angarrack tin smelting works near Hayle, and he and Joseph were partners in the bank of Batten and Carne in Pemzance. Stevenson’s book revealed much the same situation of manufacturing mix with a heavy dose of involvement in Friendly Union Benefit societies. Further, Stevenson’s book does not suggest the level of anxiety associated with the giving and the generosity which Milburn emphasises so strongly. Stevenson confines himself merely to citing the unstinting financial support. His brief in 1872 was to keep up the ‘moral tithing’ approach for Wesleyan Methodism, whereas Milburn’s later task in 1983 was to examine and dissect the Wesleyan Methodist north eastern community.

A small connection to banking in a minor way was John Wesley’s Lending Stock which gave an interest free loan to start up a business. This is detailed in James Lackington’s memoir, where he describes his rise to wealth as a bookseller from the initial Wesleyan Methodist loan. Such charitable Wesleyan Methodist loans from a small credit union bear little relation to the Launceston Wesleyan involvement in second tier imperial banking and serve to demonstrate the large gulf which separated the two. They point to the degree of financial sophistication to which the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists had risen in being involved in the Union Bank of Australia.

William Arthur’s book about Samuel Budgett, the successful merchant of Kingswood Hill, Bristol, is an example of the type of Wesleyan Methodist merchant similar to the Launceston men, Reed,

---

37 Obituary, William Carne: 1754-1836, West Briton, 8 July 1836.
Oakden and Powell. Written as a salutary example of the ideal Wesleyan economic man lifted ‘above the trammels of commercial selfishness’, it is said by the author to bring ‘religion and business into closer union’.\textsuperscript{41} It has the added weight of covering the dual concepts of commercial success monitored by the inner self. As in the Walter Powell memoir, the approach has an affinity with the partisan and sanctimonious attitude of Wesleyan Methodists. It does, however, delineate the qualities of character which were peculiar to Wesleyan Methodist businessmen and it would be applicable to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist members. These were vigour, moral tone, piety, systematisation and prompt payment; the book also expounds the convenient Wesleyan theme that ‘commerce does much to bind men to men and nation to nation by the solid tie of commercial interests and finally the errands of Christianity’.\textsuperscript{42} The book is particularly interesting for the convenient rationalisation regarding successful commerce which must have been current in the period, and which would have been popular with the Launceston group. The idea was commerce becomes the imprint of God’s great law of brotherhood, and was a system of mutual service.

An important aspect of Arthur’s book is the section 09 on ‘The Inner Life of Samuel Budget’. It is composed from remaining fragments of Budgett’s diary. There is the same tried and true formula of other Wesleyan and Non–conformist diaries. The familiar resolutions, the failures and the monitoring of the conscience are all present. These entries date from 1823 to 1843 and show, as Arthur writes, ‘the rising merchant knew he had a judge above, and keenly searched his thoughts, words and deeds for offences against his law’.\textsuperscript{43} The law was, of course, the rules and precepts of Wesleyan Methodism. The type of questions Budgett was asking himself were, ‘Have I indulged in spiritual and bodily sloth’, and ‘Have I laboured to do whatsoever I did to the Glory of God’? Arthur infers that, while prosperity was setting in strongly for Budgett, he was liable to be overcome in the heat of his driving plans, hence the need for watchfulness and self examination. It will be shown later in this thesis.

\textsuperscript{41} Arthur, \textit{The Successful Merchant}, Preface.

\textsuperscript{42} Arthur, \textit{The Successful Merchant}, 0.2.

\textsuperscript{43} Arthur, \textit{The Successful Merchant}, 0.9.
that the same words could be applied to Henry Jennings of the Launceston Wesleyan community. He was voicing the same concerns in his spiritual diary 1836-39, and travelling the same path as Budgett. The William Arthur biography goes some way to understanding the globally transferred values of Wesleyan Methodism with its commercial principles and controls. It also portrays the man of business struggling with the temptations of trade and impelled by a nature eager for commercial progress, who finds himself too engrossed by earthly things.

Another one of many such histories of specific Wesleyan groups who enjoyed some success in commerce is *Methodism in Macclesfield*, Cheshire, the centre of the silk button trade.\(^{44}\) Here is the well worn theme of a small but fervent group who attained a certain degree of prosperity through diligence and watchfulness. John Wesley described them in 1787 'as a people close to God in spite of many increasing riches. If they continue it will be the only instance I have known for half a century'.\(^{45}\) The author cites many examples of holy living and holy death, but the group emerges as pedestrian, lacking the flair and vitality of the later 1830-40’s Launcestonians.

Vitality and flair are, however, apparent in Allen B. Robertson’s study of the Halifax Methodist merchants, 1815-55.\(^{46}\) In this case, second and third generation Nova Scotian Wesleyan Methodist businessmen shared the same dynamic energy as the first generation Launceston community but, in the main, diverted their energies to education and politics. As in Launceston, they were a small group, but, as Robertson stresses, ‘their compactness lent itself to the formation of a strong group identity’.\(^{47}\) He also discusses the social activism of the group. Similarly to Launceston, this did not negate the undivided pursuit of the holy; ‘rather the faith arrived at, or mediated on privately, assisted one to interact with like-minded members of society at large’.\(^{48}\) One senses the similarities, the dynamics of both groups, ‘the coexistence of religious and secular pursuits; the emphasis on the methodical seeking out of perfection, whilst

\(^{44}\) Benjamin Smith, *Methodism in Macclesfield* (London 1875).
\(^{45}\) Ibid, p. 203.
\(^{46}\) Robertson, *John Wesley's Nova Scotia Business Men*.
\(^{47}\) Ibid, p. 33.
\(^{48}\) Ibid, p. 148.
not denying the realities of living in an imperfect world’.\textsuperscript{49} By the 1840s, the Wesleyan Methodists of Nova Scotia had ‘developed a growing sense of their part as a chosen people’.\textsuperscript{50} There was a sense of this also in the leaders of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist group, given the type of society into which they had come. At that time they were catapulted into the political arena of the transportation question and responded vigorously. The Launceston community, though later arrived, certainly had the presence of what Robertson refers to as ‘movers and shakers’ in the Wesleyan Methodist Nova Scotian community, whose members functioned in the upper levels of the socio-economic world. As Hempton writes, ‘It is only when the complexity has been laid bare that the precise pattern of cultural brokerage between Methodism and its secondary environment can begin to be understood’.\textsuperscript{51}

An interesting perspective of Canadian and Australian religious colonial experience is discussed by Mark Hutchinson, when he comments that ‘Canada and Australia were invisible to one another in their colonial experience... and religious historiography has followed this line in development, generally’.\textsuperscript{52} Hutchinson argues however, ‘that there is a wider context in which the religious life of these two post-colonial countries developed; their life had remarkable similarities...and the presence of a cultural lens between the two countries is important because the mutual invisibility has caused us to overlook one another as a potential way of seeing one another’.\textsuperscript{53} It is in this understanding that Robertson’s work about the Nova Scotia Wesleyan Methodist business men is utilised in this thesis.

**Primary Sources**

Bearing in mind the advice of historian John Tosh ‘that the relationship between the historian and his sources is one of give and

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{51} Hempton, *Religion of the People*, p. 198.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, pp. 22-3.
take', it is still reasonable to state that the strength of this thesis lies in the extraordinary amount of wide ranging primary sources available to support the work and provide a convincing basis for expressed opinions. The sources were not for the greater part overwhelming or contradictory, but illuminating and supportive.

When the Uniting Church of Australia was formed in 1977 with the merger of the Congregational, Methodist and most of the Presbyterian churches, the records of the Tasmanian Methodist Church were deposited in the Archives Office of Tasmania (AOT). The AOT holds in excess of 4,000 items from this transfer from the Methodist Church. The items relating to the Launceston, Hobart and Midlands circuits have been invaluable, though, understandably, there are gaps in the early colonial years. Similarly, the Australian Joint Copying Project (AJCP) microfilm records, covering all available correspondence and related records with the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (WMMS) in London and Manchester have provided a valuable resource. These would normally only have been available by visits to The National Archives in London and the Manchester Archives Research Centre at John Rylands Library, University of Manchester. These records provide an excellent view of the often severe attitude of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society to their ministerial brethren working in the South Seas Mission on their colonial stations. These records also highlight the often impossible demands made on the Wesleyan Methodist ministers and the continuing parlous financial state of the missions. Some seven ministerial diaries held across the Uniting Church Archives in Melbourne, the Mitchell Library in Sydney and the AOT also provide a valuable and insightful background and a good counterbalance to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society correspondence.

The spiritual diary of Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Henry Jennings, held in the Jennings Papers, State Library of Victoria, provided a basis for the chapter on spiritual diary writing. This diary of Henry Jennings follows the pattern that Brown and Shannon refer to in their discussion on spiritual autobiographies as primary sources; they state that

---

'conversion, the moment of spiritual rebirth, marks the start of the story which then continues on through various stages of trial and renewal'. Other original diaries from the seventeenth century onwards are also commented on. Wesleyan Methodist Philip Oakden’s 1833 ‘Journal of a Voyage from London to Circular Head and Launceston’ plus his business Letter Book 1833-38 and the considerable amount of his personal correspondence, sourced from descendants are vital documents. His business letter book, in particular, conveys a strong sense and understanding of the firm commercial principles of a Wesleyan Methodist business man, and the bias is unashamedly commercial, without any spiritual overtones, as would be expected. This source counts as being very reliable. Some personal and commercial correspondence of Henry Reed was obtained through access to the Hudson Fysh papers deposited in the State Library of Tasmania, Launceston Branch. In particular, many of Henry Reed’s letters reveal his sincerity and devoutness in matters spiritual and unconscious business attitudes.

Further original correspondence dealing with John Leake, Henry Reed, John Crookes, Philip Oakden, Walter Powell and the Mather family was located in the University of Tasmania Special/Rare Collections. Additionally, the contemporary letter diary of Launceston dissenter George Best gives an unvarnished and critical opinion of the Wesleyan Methodists against the background of the town. The diary provides material for a balanced interpretation of the Wesleyan Methodists. Its very bias and prejudice are of value in itself.

A valuable commercial primary source are the records held in the ANZ Bank Archives in Melbourne of the Union Bank of Australia. All early correspondence and reports from the Colonial Inspector regarding the progress of the Union Bank are available and provide an insight into the setting up of the bank in Launceston, as well as its cautious behaviour.

---


56 Best was a Baptist whose father was secretary to the Countess of Huntingdon. Selena Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon 1707-91, founded the sect of Calvinistic Methodists known as the Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion. She was supported by George Whitefield, one of Wesley’s early disciples who also broke with him over the Calvinistic tradition.
during the economic depression in Van Diemen's Land. *The Methodist Magazine* of the period gives a sense of current Wesleyan Methodist religious opinion in Britain and the importance of their missionary endeavours. Other relevant Launceston newspapers such as the *Launceston Examiner*, the *Launceston Advertiser*, the *Cornwall Chronicle* and the *Teetotal Advocate* give contemporary access to the current mentality and attitudes towards events, as well as positioning the Wesleyan Methodist Society within the growing Launceston community. As Brown and Shannon say, ‘as with modern newspapers, an important source of revenue in colonial newspapers was advertising’, and it is in these advertisements that a wealth of primary source information was discovered, particularly in the movements and commercial transactions of the Wesleyan Methodists; ship arrivals and departures, real estate sales, auctions, insolvency notices, all assisted in composing a pattern of existence.

Other official Tasmanian records in the Archives Office of Tasmania significantly contribute to the thesis; these were the Bounty Immigration records, Insolvency archive material, Wesleyan Methodist wills and the Index of Tasmanian Convicts. The Van Diemen's Land 1842-1844 Census summary statistics, originally published in 1845 and republished by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, were obtained from the State Library of Victoria. These all put flesh on the bones of the Wesleyan Methodists. The land records of the Wesleyan Methodist group obtained from the Land Titles Office, Hobart, were an excellent pointer to establishing status within the group.

**Structure of Thesis**

The thesis is divided into two parts, Part 1 provides the essential background to the thesis, and Part 2 considers the contributions made by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists.

---

**Part 1**

**Chapter 1** It will be necessary for the background chapter to be substantial to convey an understanding of the people who were Wesleyan Methodists. This chapter represents a reference text for understanding the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists 1832-49. The background will commence with the founding of the Wesleyan Methodist Society with its roots and developing theology in the Evangelical Revival, Arminianism, the German Pietist movement and other influences. Its progress into a society which incorporated a respectable, affluent, middle class in the early nineteenth century will then be charted. To understand the behaviour and ethics of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, John Wesley’s own economic views will be explained in all their limitations of the period in which they were formed. It will be shown how connexional economic teaching changed after Wesley’s death in 1791, finally reaching an accommodation with the temporal world and moving to the understanding that a wealthy philanthropic stewardship element was necessary for the survival of the Society. Spirituality and economics became one and the stewardship had a duality attached to it. The formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (WMMS) will be discussed, with its taking of Wesley’s economic theory to the higher dimension of consecrated wealth, the necessity for influential benevolent Wesleyan Methodist laymen, and the mind shift of the Wesleyan Methodists from the poor to the missionary outreach.

**Chapter 2** will discuss the Evangelical influences which supported early Anglican chaplaincy into Port Jackson / Sydney, and which was followed with the introduction of the Wesleyan Methodists. The foundation of the early Wesleyan Methodist Society is discussed with reference to some important members. The difficulties of the mission will be highlighted with reasons for its failure, and the chapter will take the outreach to Hobart, Van Diemen's Land, which had its own penal and emancipist problems. This chapter will end in 1824 just on the commencement of the Launceston Mission.
Part 2

Chapter 3 will discuss Lieutenant Governor Arthur’s support for and collaboration with the Wesleyan Methodists. The early development of Launceston will be described and the type of society into which the Wesleyan Methodists came; its penal background, its economic potential, and its future as a trading port, with strong merchant interest and connections will be considered. The first failed Wesleyan Methodist mission will be discussed, as also the successful Wesleyan Methodist establishment of 1834. Specific references will be made to the emerging Wesleyan Methodist elite, such figures as Isaac Sherwin, John Gleadow, Henry Reed, Theodore Bryant Bartley and Philip Oakden. An understanding will be highlighted that the development of Launceston and Wesleyan Methodism were to run in tandem.

Chapter 4 discusses the social composition of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society and the egalitarian response of the elite to the large penal element in the Society. The strategising of the Wesleyan Methodist Society is examined with its various institutions and rituals. This examination leads through to the topics of revival, enthusiasm and consecration of wealth. There is a short discussion on the self-help ethos in other Launceston churches and inter-denominational benevolence. The power of the Wesleyan Methodist elite is demonstrated by discussion of their struggle with the Rev. Joseph Orton over usage of the liturgy and their subsequent success will point to a subtle shift in colonial Wesleyan Methodism, which issued out of the global missionary experience. The emergence of John Crookes, later to be a strong member of the elite, is introduced and the topic of consecration of wealth is extended by demonstrating the support shown by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists for the new Port Phillip mission.

Chapter 5 initially establishes the growing status of the Wesleyan Methodist elite by land and property ownership, jury involvement and philanthropic and civil involvement. Individual commercial interests of the Wesleyan Methodist elite are examined, as well as a discussion of the
second rung Wesleyan Methodists. The chapter moves into a discussion of Wesleyan Methodist involvement in banking, with the crowning achievement of Philip Oakden in founding the Anglo Imperial Bank, the Union Bank of Australia.

Chapter 6 centres on the Spiritual Diary of Launceston Wesleyan Methodist, Henry Jennings. The chapter begins with a discussion of the evolution of spiritual diary writing. Henry Jennings’ diary is discussed in relation to two main dialogues with a third lesser dialogue. The two main dialogues centre around Jennings’ spiritual advancement and his temporal financial concerns. The discussion of the third and lesser dialogue involves Jennings’ proselytising and its resultant successes and failures. An attempt has been made to include examples of other diaries to reinforce the discussion.

Chapter 7 traces the temperance and teetotal movements with their British roots to early formation in Launceston, Van Diemen's Land. The Wesleyan Methodist involvement in the Teetotal Society is discussed with particular emphasis on the Wesleyan Methodist president, Isaac Sherwin, and the egalitarian and secular nature of the Society is also highlighted. The important feature of this chapter is to show that the Teetotal Society was a body which provided a political training ground. This was a political involvement that tried to influence the issue of public house licences and consequently the retail alcohol trade. John Crookes’ rise to greater status is shown through his philanthropic involvement alongside other Wesleyan Methodists in the 1840s. This status was to provide a background for Crookes’ later political role in Chapter 8 with the anti-transportation saga.

Chapter 8 initially raises the entry of Wesleyan Methodists into the world of politics in Van Diemen's Land, based on precipitating factors which challenged their rights. Grievances such as discontinuance of the assignment system, the introduction of probation gangs, the labour market, quit rents and the economic depression of 1841-44 are shown to be contributing factors. The chapter stresses the growing understanding of
the Wesleyan Methodists that they had to act for themselves and be involved in the political stirrings and influences of the day. The strong and definitive role of the Wesleyan Methodist contribution to the establishment of the London Agency is discussed along with the firm aims of the Agency in the reform of the transportation system, removal of duties on English grain and representative legislature. The call for the total abolition of transportation is shown to have been accelerated by growing irritation with the probation gangs and the associated perceived moral dangers. The political presence of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists within the anti-transportation movement is extracted from the overall involvement and highlighted. The chapter concludes in 1849 with the fragmentation of the Wesleyan Methodist elite group, but later defining political victories are detailed briefly for a continuum. A chart of mature electoral political positions for the Wesleyan Methodists is illustrated to show their final political progress and involvement. A biographical appendix explains and defines the movements of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist group, to give an understanding of why the group dispersed, and to answer any queries as to later movements.

Limitations of Thesis

This thesis is confined to the Wesleyan Methodist group in Launceston Van Diemen’s Land for the period defined and does not propose to incorporate the Primitive Methodists or the United Free Methodists, who finally achieved union with the Wesleyan Methodists in 1902. Both groups arrived in Tasmania in the 1850s and fall outside the parameters of this thesis. The thesis does not attempt to discuss, at any length, the Wesleyan Methodist involvement with Aborigines. The New South Wales Wesleyan Methodist involvement has been treated elsewhere, and the Buntingdale Mission in Port Phillip has been well covered in Alison Head’s M.A. thesis ‘The Wesleyan Methodists in Port Phillip, 1836-50’. There was no involvement of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists with Van Diemen’s Land Aborigines as they were nearly decimated by the time this thesis commences. The only mention will be in Chapter 4 where the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists are shown to have given financial
support to the Aboriginal mission at Port Phillip at the behest of Lieutenant-Governor Arthur. The thesis does not attempt to discuss female Wesleyan Methodist involvement. Such discussion would not add to the argument of this thesis because women were not involved in commercial, political or public life. Women certainly formed a quarter of the class leadership in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, and records show that Georgiana Oakden, wife of Philip Oakden, continued being a class leader well into the last part of the nineteenth century. Records contain references to women assisting in making collections, as well as references to admittance to the Society, and notes of some misdemeanours. Though it may be inappropriate to exclude them, the judgement was made that it could not further the argument of the thesis. No extra emphasis has been placed on ministerial achievements. It is considered, in this context, that the ministers were creatures of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in London, with an already formed set of current denominational attitudes. As this thesis argues, it was to be the powerful middle class business men who would respond to the variables in Van Diemen's Land society and they are the focus of the discussion to follow.
Part 1
Chapter 1

Background

*Introduction to Background, Chapter 1*

There is a vast body of literature related to John Wesley’s theology, as well as his connection to such movements as the Evangelical Revival, the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution, and many other social and political events. The body of literature can be a minefield and it is easy to be diverted by the magnitude of side issues so beloved of Methodist historians. It is thus important to narrow the literature into specific areas and channels in order to chart a clear, logical path to the argument.

It is, first and foremost, important to see the chapter as providing some background understanding of nineteenth century Wesleyan Methodist ethics. It is important to demonstrate that Wesley’s theology did not develop in a vacuum; it was the result of many interacting influences. It is proposed to highlight Wesley’s developing theology, placed against the international movement of the Evangelical Revival, and then take it through the influences of Arminianism, devotional literature and the strong moulding influences of German Pietism and the Moravians. It will be shown how the final theology of Justification, Sanctification and Christian Perfection was developed and how it was dovetailed into the evangelical economic theory of Wesley, how the spirituality and economics became one. It is important to understand the bones and sinews of the theology in order to comprehend the later behaviour and contributions of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists.

Establishment of the Methodist Society will follow with its complex structure and Wesley’s communitarian bias will be discussed as well as the tandem progress and rise of the New Dissent. Wesley’s anxiety about The Stewardship of Riches and obligations to the poor will lead through the Industrial Revolution to Methodist separation from the Anglican Church. Discussion will then move to the dawning of the nineteenth century with its rise of the respectable, affluent middle-class Methodists, who were left
with a duality in relation to The Stewardship of Riches. Emphasis will be placed on the fact that Methodists saw themselves as a force for order.

The all-important formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (hereafter WMMS) will be discussed as a background to understanding the Wesleyan Methodist missionary outreach and the demands placed on the shoulders of the Wesleyan Methodist middle-class economic man.

The slowness of the Wesleyan Methodists in legalising their missionary structure in the late eighteenth century, which was the result of Dr. Thomas Coke’s single-handed missionary enterprise, will be discussed. The reorganisation of the WMMS in 1813 will be traced alongside the growing evangelical support. The inclusion of the influential Wesleyan laymen of commerce, in order to fund the endeavour, will be evaluated alongside the Rev. Richard Watson’s theory of benevolence and consecrated wealth. This theory of consecrated wealth shifted Wesley’s economic theory to a higher dimension. Other features to be explored will be the shift of emphasis from the poor to the ‘heathen”, and the new label of respectability gained by the Wesleyan Methodists in their missionary endeavours. Contemporary political and social events with their interaction are not examined in any detail. Another facet of the emphasis is to show that Methodism was just another segment of the Evangelical Revival playing its part as one of the building blocks, neither exaggerating or underestimating its part as is often done.¹ Langford contends that, ‘there is an obvious danger in giving Wesley and his followers more significance in the second quarter of the eighteenth century than they deserve. They are not an appropriate starting point for the Evangelical Revival.² Of necessity in the background, there will be a loose

¹ On an opposing note, John Kent’s work Religion in Eighteenth Century Britain, starts his work with, ‘One of the persistent myths of modern British History is the myth of the so called evangelical revival’. Kent sees a distinction between primary religion and secondary theologies and the trappings of ecclesiastical institutions which developed around it. He sees Methodism as a religious sub-culture taking an advantage of the religious climate of the time. (‘Review article’, Barrie Tabraham, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 55, No. 2, April 2004, p. 326.)
chronological thread running through to show the progression of formation.

There is not a vast body of Methodist histories referring to Wesley’s economic theology. In general it receives passing and un-detailed references. The writers who have developed the theme are Kathleen MacArthur, Charles Elliott, John Walsh, Robert Wearmouth, Theodore Jennings, Wellman J. Warner, Kurt Samuelsson, Thomas Madron and John R. Tyson. The background chapter has made considerable use of their works. The part of the background chapter relating to the Evangelical Protestant Awakening and German Pietism may appear lengthy, but it is felt that it was warranted to demonstrate its legacy to Wesleyan Methodism.

**Eighteenth Century**

The Centenary Book of Wesleyan Methodism published in 1839 presents the core of Wesleyanism with this description of John and Charles Wesley:

> Having obtained by the simple exercise of faith in Christ, not only the abiding witness of the pardoning and adopting mercy of God, but also the purity of Heart which they had long unsuccessfully endeavoured to obtain by righteousness and law, they were astonished at their former errors and longed to make known the great salvation which is thus attainable by all. Before this period, they served God because they feared Him; now they loved Him from a joyous assurance that He had first loved them.  

---


4 This publication was reviewed in *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* in January 1839, Vol. xviii, 3rd series, p45. *The Arminian Magazine*, was first published by John Wesley 1778 and lasted until 1797. In 1798 the magazine was called *The Methodist Magazine*, and it lasted until 1821. In 1822 the magazine became *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* and it ended publication in 1913. (It has been decided to retain the definite article in front of these magazines as this is how they were always termed). *The Arminian Magazine* was first published in order to promote doctrines that God is willing that all men should be saved, and to answer virulent anti-Wesleyan attacks published in the Calvinist periodical, *The Gospel Magazine*. It promoted an antidote to the poison of Calvinism and Antinomianism. There was always one article defending universal redemption. (Herbert Boyd McGonigle, *Sufficient Saving Grace: John Wesley's Evangelical Arminianism* (London, 2001))
This was John Wesley’s underlying precept and conviction, and on this he built a religious force underpinned with ethics. How had John Wesley arrived at this conviction? What influences had come to bear upon him? The Methodist Society regarded 24 May 1738 as the day Wesley was converted with the Aldersgate experience, hence the Centenary Celebration in 1838. 

Wesley’s birth in 1703 heralded the dawn of the eighteenth century. England was developing the empire with its colonies, and consequent expansion of colonial trade, but there were ‘inherited economic problems passed on from the seventeenth century, including the beginning of the enclosure process as one of the steps of agriculture improvement’. Mercantilism was arising and chartered companies were seeking trade in new lands. A lack of economic unity was evidenced in bad roads and transportation and riots were common. There was low agricultural profitability and there was no sign of industrial investment opening out. The population was beginning to climb, but was set back by the lethal epidemics that struck it regularly. Not until 1740 did the population start to rise steadily. Porter feels that ‘during the first forty years of the eighteenth century, society and the economy remained in self adjusting equilibrium’. Kathleen MacArthur also refers to precarious means of communication at this period, but it will be shown later that poor communication did not diminish the discussion of religious ideas. The unpropertied man was economically helpless. However, Porter points out that ‘the enclosure system also boosted rural output. It was a shot in the arm for the economy, though a blow to land workers’. Some clergy

---

5 Wesley had a strong transforming experience at a society meeting at Aldersgate on 24 May 1738, where he felt his heart strangely warmed, that he did trust in Christ and that assurance was given that his sins had been taken away. (Roy Hattersley, A Brand From the Burning: The Life of John Wesley (London, 2002), pp. 136-7.) This was to be the core Methodist belief in the ‘felt experience of conversion’. It was something ‘the recipient felt and sensed’; Richard Beresford Roy, ‘A Reappraisal of Wesleyan Methodist Mission in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century, as Viewed Through the Ministry of the Rev. John Smithies (1802-1872)’, PhD Thesis (Edith Cowan University, Perth, W.A., 2006), pp. 192, 200.


8 MacArthur, Economic Ethics, p. 36.

9 Porter, English Society, p. 228.
became powerful as a land owning class because of land enclosure and there was always the ongoing problem with absentee parsons. The eighteenth century Anglican Church was unspiritual and quite unable to deal with the situation. Populations were shifting, but new churches were not set up to cope with the change.\textsuperscript{10} Parish boundaries were not redrawn.

\textbf{Evangelical Situation, Arminianism and Holy Club}

The early period of the eighteenth century produced many religious societies. These religious societies did much good with their offer of fellowship. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) emphasised the spread of religious education, charity schools and religious literature. Ward writes that ‘the SPCK was originally intended by Thomas Bray to put down Quakerism at home and dissent generally in America’.\textsuperscript{11} Piety was encouraged by a variety of small religious societies which were devoted to holy living and more controversially good works. According to Brown-Lawson, ‘the Society for the Reformation of Manners rooted out wickedness in the community with the doubtful methods of employing informers’.\textsuperscript{12}

The church was challenged by the chilling movement of rationalism such as the Deists who opposed all forms of Christianity. However there were other powers at work. The Anglican Evangelicals were church men, gospel men committed to the concept of the new birth, personal religion and salvation by faith. They felt that God’s grace effected salvation and once saved, man was justified, regarded by God as having never sinned. Also the work of the Holy Spirit was seen to be important to conversion. Bebbington sees evangelicalism as ‘consisting of all those strands of Protestantism that have not been either too high in churchmanship or too broad in theology to qualify for acceptance. It has spanned the gulf between the Established Church and Nonconformity’.\textsuperscript{13} Ranged on the

\textsuperscript{12} Brown-Lawson, \textit{John Wesley}, pp. 11, 12.
\textsuperscript{13} David W. Bebbington, \textit{Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s} (London, 1989), Page ix, Preface.
other side was Calvinism, with its stark logic of absolute predestination, which gave very little place to love and compassion.

Arminianism was another force to be reckoned with in this vigorous religious world. Jacob Arminius, a strict Calvinist scholar, doubted predestination and felt that God had given man free will and the liberating idea that Christ had died for the whole world. Averse to the High Calvinist notion which made God a tyrant, the Arminians, according to Semmel, ‘saw the relationship between Christ and his worshippers as akin to a commercial contract’. They saw Christ as having, by his sacrifice, purchased favourable terms for men. This was at the heart of the Arminian doctrine of conditional justification, which saw Christians as seeking by good works to obtain holiness and striving to retain that holiness as part of the contract. Arminians ‘insisted that the terms were clear in the gospels, in exchange for which God, because of Christ’s sacrifice, had agreed to grant eternal salvation’. In effect, all who believed would be saved, the message of the early Christian church. Arminius also said salvation depended on a final perseverance, that is, a determination to maintain a state of grace to the last. According to Semmel, ‘Arminianism, particularly of the Wesleyan Evangelical form, bore a revelatory message of liberty and equality of free will and universal salvation’. Semmel sees Wesley as the mediator between the traditional Protestantism of the Reformation, which had flowered in England in the sixteenth century, and the modern Arminian Protestantism, which became a feature of Archbishop Laud’s Anglicanism.

The year after John Wesley graduated from Oxford in 1724, he received a letter from his mother Susannah Wesley, written in reply to his query about predestination and the 17th article of the 39 Articles. Her contention was that ‘The doctrine of predestination as maintained by rigid

---

14 Jacob Arminius (1560 – 1609) Divinity Professor, Leiden University in Holland.
16 Semmel, Methodist Revolution, p. 12.
17 Semmel, Methodist Revolution, p. 80.
Calvinists is very shocking and ought utterly to be abhorred'.\textsuperscript{19} Wesley rejected the theory of predestination as he prepared for ordination and at the same time gathered other pious forces around him. His spiritual progression was not allowed to develop into too great a mystical response to religion,\textsuperscript{20} and to this end The Holy Club founded by Charles Wesley met at Oxford in 1729. John Wesley soon took the leadership and the small group exuded a strong spirit of discipline and philanthropy, which involved its members in practical morality and philanthropic activities.

For the thrust of this thesis, it is important to note that the Holy Club members were expected to examine regularly both their conduct and conscience. Roy Hattersley notes that ‘criticism was levelled at the Holy Club that they were obsessed with self examination’.\textsuperscript{21} Members confessed their sins and expected others to do likewise. John Wesley was focusing on both inward and outward piety and both their forms can be traced through to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist community. At the Holy Club, Wesley was producing an ideal religion for young men – their philanthropic tasks took them all over London to the hospitals and prisons, all helping him to a social understanding.\textsuperscript{22} Sometime before the foundation of the Holy Club, John Wesley had outlined his practicality for living by setting himself ‘General Rules for Employment of Time, supplemented by General Rules of Intention’. This formulation of rules and regulations appealed to his personality and he managed to stamp this on the Methodist Society.

Holy Club members were described as Methodists early in its history.\textsuperscript{23} Members were John Gambold, who became a Moravian Bishop, Benjamin Ingham, who travelled to the mission at Georgia with the Wesleys, John Broughton, a future secretary of the SPCK and, most importantly, George Whitefield a co–leader of Wesley’s in contributing to

\textsuperscript{20} MacArthur, \textit{Economic Ethics}, p. 60.
\textsuperscript{21} Hattersley, \textit{A Brand from the Burning}, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{22} MacArthur, \textit{Economic Ethics}, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{23} As far back as 1639, the name \textit{Methodist} was in use (and apparently not for the first time) in a sermon preached at Lambeth ‘Where are now our Anabaptists and plain packstaff Methodists which esteem all flowers of rhetoric or sermons no better than stinking weeds’ (Frederick C. Gill, \textit{The Romantic Movement and Methodism: A study of English Romanticism and the Evangelical Revival} (London, 1937), p. 17.)
the Christian Revival in England. Whitefield anticipated Wesley in many of his techniques, though he differed completely from Wesley with his Calvinist Methodist leanings. He became chaplain to Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, and Armstrong surmises that Whitefield, ‘having found himself an aristocratic patroness, thereby inducted to his sympathies another important way forward. The landed gentleman who was saved had influence to exert’. Armstrong further considers that neither Wesley nor Whitefield was the leader of the Evangelical Period in England, but they were national figures who had a critical impact in the revival. Many of the evangelical clergyman had Calvinist bearings like Whitefield and significant names were Henry Venn, James Hervey, William Grimshaw and William Beveridge.

**Influence of Devotional Literature**

What these evangelicals did have in common with John Wesley was their connection to devotional literature and in particular to three books. These were Thomas à Kempis’ *Imitation of Christ*, Bishop Jeremy Taylor’s work *Rules and Exercises of Holy Living and Holy Dying*, and William Law’s *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. The *Imitation of Christ*, with its concept of imitating Christ, impressed Wesley. It ratified his desire for inward and outward holiness. Wesley believed that ‘giving my life to God would profit me nothing unless I gave all my heart’. Bishop Taylor’s work had as its theory that ‘attainment of salvation wholly depended on living a holy and religious life’. Written in 1649 after the Civil War, Taylor hoped the book would keep the impoverished Anglican

---

Church alive. Stanwood sees *Holy Living* as having roots in the long tradition of devotional literature that appeared in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England.\(^{28}\) In his work, Taylor described religious practices for *Holy Living* in various areas, such items as personal treatment of our bodies, duties to neighbours, direct religion and intercourse with God. We can also see in Taylor the roots and patterns for the writing of spiritual diaries. The injunctions were all present in Taylor - the self-examination of conscience, the care of time, the ordering of worldly employment - in order to make time for devotional prayer (particularly private and corporate). This was supplemented by purity of intention, and Taylor reminded his readers that they stood in the presence of God. He also dealt with the topics of neighbourly duties, including negotiations, trade and contractual honesty. It is fairly certain that Wesley absorbed and took on board the concept of purity of intention, as well as the strictures on business dealings. Wesley’s own opinion of the book was that:

On reading several parts of this book, I was exceedingly affected; that part particularly that refers to the purity of intention. Instantly, I resolved to dedicate my life to God. All my thoughts, words and actions in every part of my life must be sacrificed to God.\(^{29}\)

Kathleen Walker MacArthur agrees that Taylor’s *Holy Living, Holy Dying* affected Wesley deeply and permanently and she makes the telling point that it was the ‘leaning to practical piety that gave the Wesleyan movement its later social power’.\(^{30}\)

The other book of practical piety which Wesley embraced, was William Law’s\(^{31}\) *A Serious Call to a Devout, Holy Life*, published in 1738. Another of his books was *Christian Perfection*.\(^{32}\) Wesley recalled that

---


\(^{31}\) William Law, born 1686 died 1761; fellow Emanuel College, Cambridge, Non Juror, unable to take oath of allegiance to Hanoverian dynasty; Private tutor to family of historian Edward Gibbon. Forbidden the use of the pulpit, he preached through his books. Gibbon said ‘If Mr. Law finds a spark of piety in a reader, he will soon kindle it into a flame’. Wesley and Law took increasingly different theological routes, they differed on the view of justification, viewing it as a pardon like the Protestant Reformers, it is reasoned by faith and trust in God. For Law, justification was akin to Catholic mysticism. Being made just, it was a process and not an event based on the Cross; *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (On-Line Edition, 2006).

‘Christian Perfection and Serious Call were put into my hands and these convinced me more than ever of the absolute impossibility of being half a Christian, and I determined through his Grace to be all devoted to God, to give all my soul, body and substance’. The thesis of Law’s book was that God calls us to obedience and to a life completely centred in Him. He declared that ‘If you will here stop and ask yourself why you are not as pious as the primitive Christians were, your own heart will tell you that it is neither through ignorance nor inability, but because you never thoroughly intended it’.

Wesley was attracted by the appeal for Christian holiness, and Law’s treatise on Christian perfection aroused Wesley’s interest in the doctrine of Christian perfection. Law’s brand of theology was the type of movement that called itself ‘faith at work, with the emphasis on a disciplined active Christian lifestyle’. Perfection was an important cornerstone of Law’s writings and Wesley seems to have captured the vision of Christian Perfection, though he interpreted it differently in the manner of justification. Law’s writings connected with Wesley’s awakened spirituality. This could be called his intellectual conversion. Both Law and Taylor favoured the Arminian way, particularly the sense of right action which was a central outcome of the Puritan influence. They regarded Christian perfection as regaining Christ’s image through right actions, a form of practical mysticism.

In the Serious Call Law appealed to every exhortation in scripture which engendered man to be wise and reasonable, satisfying only real wants. Law’s message was clear: money in itself was good, but the usage of it was important. To sum up, it was Christian perfection and the practice of works of piety, self discipline, private prayer, fasting and the Stewardship of Time and Wealth which Wesley took from Law. Bernard Semmel agrees that both Wesley and Whitefield shaped their views on the

---

34 W. Law, A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life (Grand Rapids, 2000), Chap. 2, p.8.
36 Law, A Serious Call, Chap. vi, p. 35.
The Order of Salvation was coming together for Wesley, with some of the building blocks in place; Arminianism, Christian Perfection and Justification were to be part of the ascent to spirituality.\(^{39}\)

The evangelical, economic building blocks were influenced by exposure to the *The Rich Man’s Charge*, a sermon preached by the Bishop of Norwich before the Lord Mayor in 1658. Macarthur sees this as a powerful exposition of Christian economics, and asserts that it formed part of Wesley’s Christian Library.\(^{40}\) The thesis was that the living God gave us riches to enjoy and we should be ready to distribute the wealth. Rich men should be grateful for God’s bounty and liberality, and to do good with it. Moreover, the instability and uncertainty of riches is connected and fixed into a good foundation by laying out upon others.\(^{41}\) The sermon emphasised that God did not forbid man to be rich as if Christian Perfection was central to voluntary poverty. Riches are the good gift of God.\(^{42}\) Relevant quotations included, ‘we must maintain honest trades for necessary uses’,\(^{43}\) and ‘we must be industrious in that we have lack of nothing’.\(^{44}\) The emphasis was on stewardship as Treasurer to the Lord.

The Bishop of Norwich advised that the first step was to trust in God, the author of all comforts, and then to imitate him to do good.\(^{45}\) He also posed the interesting premise ‘that money, while it is in motion, passing from hand to hand, does good’.\(^{46}\)

---

39 H. Ray Dunning of the Wesleyan Centre for Applied Theology, points out that John S. Simon has conclusively shown that Wesley was dependent on a book he had abridged in 1753, that is William Cave, *Primitive Christianity or the Religion of the Ancient Christians in the First Ages of the Gospel* (London, 1676). Simon says ‘When Wesley was writing the rules, it seems possible the book was before him. In many of their particulars, Cave’s book and Wesley's rules coincide’. John S. Simon, *John Wesley and the Methodist Societies* (London, 1923), pp. 104-5.
41 John Wesley, *A Christian Library consisting of Extracts from and Abridgments of the choicest pieces of practical divinity which have been published in the English Tongue; in fifty volumes; vol. 25, dr. Reynolds, sometime bishop of Norwich, sermon 5, the rich man's charge, delivered in a sermon at the spittle, upon Monday in Easter week, April 12, 1658, before the lord mayor. 1 Timothy 6:17, 18, 19* (London, 1819), republished Wesley Centre for Applied Theology, 2005.
42 Sermon at Spittle, quoting PROV. 10.22.
44 Sermon at Spittle, quoting 1 Thess. 4:1,12.
46 Ibid, p. 11.
Influence of German Pietism

Ward has postulated that the growth of Methodism illustrated ‘the complex of early eighteenth century forces which were uniting England to Germany closer than ever before, to its politics and piety, to its theology’. 47

This chapter relies strongly on W.R. Ward’s monumental work, The Protestant Evangelical Awakening and its accompanying work Power and Piety: the Origins of Religious Revival in the Eighteenth Century. Arguably no other work on the topic appears to have the breadth and depth of Ward’s with his bilingual status, and consequent access to the German religious archives. In his chapter ‘Noisy Methodists and Pious Protestants’, David Hempton discusses Ward’s important work and shows how Ward invites his readers ‘to penetrate a tangled web of circulating literature, itinerant revivalists, and folk migrations, that combine to show that The Great Awakening of the eighteenth century was more a truly international event, than some have imagined’. 48 Hempton sees Methodism as having its roots in Continental Pietism as well as British evangelicalism. Pietism emphasised the New Birth and the priesthood of all believers. Ward himself says that it is only possible to understand the Evangelical Revival in Europe and America by examining developments in Central Europe and being aware of the shared expectations in the Protestant world.

Ward gives an excellent description of the circulation of religious information in the eighteenth century. 49 He conveys a sense of bridges between England and Europe and a sense of the almost volcanic activity of the revival in the Protestant world, wonderful role models for the later dynamic energy of the Methodists. Ward highlights the extraordinary accumulation of letters and correspondence which shored up this activity. He concedes that, ‘unlike the Reformers of the sixteenth century who offered a confession of faith for public discourse, the revival accumulated

archives which would support their understanding of history’.\(^{50}\) He backs this with such examples as ‘August Herman Francke who had about 5,000 correspondents and was in constant touch with three to four hundred’.\(^{51}\) Postal difficulties were surmounted and information was often received by circuitous routes. Ward quotes the case of Gotthilf Francke, son of the great August Herman Francke, receiving news of the revival in New England from English sources, via the community in Pennsylvania and friends of his late father in the Rhineland.\(^{52}\) One can possibly see Wesley’s intense fascination with publishing activities in the light of the furious Continental activity.\(^{53}\) The spirit of the Continental Pietists reached its apotheosis in the establishment at Halle with its extraordinary publishing output. British religious literature was also popular and translation was accessible in the eighteenth century.

Philip J. Spener, the apostle of Pietism, had a heartfelt desire for improving the church and suggested forms of improvement. He saw the responsibility to the poor and the inner spring of spiritual vitality.\(^{54}\) This was anathema to Lutheran Orthodoxy and was an attempt to restore some missing warmth. Spener proposed the idea of class meetings (\textit{collegia pietatis}), in which the faithful ‘should teach, warn, convert and edify, each other’.\(^{55}\) In this can be seen the actual influences for Methodist organisation. The class meetings were to have no borders of class or education. The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 after the Thirty Years War had secured establishments for Protestants, but it excluded Protestants in Salzburg, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Austria, Hungary and Poland. Assimilations and denationalisations caused bitter conflicts.

Prussia’s ambitions were overweening and part of the unifying force was to found a Lutheran University at Halle, staffed by Pietists. The rousing of the Protestant minorities weakened the Habsburgs and

\(^{50}\) Ward, \textit{Protestant Evangelical Awakening}, p. 2.
\(^{52}\) Theodor Wotshke:August Herman Francke, \textit{Rheinische Freunde in Ihren Briefen}, MKRg 25 (1929), 24, 26, as cited in Ward, \textit{Protestant Evangelical Awakening}, p. 3.
\(^{54}\) Ward, \textit{Protestant Evangelical Awakening}, p. 57.
\(^{55}\) Ward, \textit{Protestant Evangelical Awakening}, p. 57.
produced a flow of migration. Demonstrations broke out as Protestants demonstrated for rights under the Peace of Westphalia. The classic case were the Salzburgers. The Salzburg Government had expelled all Protestants over the age of twelve at eight days notice and closed its passes into Salzburg. Twenty thousand had marched across Europe to Pomerania, East Prussia and Lithuania fleeing Austrian persecution. They were Lutherans with rights under the Westphalia settlement, not an underground sect. Followers of August Francke of Halle, they attracted sympathy in Holland and England from the SPCK, which contributed funds to two hundred of their members’ resettlement in Georgia, the scene of John Wesley’s later mission.

Auguste Herman Francke was a disciple of Spener and became a visionary at the Halle University finding protection for the Pietists from Lutheran orthodoxy. Francke was clearly a role model for John Wesley. Ward sees Francke as a great systematiser of Christian life, and the model for Methodist class leaders. Francke also expounded a faith sanctification through rigorous self examination as did the Moravians. Ambitious for practical piety, he erected at Halle the charitable institutions such as the Orphan Institute with accommodation for three thousand, Bible Institute and Dispensary.

The Halle institutions relied on collections and large commercial ventures in the trade of oxen and wine. Here we see commerce as a vital partner and acceptable to religion. Its business also supplied medicinals, Bibles and religious literature. It was one of the chief publishers in Germany, publishing in German, French, Russian and Slavonic languages, filling the vacuum of previous years. John Wesley absorbed the pragmatic self help of Pietism. Ward considers that ‘Francke established characteristic forms of charitable and educational activity which marked the whole subsequent history of evangelical religion’.

---

58 These Slavonic languages were mainly for the benefit of the Wends and other enserfed populations of the Pietist nobility in Germany and for the restless Protestant populations in the Habsburg lands.
Two other important movements which Ward discusses in *Protestant Evangelical Awakening* are the Silesians and the Moravians. Charles XII of Sweden had haggled with the Austrian Emperor for the rights of the Silesian Protestants and Silesian Protestants turned to domestic piety and class meetings to replace public worship. Ward notes that ‘itinerant clergy were known as *Busch–prediger*, the local equivalent of the later Methodist field–preachers’;\(^{60}\) Casper Neuman, their chief pastor, had to cope with camp meetings called ‘feldgottesdienst’. These had evolved in 1708, from the children in Lower Silesia, ‘meeting several times a day in the open air, without adult cooperation, standing in circles around their elected leaders in prayer and singing’\(^{61}\) One can see similar overtones in the resolution for early morning prayer meetings at 5 am held in Launceston in the month of March 1838.\(^{62}\)

Protestant group movements continued to be expelled and escape persecution and there was a large scale migration of them to America. The Moravian background had roots in Teschen, where an establishment had been set up by Francke, a type of mini Halle, backed by the Prussian Government. It contained a church, a large home with cellars for the wine trade, and a ground floor bookshop. Ward considers that propaganda and commerce were united at a strategic point where confessional revival was acute.\(^{63}\) Christian David had been converted by the preaching of Steinmetz of Teschen and given an introduction to a Halle educated Pietist nobleman, Count Zinzendorf. At Count Zinzendorf’s estate at Herrnhut, a religious community was founded when revival broke out there in 1727, and the Unity of the Moravian Brethren was created.

**Moravian Influence**

Ward argues that ‘one of the most famous missionary forces of the revival was born of the necessity to secure alternative bases’.\(^{64}\) In 1732, Herrnhut received 6,000 emigrants from the Salzburg situation, and finally

---

\(^{60}\) Ward, ‘Power and Piety’, pp. 80-1


\(^{62}\) Quarterly Meeting Resolutions, held Vestry of Paterson Street Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, 27 March 1838 (Minute Book of Quarterly Meetings, Launceston, NS499/928, AOT.)

\(^{63}\) Ward, *Protestant Evangelical Awakening*, p. 74.

\(^{64}\) Ward, ‘Power and Piety’, p. 83.
20,000. Revival tended to reinforce the problem of moving groups. The renewed unity of the Brethren in Moravia arose from the conjunction of Protestant German speaking migrants from Bohemia and Moravia with a large proportion of refugees attracted by Herrnhut and Zinzendorf. By 1733, negotiations were being made for new bases abroad to settle such groups as the Salzburghers and Moravians were needing to become a missionary body. Special toleration was offered to them as a body distinct from the established church. In England, they got public recognition as a dissenting Church rather than a religious movement, just as John Wesley was to feel regarding his position as a Methodist within the Anglican Church. Georgia was to be the destination for some of the Salzburghers, and John Wesley was in contact with Oxford don John Burton, who took a great interest in the North American colonies. He was helping James Edward Oglethorpe of the Georgia settlement, and was also aided by the SPCK.

John and Charles Wesley were asked to go out as preachers and clergymen. Inspired by the thought of saving his own soul, John Wesley sailed in a party including a large group of pietistic Moravians as well as the Oxford Methodists, Benjamin Ingham and Charles Delamotte. En route to Georgia (which took four months), a storm was encountered where John Wesley was treated to an extraordinary display of serenity by the Moravians. Seemingly undisturbed by the raging storm, the German Moravians sang hymns and prayed with total composure. Their belief in Primitive Christianity was a seductive experience for Wesley.

Their entire demeanour impressed Wesley. The early rising in the morning to pray and methodical meetings of self criticism, conjoined with criticism of fellow passengers, were typical of Pietistic Revivalist life. The latter habit of criticism of fellow men, contained the seeds of that unattractive practice of later Wesleyan Methodists. The Moravian, Augustus Spangenburg, was waiting at Savannah in Georgia and asked Wesley, ‘Do you know Christ has saved you? and Wesley answered, I hope he has died to save me’.65 This embarrassing inquiry from Spangenburg in

---

1736 has echoes through to Launceston, Tasmania, in 1890.\footnote{66} The Georgia experience was not a success spiritually or socially for John Wesley and his brother Charles. They were succeeded in Georgia by George Whitefield, who ‘distinguished himself honourably from them by his superior grasp of the means to survival in the wilderness’.\footnote{67}

Having learnt German from the Moravian hymn books, en route to Georgia, Wesley remained impressed by the Moravians and partially committed to them. In June 1738, he journeyed to Halle, not long after the Aldersgate experience. Munsey Turner describes him ‘as a man somewhat unsure of salvation, he was refused communion and designated a *homo pertubatus*.\footnote{68} When he arrived, the forces of Halle and Herrnhut were at loggerheads and the Moravians did not appear to have resolved their doctrines. Wesley was intellectually connected to the evangelical movements and was familiar with all the varying theologies. Certainly after Moravian contact, and his visits to Georgia, Halle and Herrnhut, John Wesley began to view the world as his parish and he broke free from the confines of the English context. He could not have failed to be impressed by the institutions at Halle and Herrnhut. Though it was primarily a trip for observation, McCoy North sees that ‘its value for Methodist philanthropy lay in the fact that he saw some of the most noted charitable institutions in Europe and their methods for educating and providing for the poor’.\footnote{69}

At Herrnhut in August 1738, he spent time with Christian David, who explained his conversion to Wesley and discussed his assurance that sins were forgiven. David ‘plainly perceived this full assurance was a distinct gift from justifying faith and often not given too long after it’.\footnote{70} In his diary for August 1738, Wesley also detailed the situation of the church groups at Herrnhut and the daily religious programme – all fodder for his own plans.

\footnote{66} The question travels over time and distance to Eric Reed, grandson of the evangelist Henry Reed, who on visiting his grandmother Margaret at the family home Mount Pleasant in 1890 was asked, ‘are you saved? As a small boy he said, ‘he had no clue to his state of salvation’. (letter Eric Reed to Sir Hudson Fysh 3 Jan. 1962, Hudson Fysh Papers, Tasmanian State Library, Launceston, LMS 0049/2/2, Box 1 / 2).

\footnote{67} Ward, *Protestant Evangelical Awakening*, p. 286.


for the Methodist Society. One of the most remarkable features of the Evangelical Revival was its transatlantic character, with all the journeyings that happened before the days of steam - a type of early networking.\textsuperscript{71}

As David Hempton concludes, ‘Methodism was in short an interactive religious movement (with roots in European pietism and with branches all over the world), not an English epi-phenomenon’.\textsuperscript{72} The Moravians had a mission of religious colonisation in England. German and English Moravians had joined with Wesley to found the London Fetter Lane Community. Here, Wesley, under the Moravian Pastor Peter Böhler, discussed the nature of true living faith which engendered justification. Knight contends that ‘they wanted to maintain a lively sense of the activity of God, but sought to do so by encouraging human passivity’.\textsuperscript{73} He suggests that for Moravian enthusiasts, ‘this took the form of quietism as stillness, passively waiting on God’s active participation in grace’.\textsuperscript{74} On the contrary, Wesley advocated waiting on God’s grace by using the means of grace. The Moravians were bent on separating Christ and the means of grace, whereas Wesley viewed them as channels through which the grace of God was conveyed. The arguments raged and Wesley accused the Moravians of undervaluing good works because of their suspicion of connecting human activity to salvation. Knight points out that ‘the Anglican holy living tradition had insisted that the Christian life must be sought as a matter of initiative or will. The Wesleyan Methodist discipline involved small groups in Acts of Mercy and regularly used the means of grace in public worship and private devotion’.\textsuperscript{75} Finally John Wesley lost recruits to the Moravian cause.

\textit{Introduction of Community of Goods}

In common with Ingham and Whitefield, John Wesley had been flirting with the concept of ‘community of goods’. The idea of communalism had been invoked in early eighteenth century sermons for

\textsuperscript{71} Turner, \textit{John Wesley}, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{74} Knight, \textit{The Presence of God}, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{75} Knight, \textit{The Presence of God}, p. 43.
use in ‘charity’ sermons. It was a post Pentecostal idea, but, as John Walsh comments ‘it seems a concept curiously at odds with fashionable interpretations of Methodism as an agency of industrial capitalism’. The Holy Club had engendered a desire in Wesley to capture the ‘lost purity of the early Church, a model for his belief and action’.77

Wesley had also read the Patristic literature of Basil, Ambrose and Augustine, with their concept for the sharing of wealth. High Anglican devotional literature of the early eighteenth century reminded its readers that, after satisfying one’s wants in this life, the rest of one’s wealth should be directed to deserving poor neighbours. Even William Law in his final mystical phase, when he wrote The Spirit of Prayer Part 1, lauded the primitive community of goods at Jerusalem. This was where the concepts of ‘me, mine and my own’ were dispensed with. Objections inevitably arose against this concept, and contemporary writers such as Brownsword fulminated against it as a ‘dangerous levelling notion’.  

Walsh discerns that ‘Wesley’s debt to Law on the issue of riches is not easily determined and difficult to isolate from other parallel influences on a man who browsed and cropped unusually widely in the literary pastures of spirituality’. He surmises that Wesley’s insistence that men were not proprietors of their possessions, but stewards, was a relatively complex one. According to Walsh, it was significant that, like Law, ‘Wesley had an uncompromising radical ethic of stewardship and in his attachment of that ethic to a perfectionist theology’. His economic theories developed alongside the spirituality and became one with it.

In Georgia Wesley had told a friend that he hoped to show his faithfulness to God, ‘in dispensing the rest of my Master’s goods, if it

---

78 Writings of Robert Nelson studied by the Holy Club, e.g. Address to Persons of Quality, Walsh, ‘Community of Goods’, p. 32.
80 J. Brownsword, The Care of the Rich Young Man in the Gospel, all… and giving it to the Poor…endeavored to be set in a clear Light (London 1739), p. 11.
81 Walsh, ‘Community of Goods’, p. 34.
82 Walsh, ‘Community of Goods’, p. 35.
please him to send me to those, who, like his first followers, had all things in common’. This difficult and unworkable proposition was watered down significantly by Wesley in the coming years. Initially, there was a plan for each, ‘to buy what each they have and put it together, pay small debts and buy weekly what they can and put into a common stock. Out of this, they receive weekly what is thought necessary to maintain their families’. A fellow Moravian told Wesley the plan would not succeed and it was shelved for the time.

However, this whole idea of contributing to the common stock was enshrined in the first conference of Wesley’s preachers who assembled in June 1744. Rules were set for the select societies, the inner groups of members who were seeking or had attained Christian Perfection, and it was decided that ‘till we share all things in common, every member, once a week, will bring all he can spare towards a common stock’. In August 1744 Wesley took the community theme further, when he preached his University sermon at Oxford. The community of goods then languished for a period, until Wesley developed it from another angle, in accordance with his maturing thought processes. Possibly, the Moravians’ careless and debonair attitude to finance may have hardened Wesley’s thinking into a more systematised and pragmatic attitude to money.

Ward has detailed the ongoing financial debacles of the Moravians and their devious reactions and solutions. They said, when pressed for money, ‘that the capital had all been consumed for the Saviour and that he would repay in due course’. Whitefield accused Zinzendorf in 1753 of accumulating debts in excess of £60,000. Zinzendorf was a charismatic, aristocratic figure with a propensity to gambling. He was an opportunist who discovered through pious souls in 1736 that the Dutch rate of interest was a great deal lower than in Saxony and made use of it. Various pious

84 *Proceedings The Wesley Historical Society*, 11, 1924, p. 29.
financiers rescued him at different times. Two of them, Johann Daknatel, a Mennonite minister, and Isaac Lelong, an Amsterdam merchant, were two of Wesley’s contacts when he travelled to Herrnhut via the Netherlands. The English debt had amounted to £132,000 by 1753. Zinzendorf was suspended from office and the church management put under administrators. Ward makes the point that Zinzendorf was a good deal less wise than even ‘bourgeois old Wesley’, he also emphasises that networks of pious business men in the eighteenth century were prepared to support the likes of Zinzendorf, as he was a Count of the Holy Roman Empire. Some years later, Wesley wrote in his journal that he did not admire the Moravians because they confined their beneficence to the narrow bounds of their society.

At this stage of Wesley’s development it can be seen that his view of ‘transformation of all life on the basis of the gospel was intimately linked to economic issues, and that economics had a central place in his project. This is an evangelical economics, since it emphasises the gospel as the basis of a theory at variance with the practice of worldly economic relations’. By 1739, Wesley felt that, ‘Methodism theologically has nothing new to offer. At Abergavenny, I simply described the plain old religion of the Church of England’. To an extent this was true, but it was Frederick C. Gill who pointed out that it was the new emphasis that gave these truths new life, and certain doctrines such as ‘Justification by Faith and Christian Perfection it brought into prominence’.

---

89 John Wesley was with Daknatel 15 June 1738. He went to one of the Societies in Amsterdam and the singing was in Low Dutch. Daknatel having translated into Low Dutch part of the Herrnhut Hymn Book. The exposition was in High Dutch. (Richard R. Cameron, The Rise of Methodism: A Source Book (New York, 1954)).
90 Ward, ‘Zinzendorf and Money’, p. 139.
93 Theodore W. Jennings Jr., Good News to the Poor: John Wesley’s Evangelical Economics (Nashville, 1990), Introduction.
Final Theology

By 1742 Wesley had come to his almost final theology from many areas. He had been influenced by the gospel men of the Evangelical Revival and had taken from them and given in return. MacArthur feels that ‘he contributed to the movement by practising a sound historical validity resting solidly on the Scriptures’.96 The devotional literature of Jeremy Taylor, William Law and Thomas à Kempis along with such sermons as The Rich Man’s Charge had played their part. He had embraced the tenets of Arminianism and pursued a middle course line of Evangelical Arminianism. Correspondence and communications had alerted him to the European Pietist movement and such leaders as Spener, Francke, Christian Davis, Spangenberg and Zinzendorf. He had visited and observed the impressive Pietist centres of Halle and Herrnhut with their combination establishments of religion, charity and commerce. He was aware of the persecuted Protestant minorities like the Salzburgers, Silesians and Moravians. He had had contact with some of them in Georgia, and the Moravians, in particular, had had an influence on him with their organisation.

From all these influences, he had forged his own amalgam of theology which ran parallel to and was dovetailed into the dominating theme of evangelical economics. His evangelical economics and soteriology grew together, mutually influencing, reinforcing and clarifying each other. Rack considers that ‘Wesley borrowed from a wide range of Christian traditions and then interpreted them through his own selective imagination’.97 All the afore-mentioned influences were vital stepping stones in Wesley’s developing theology, though some writers oversimplify the influences on his theology. Bishop Warburton ascribed the paternity of Methodism to Law: ‘William Law was the father, and Count Zinzendorf rocked the cradle’.98

Wesley finally believed that men could be led to an understanding of the new birth, the assurance of justification, which was to know that he

96 MacArthur, Economic Ethics, p. 134.
98 Gill, Romantic Movement, p. 18.
had a new relationship with God. He was a new creature saved from the
guilt of sin. It was in effect, a transformation, a conversion experience, a
new experience of God. This was the inward regeneration described a
hundred years earlier by the Puritan divine, John Preston, as ‘the
testimony of the Spirit, such an expression of love and peace and joy, such
a thing as no man knows but himself’.99 When a person is justified (it is
the state of it), then God is working in us, in other words Sanctification.100

In the next step a person was led through to Sanctification by
accessing channels of grace, and Christian Perfection was the goal or
entire sanctification. To have Christian Perfection, one had to have purity
of intention, imitation of Christ and love of God and neighbour. Men had
to strive to maintain their Christian Perfection because it could be easily
lost. The channels and means of grace covered and included a wide range
of activities. These included public worship, personal devotion and
Christian community discipleship. The general means of grace were
general obedience and keeping the commandments, self denial and taking
one’s cross daily. The partial means of grace were prayer, fasting, The
Lord’s Supper, reading the Scriptures and rightly ordered conversation.101
The prudential means of grace were works of mercy, acts of love, class and
band meetings, watch night services, visiting the sick and reading
devotional classics.102 The traditional means of grace in the Anglican
Church were vulnerable. People could come again and again and
experience nothing. What was wanted was the structured Methodist
means of grace. The means of grace, instead of being a substitute for God,
became the means to encounter God and maintain the relationship.103
Wesley considered that the grace received in sanctification, in other words
the transforming process, meant that men will also have transformed
economics, which will be a testimony to the efficiency of grace. Further,
Theodore Jennings contends that ‘Wesley felt that a failure to actualize

99 Watson, Early Methodist Class Meeting, p. 45.
101 Rightly ordered conversation figures largely in Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary, 1836-
38, which will be discussed in a later chapter.
102 Henry H. Knight, The Presence of God In the Christian Life: John Wesley’s Means of
103 The Presence of God, p. 34
evangelical economics would mean the collapse of the holiness transformation project.’

With his theology in place and a certain amount of doctrinal isolation, Wesley turned to the practicalities of the Methodist Society. Headquarters had been established at the Old Foundry in 1739. As well as headquarters and a poor distribution centre, the Foundry served as a centre for a melting pot of projects, a house of mercy for widows, boys’ school, employment bureau, loan office, savings bank, bookshop and church. A form of centrality had to be achieved with doctrinal consolidation. At the same time, Wesley was fully aware that this was a new order still firmly placed within the established system – the Church of England, and, concurrently, demographics were changing as the economy was starting to accelerate.

**Establishment and Structure of Methodist Society**

The first Conference of the Society met at the Foundry on 25 June 1744 with ten members, six of whom were clergymen and four Methodist preachers. In actual fact, the Conference merely advised Wesley. The Society was going to operate outside the bounds of the English parochial system, with its itinerancy, open air evangelism and desire to work through a society system. This system provided for a revival mission spread over a wide territory. Philanthropy and good works with their inheritance from the days of the Holy Club were now part of the structured system of the Society and the framework included class meetings and bands. The idea was that the small groups would hold the ground already gained, and strengthen the weak. The poor were uppermost in Wesley’s mind. That body of people, marginalised, ignored and despised in eighteenth century England, were to find themselves an
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104 Jennings, *Good News to the Poor*, p. 155.
105 The Old Royal Foundry was an armoury and arsenal, but had ceased making cannons since an explosion in 1726. Purchase price was £115, borrowed by Wesley with a further £600 to make it habitable. Subscriptions totalled £480, leaving Wesley £300 in debt. (Hattersley, *Brand for Burning*, p. 170).
advocate in Wesley. Edwards affirms that ‘in a sense, John Wesley discovered the poor’.  

By 1743, Wesley had published a manifesto, *The Nature, Design and General Rules of the Methodist Societies in London, Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle upon Tyne etc*; this directed the structure of the Society. The Methodist Class Meeting owes a considerable debt to the Moravian model which ran classes for the furtherance of spiritual growth and direction. Allied to this was a rigorous assessment programme, but basically the meeting was a supportive structure grounded in piety. The group comprised ten to twelve people who prayed and cared for each other, engendering a sense of belonging. Classes had a leader who collected weekly contributions for the poor and watched over the souls of their brethren.

A smaller more intimate alternative was the Band Meeting, which comprised a few chosen friends. Watson says that ‘to meet together in band, was not merely to exercise self examination, nor yet to engender a mutual growth in spiritual self-awareness. It was to occasion the presence of Christ and thus to assure an efficacious means of grace’. These band groups of about three people expressed greater union with God and their search for Christian Perfection was closely followed. Meeting in band was an intense experience, which will be amply demonstrated, later in this thesis, in Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary. Tyerman criticises this pervasive aspect of Methodism, referring to ‘the unhealthy tone of Wesley’s piety… no doubt with the best of intentions, but like spying into the secrets which properly belong to man and maker’.

A group of classes and bands formed a Society, which had fellowship meals called love feasts, prayer meetings and watch nights. Love feasts consisted of simple bread, biscuits and water, whilst participants shared prayer and testimony. Wesley regarded them as an extension of band fellowship. Watson explains that ‘they had an immediacy and impact which could be misunderstood by those not aware of the nature of the

---

109 Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, p. 78.
110 Watson, *Early Methodist Class Meeting*, p. 84.
gathering. They were a highly sought after privilege with admission strictly by class ticket.\textsuperscript{111} The symbol of identity to these gatherings was the class ticket.\textsuperscript{112} In Methodism, class tickets were subjected to a quarterly examination hence the phrase, quarterly class tickets. Band members had a B printed in the corner of their tickets. Band members needed a trial three month period and it set them apart as committed members of the Society. The overall structure was group fellowship. Watson feels that Wesley had toned down the Moravian rigid system of spiritual supervision with the emphasis that ‘mutual responsibility should be the true purpose of the group fellowship’.\textsuperscript{113}

The Societies in a particular district were linked together in a Circuit, and the preacher in charge made a regular round of visiting classes and preaching. In reality, accountability was the main purpose of the class meetings. Watson comments that ‘Initially there would be some awkwardness as the catechetical process was implanted and people would be diffident about answering direct and evaluative questions, but as the accountability was extended, they realised they were on a common journey’.\textsuperscript{114} However there were also fellowship, inclusiveness and intimacy, which eighteenth century Methodist Society members had not previously experienced. Wesley, with the accuracy of a psychologist, had read the minds of the groups he was aiming to convert. His doctrine of Christian Perfection, aligned to the Stewardship of Wealth and accountability, did not initially have the later impact which it had in the pre/post phases of the Industrial Revolution, with the changing fortunes of the middle and lower classes in English society.

\textit{Further Communitarian Features}

Wesley’s own ideas on the matter of economic behaviour never completely stabilised. The greater part of the congregations were prepared to give their weekly contributions to the poor through the Class Meeting.

\textsuperscript{111} Watson, \textit{Early Methodist Class Meeting}, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{112} There was a practice in the early Christian Church where the supplying of commendatory letters (a widespread practice in the Graeco Roman world) was adopted by the primitive Christian Community. (Watson, \textit{Early Methodist Class Meeting}, p104)
\textsuperscript{113} Watson, \textit{Early Methodist Class Meeting}, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{114} Watson, \textit{Early Methodist Class Meeting}, p. 116.
However, the rest of the services ranged around the care of the sick, visiting prisons and friendship with the poverty stricken. Following the practice of the Holy Club, Wesley gave away all but a very small amount. Henry Moore examined his account books and estimated that Wesley gave away in fifty years considerably more than £30,000. At the end of his life in 1790, he reiterated that for over sixty six years he had kept his accounts exactly, and that he was satisfied that he had saved all he could and given all he could. Wesley was not ashamed to beg in the manner of a monastic mendicant, but this was not something he could enforce on other Society members. This was all part of the old longing for the community of goods. Walsh stresses that Wesley admired the figure of St. John Chrysostom, who told his congregation at Constantinople in the year 400, that if only their wealth was pooled, poverty would be eliminated and the Community of Acts realised.

Walsh further believes that Wesley introduced into Protestantism by ‘his doctrine of Perfection something approaching the two-tier ethical system of Catholic Antiquity, but firmly laicised it, removing the perfectionist imperative from the monastic community and placing it firmly on the shoulders of the ordinary folk of his societies’. There is a considerable amount of truth in this statement. Short of belonging to a monastic community with its vow of poverty, Wesley was going to impose some of its disciplines on his own adherents. The pressure was on for the believing masses, but according to their station. There was no escape for them. Those who belonged to bands were obliged to give to their uttermost. Thus Wesley attempted ‘to maximize the charitable commitment of his people.’ He rejected the idea that ‘the State should exert itself to reorder the economic system of the country’, and relied on ‘drastic, but voluntary Christian philanthropy’.

118 Walsh, ‘Community of Goods’, p. 44.
119 The Rules of Band Societies contain the injunction ‘to give alms of such things as you possess and that to the uttermost, Walsh, ‘Community of Goods’, p. 44.
The charitable commitment was expanded to include orphan houses, charity schools and dispensaries and, in 1746, a Loan Fund or Lending Stock was established. Wesley wrote ‘I made a large collection towards lending stock for the poor. One rule is to only lend 20/- at once. No less than 250 persons have been relieved in eighteen months’. Wesley had changed the opposition to the community of goods into the two-tier system with the Society members bearing the brunt. In a sense the communitarian features had been subsumed into the class meetings, bands and societies like Herrnhut. Herrnhut had also been one of the inspirational features for communitarianism but, as Wesley’s enthusiasm for the Moravians had palled, so perhaps had their way of life. As the eighteenth century wore on, Wesley continued to view the Moravians with a combination of benevolence and disapproval.

The spectre of the community of goods was sufficiently strong for Thomas Coke to write after Wesley’s death in 1791 that ‘The riches of goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, tithe and possessions of same as some do falsely boast’. This was official authority and an attempt to codify the doctrine. Wesley’s view on property was not that of John Locke whose ideas had dominated much of eighteenth century political and economic thought. The economic reality of the eighteenth century was that property for man was an unalienable right to be defended, and that defence of property was important. Wesley, on the other hand, considered property was never an unalienable right. It was only to be held as a steward or trustee and at any time God could take it away. This theory linked it with the originally held communitarian view.

**New Dissent**

Moving in the same direction as the Methodists were the New Dissenters, the Congregationalists and the Baptists; the latter shared with

---

the Methodists the insistence on high standards, personal morals and the primary emphasis on the necessity of conversion. There were other things common to the Non–conformist groups. As well as the priority of conversion, there was the centrality of the itinerancy, village preaching, the recruitment process and the heavy reliance of each denomination on laymen. This reliance on the laity was an inheritance from the European Pietists who endowed the laity with a type of spiritual leadership. There was also access to ordination without formal training.

E.P. Thompson sees the Non–conformist groups and their chapel communities as providing alternate activities and helping socio-economic groups at the mercy of the trade cycle. These Non-conformist groups of the New Dissent were certainly targeting the lower echelons of society like the Methodists. The old Dissent had targeted socially prominent people, but the new groups had an egalitarian spirit. Like the Methodists they saw the new converts as travelling to heaven and those who were without God were travelling in another direction – hell. There was a rejection of the old privilege system of patronage and wealth. As Wesley commented, ‘We consider all men only on their spiritual state and how they stand related to another world’. At the same time, Wesley was cultivating for religious reasons the insularity of the Methodists. Being a Methodist included, through integration, joining a church which kept contacts with outsiders to a minimum.

The Society maintained a type of exclusiveness despite the influx of recruits from a wider society. In his rules for the Methodist Societies in 1743, Wesley had emphasised, ‘to do good to the householder of the faith, employing them preferably to others, helping each other in business and much more because the world will love its own and them only’. Wesley was reinforcing the idea of Wesleyans against the rest of the world. Wesley advised against close relationships even with parents, brothers and sisters

---

who were of the world. He conceded that it was possible to be civil and
friendly at a distance, but Methodists had to be separate. One can see
the seeds of the nineteenth century Methodist business and social network
system. The chapel and its contacts were to provide all the social and
economic needs. However, the chapel goers mostly of the lower classes
were prepared to put up with the discipline in order to reap the benefits.
Langford points out that Wesley’s societies ‘fitted none of the approved
models of ordinary association’, from vestry and parson to club
conviviality to the working class ethos of taverns and ale houses. This
observation throws up a distinct picture of Methodism’s isolation within
general society.

For the greater part, though, most members of the Methodist Society
had been people who really had nothing to lose by joining the Society. In
fact, they could gain spiritual satisfaction and some economic
improvement. They had been encouraged to speak freely, plainly and
accept responsibility; opportunities for literacy were offered through the
Sunday School movement, one of the building blocks of the movement.
The individual was important and he was taught self discipline, to keep
records accurately, lead meetings and improve self expression and
oratorical skills. They were served by the itinerant lay preachers who came
from their own class, from farm, mill and shop. The movement had
provided a vehicle for psychological excesses in the form of ecstasies,
shrieking and groaning as part of the struggle to Christian Perfection, and
Charles Wesley’s six thousand hymns had nurtured their emotional state.

**Stewardship of Riches and Effects of Industrial Revolution**

By 1760, Wesley was growing increasingly wary of the concept of
riches and realised that more direction on the matter would have to be
imposed. He was aware that riches could be a sticking point and sap the
vitality of the movement. The Model Deed was imposed in 1763 to protect
the growing chapel establishments from ever reverting to the Church of
England. He did this by placing ownership in a board of trustees. In the
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establishment of the Model Deed to secure continuity, Jennings says that Wesley’s ‘Standard Sermons’ were included ‘and achieved canonical status with all their equivocal statements’.  

Methodism was under attack at the time with demonstrations and violence by groups opposed to the general economic ideology. These groups were enraged at Wesley’s denial of wealth and privilege as being a symptom of God’s favour, and the invective that ‘the poor have a particular place in God’s action was inflammatory for the time’. The later 1784 Deed of Declaration empowered the Annual Conference as the governing body of the movement and contributed a ‘legal 100’ preachers to form the Methodist Conference and undertake specific duties. Wesley was really doing a juggling act with his insistence on the fact that Methodism was part of the Established Church, yet he was challenging the established wealth of the church by insisting on more charity for the poor. He was anxious to make sure that the right interpretation of ‘stewardship of riches’ was conveyed to his congregations, that it was a practice of solidarity with the poor. There was a flurry of sermons by the 1780’s (when Wesley was up against profound economic change) all relating to riches in an effort by Wesley to reinforce his message. Wesley’s sermon on The Use of Money, also known as the Mammon of Unrighteousness, had produced the three rules - gain all you can, save all you can and give all you can - and was being highlighted by Wesley as somewhat of a failure. In the On Riches Sermon Wesley complained that, of the 50,000 Methodists in 1789, fewer than 500 gave all they could.

Wesley had developed the three injunctions independently, and Jennings criticises him for not conjoining the second injunction to the
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133 Jennings, Good News for the Poor, p. 169.
134 Jennings, Good News for the Poor, p. 170.
137 Other reports give higher numbers, but the first national census was not ordered until 1801 by the House of Commons. (J.H. Plumb, England in the Eighteenth Century: 1714-1815, p. 144.) See later discussion on Wesleyan Methodist numbers at turn of century.
third, on the grounds that it made no sense to save all you can and then to give it away. The Deceitfulness of Riches in 1784 was followed by The Danger of Riches which tried to define riches in a minimalist fashion. In order to negate dependence on rich men, he advised against building large chapels, saying that ‘otherwise rich men will be necessary to us… if we depend on and be governed by them, farewell to Methodist discipline’. Rapid population growth had triggered consequent larger building plans within the Connexion. Wesley fulminated against the ‘execrable bill trade’, saying ‘Whosoever endorses a bill (that is promise to pay for more than he is worth), is either a fool or a knave’. There seemed to be no area of private and personal financial matters in which Wesley was not prepared to infiltrate. Advice on bequests recommended that ‘they are only justified if they will keep one’s survivors to live as they are accustomed’. Bequests should only go towards those who know how to use them with moral discretion.

As the Industrial Revolution gathered strength, Wesley was beginning to be a part of a fading era. At this time business and profits were everything. Hampson stresses that Methodist adherents were ‘visibly increasing in wealth, not by speculation and fraud but by their attention to business’. Warner finds confirmation of this judgement in the available records of individual achievements, particularly in the new processes of manufacture. Leading ironmakers throughout the country were prominent Wesleyans. Another example was the economic development at Stockport, which had a large religious community and three of the five

139 Jennings, Good News for the Poor, p. 167.
master spinners who engaged in water power spinning on a large scale were Wesleyans.\textsuperscript{148} These were the Methodists who were having to value the profit motive and learning to be acquisitive. Edwards reveals that these prosperous Methodists were those ‘achieving middle class status and becoming leaders of the local societies’.\textsuperscript{149} Having gained material success, these men offered to build a chapel for the Society.\textsuperscript{150}

Methodists had presented with the right moral virtues for success in the framework of the Industrial Revolution and its economic structure, and this was the result. They had fitted perfectly into the system. The push was on for a move in the direction of respectability and the middle class.

\textbf{Separation}

Gilbert sees the Industrial Revolution as ‘a major watershed in the nation’s history; one which separated an era of slow economic growth’,\textsuperscript{151} from a new era of widespread wealth and genuine economic improvement for most members of society. Tyson believes that, ‘the economic rise of Methodists caused separation from the Anglican Church and created a myriad of logistical and economic problems which brought a financial accommodation to Methodists, that sapped the vitality of the earlier mission.’\textsuperscript{152} Hagen sees the change as a process that eroded the old feelings of deference and dependence by the lower orders.\textsuperscript{153} Separation for Methodists had also been aided by the Deed of Declaration, 1784, with its Legal 100. There was no suggestion in the Deed of any imminent separation, but in 1784 Wesley, Thomas Coke and James Creighton ordained two itinerant preachers Whatcoat and Vasey as deacons and elders for America; Thomas Coke was then made General Superintendent

of the American Mission. This situation had arisen from the Peace Settlement of 1783 after the American War of Independence. Ward describes the appointment as ‘clandestine, with Wesley envisaging an extension of the system operating in Ireland with the American Methodists linked nationally to the Church of England by Superintendent Coke’.\(^\text{154}\)

It was not possible for English bishops to ordain citizens of what was now a foreign power and the resulting fracas raised the implication of American Methodists remaining within the confines of the Episcopal Church. By 1791, Coke seems to have sought an American settlement in the general interests of Methodists in which England was the senior partner.\(^\text{155}\) Ward argues that if ever there was a year when Wesley could be said to have irrevocably severed himself from the Church of England, it was in 1784, when by his ordinations and Deed of Declaration, he sought a settlement for the societies on both side of the Atlantic.\(^\text{156}\)

Wesley was dead by 1791 and his legacy to the Society included many constraints on the members. In particular, he had impressed on them that wealth came from God, and therefore it had to go back. Discussing the theme of resignation amongst members of the Methodist Connexion, Elliott contends that it was ‘characteristic of wealthier Wesleyans as well as the likes of skilled frame knitters’.\(^\text{157}\) I would prefer to use the word anxiety instead of resignation and it was the direct result of Wesley arranging his theology on to his evangelical economics, tying his adherents up in knots, from which there was no escape. Samuelsson’s excellent work is one of the few Methodist works to actually refer to and highlight the anxieties and disquietudes which must have tormented businessmen on their way to salvation. He describes the great frustrations engendered by moral injunctions like those of Wesley.\(^\text{158}\)

---


\(^{155}\) W.R. Ward, Protestant Evangelical Awakening, p. 335.


agreed that it was a good thing earning money, but what one did with it was the catch. Elliott discusses ‘the virtue of pleonexia’, which is the desire to make more money. This virtue implies self improvement and social mobility.\textsuperscript{159} Wesley had developed the medieval theme of Stewardship of Wealth ethic that censured all forms of acquisitiveness and economic aggression.\textsuperscript{160} The spirit of capitalism was the spirit of unqualified pleonexia, getting more and producing more.

\textit{Nineteenth Century, Evangelical Connection, Rise of Middle Class}

At the turn of the century, \textit{The Methodist Magazine} was driving home the virtue of liberalaty with lengthy biographies extolling members who had given all.\textsuperscript{161} Glowing obituaries of generous behaviour were unrelentingly served up as samples of ideal Methodists, ideal in spirituality and business, good stewards of their holdings.\textsuperscript{162}

In his broad study of the influence of Evangelicalism on social and economic thought, 1795-1865, Boyd Hilton claims that the moderate evangelicals in the early part of the nineteenth century regarded the economy as ‘a sphere of activity in which so many of God’s creatures engaged unthinkingly, as an arena of great spiritual trial and suspense’.\textsuperscript{163} As one can see much of the Methodist situation in this statement, one asks the obvious question who was influencing whom, or was it a two way

\textsuperscript{159} Elliott, ‘Ideology of Economic Growth’, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{161} One such example was William Beresford who was a local preacher in Snelstone, Derby. He rose early every morning, laboured hard in the day and afterwards walked three or four miles to preach the gospel. He maintained a family of nine children and realised property of one thousand pounds. His liberalaty was as eminent as his industry. He built a small chapel at his own expense and bequeathed it to the use of Methodists. \textit{The Methodist Magazine} tut-tutted that his wife did not concur with this behaviour and marvelled that she had left him at one stage as a protest, \textit{The Methodist Magazine}, March 1805, p. 97, Vol. xxviii, 2\textsuperscript{nd} volume of New Series.
\textsuperscript{162} It is also interesting to read in the 1810 \textit{The Methodist Magazine} a lengthy dissertation on the origins of the Pietists in Germany. It was obviously important for the Methodists to understand and be close to the heart and roots of their origins. It was also a recognition and acknowledgment of their debt to the Pietist movement. \textit{The Methodist Magazine}, 1810, Vol. xxxiii, 7\textsuperscript{th} Vol., New Series.
traffic of influence? Chalmers, the Scottish divine, discussed ‘solid commerce which was God’s instrument for the development of his world and excrescent trade which was vicious and selfish’.

Over trading was another name for speculation in certain evangelical circles, and it implied not only economic irresponsibility but philosophical doubt and atheism. The theme of the atoning bankrupt was also strongly imbued in evangelical economic circles, though at the same time there was a tendency to regard innocent bankrupts as sacrificial offerings beloved by God, and atoning for the sins of a fallen world. Speculation was regarded as a sin, and charity was a Christian obligatory duty, but hardly to the same extent as among the Wesleyan Methodists. Hilton makes use of Benjamin Gregory’s hagiographic work about Walter Powell, successful Launceston Wesleyan Methodist, who later resided in Port Phillip and London. He refers to Powell as a mercantile angel, a little known evangelical Methodist from Tasmania. Hilton suggests that ‘Powell’s mercantile salvation was his moderation and refusal to speculate, and this was made possible by the application of conscience and a heroic and martyr like trust in God’.

Once again the question is raised, did the Evangelicals give charitably until it hurt as the Wesleyan Methodists did? For an answer we can turn to what was referred to as a ‘Singular Instance of Christian Liberality’ in *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for 1825. A George Cubitt wrote from Oxford on 25 March 1825, referring to a Henry Goring Esq., a member of the Church of England, residing there, who recently presented to the Treasurer of the Methodist Trust Fund the sum of £3,000 for the following purposes: £2,000 towards liquidation of the debt to the Methodist Chapel in Oxford, and £500 to the trustees of the chapel to pay off the debt incurred by the Sunday and day school after building the school room.
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164 Thomas Chalmers, 1780-1847, Scottish divine wrote volumes on Christian and the Civic Economy of Large Towns; leader of the Evangelical section of Scottish Church, 1834.
167 Hilton, *Age of Atonement*, pp. 141, 142. (It will be demonstrated later in the thesis that Walter Powell learnt these values from the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists.)
There was £300 for a small chapel at Abingdon and, for the purpose of erecting a place of worship at Woodstock, he gave £200. Mr. Cubitt finished with ‘This is the Lord’s doing and it is marvellous in our eyes’. Whether or not Henry Goring had given till it hurt, as enjoined on the Methodists, it was still a splendid example of evangelical Anglican benevolence towards Methodism.

Clive Field has analysed the social composition of English Methodism, and has alerted his readers to the existence of the grey area which exists in population studies. He reveals that in 1830, ‘there were 232,000 full members of Wesleyan Methodism, a ten fold increase in numbers since records were first published’. This grey area was comprised of the people who regularly attended Wesleyan worship, but who avoided full membership either because they were too poor to pay the weekly contributions or were too substantial to adhere to the financial imperatives of Wesley. Additionally, they may not have been able to embrace the self discipline and spiritual requirements. Contemporary estimates between the 1780s and 1840s put the total of the worshipping community (inclusive of members) at anything between five and six times the membership, with a median of 3 or 4 times. This would make Wesleyan Methodism in England in the 1830s as having 600,000 to 800,000 adherents. Field feels that, with all the literature, it is still difficult to get a complete picture of the entire Wesleyan community. David Hempton conventionally multiplies the figure by three and calculates that Methodists were 4.5% of the adult English. He refers to the grey area as ‘denominational gypsies of no fixed abode’. Gilbert believes that, ‘something approaching 20% of the most politicised section of the adult lower orders were associated with chapel communities of one sort or another’.

---

With the dawning of the nineteenth century, Methodism had changed from being a sect and was moving into the denominational phase. It had ceased to be only the Church of the worker and the poor as the wealthy adherents were courted and encouraged to be involved in chapel trusteeship. Edwards notes that rich Methodists found their interests increasingly built up with the existing order of Society, these were the strong conservative force in Methodism. This rising middle class was confident of a divine and compelling power which accounted for their success in the economic world. It was a mark of divine approbation, they saw themselves as agents of a divine purpose and providence was working in them. At the same time, prosperous Methodists vocalised the impracticability of the economic directive and stressed the need to prove that Methodist doctrines would still be entertained in business, even if watered down. The consolidation of their class provided opportunities for dominance by the middle class. There had been no way previously for them to penetrate the closed world of privilege and politics. The logical conclusion was to embrace business and economic prosperity. This was followed by the growing sense of the ideal Wesleyan Methodist economic man. The Methodist Society prided itself on its reputation in the world of trade and industry. This was viewed ‘as a test and justification of one’s religious profession that in business, one was punctual, conscientious and honourable’. With all this stress on reliability of character, Methodists would have been considered in today’s parlance as a good credit risk. This would have given them a certain manoeuvrability in the larger economic world, but could not morally have been taken any further or extended by them. Aspirations were not only confined to the respectable wealthy middle class. Ward notes that the real income and expectations of the Wesleyan Methodist ministers had risen in the opening decades of the nineteenth century. The need for ministerial support was part of a greater movement as ‘preachers were not allowed to find outside

175 Maldwyn Edwards, After Wesley, p. 21-2.
employment and that created a need for financial support’. The Methodist Magazine of 1815 argued that a preacher fulfilled a respectable station in society and he and his family needed to appear becoming in that station.

Gilbert concludes that the complex task of running a massive national association was combining to produce organisational consolidation and concentration of effort in economically viable areas. The ministers with their temporal expectations were dependent on the prosperous, wealthier elements in the Wesleyan laity. This new ministerial shift and dependency on the wealthy elements explains the schisms which rent the movement by Methodists determined to retain the original values of the early movement.

Jabez Bunting was the most important figure in Methodism after the death of John Wesley. He was assistant secretary to the Conference in 1806. Like Wesley, he was a Tory and resisted the growing political reform in the early nineteenth century. According to Armstrong ‘Bunting was in control of all rewards and punishments available to members and he ran the Conference absolutely’. The conservative outlook, so typical of the

181 The schisms had commenced as far back as 1796 with Alexander Kilham leading a breakaway group called the Methodist New Connexion. In 1808, Hugh Bourne, a revival practitioner, was expelled from the Conference for holding large outdoor rallies and camp meeting ‘revivals’. Bourne’s breakaway group became the Primitive Methodists; an independent entity identified with the working class. Their place of origin was the Staffordshire – Cheshire border, half rural, half industrial. Armstrong refers to Thomas Cooper’s description of Primitive Methodism ‘as the religion of the poor man who knew little of books and who found happiness in prayer. The only books they read were the Bible and truly religious books’. (Anthony Armstrong, The Church of England, the Methodists and Society: 1700-1850 (London, 1973, p. 199). They enjoyed visions and exorcisms and later labour histories see the Primitive Methodists as providing a training ground for trade union leaders, because of their ranter type preaching. Another breakaway group was the Bible Christian Connexion in Devon, led by William O’Bryan who preached outside the official Wesleyan circuit. In 1805, The Independent Methodists united with other remnants at Oldham, Stockport, Warrington and Macclesfield as well as joining the Manchester revivalist group, The Band Room. The latter were never fully in or out of the Methodist community. (Ward, Religion and Society, p. 82). Divergences like these were the rational outcome of the religious development of Wesleyan Methodism. They had been formed by change and they kept the impetus going. Despite this group of churches, the main body, the Wesleyan Methodists, were established as the main denomination with all the qualities of effective organisation.
Society in the early days of the nineteenth century, was not only a response to dissent and religion, but just as much to the crises in society. There was in fact a crisis of authority in English life between the establishment and the rest.\footnote{Ward, Religion and Society, p. 20.}

Bunting certainly had no sympathy with such groups as the Luddites, who smashed steam loom machinery in 1811 and seized fire arms. They had a fear of impending poverty, as steam replaced their lace and stocking frame looms. The Wesleyan Conference saw itself as a force for order. They were wary of their position in the outside community and wanted nothing to compromise their standing. At the same time, they had a certain amount of pragmatism in the political arena. The Conference wrote in 1812, ‘fear the Lord and honour the King and meddle not with them that are given to change’.\footnote{Minutes of the Methodist Conferences: from the first, held in London, by the Late Rev. John Wesley, A.M., in the year 1744 (London, 1932), 1812.} At the same time, they were anxious for their own political rights, and the \textit{Toleration Act of 1812}, gave Methodist Preachers the legal privileges of clergymen. It had been passed through by the intense lobbying of Thomas Allen, the solicitor who acted for the Connexion. He had emphasised the line that Methodism was a force for order and in no way contributed to the unsettled nature of society, as reform had.

As the century developed, the strength of the Society was in the industrial areas of Newcastle, Cornwall, Lancashire and Yorkshire. The revival movement had great success in conversions in 1814 in Cornwall and the West of England, and in 1816, revival was strong in the north west of Derbyshire and about Leeds. Financial salvation for the revivals came from the wealthy towns of Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Halifax.

What emerged from this early nineteenth century period was the transformed pious, economic Wesleyan man, dynamic, energetic, confident and optimistic about his spiritual possibilities leading to Christian Perfection. Additionally, these spiritual values were inexorably entwined with economic principles and responsibilities. The Wesleyan
economic man knew that he had to sanctify his commercial transactions with right behaviour and then consecrate the commercial proceeds.\textsuperscript{185}

\textbf{The Development of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society}

Findlay and Holdsworth in their \textit{History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society} admit that Protestantism was slow to realise its duty to the ‘heathen’, and that the Church of Rome had long since beaten them to missionary opportunities. The Catholic Church, with its Middle Ages ‘heritage of missionary obligation and tradition’,\textsuperscript{186} was vindicating its apostolic lineage through the missionary agency \textit{The Congregatio de Propaganda Fide}.

The German Pietistic movement in the early eighteenth century, in the shape of August Herman Franke and his seminary at Halle, preached salvation to the ‘heathen’. They also trained missionaries for the Danish Mission to India in 1705.\textsuperscript{187} The Danish Mission to the Hindus at Tranquebar in 1709 was the first Protestant Mission to the heathen. Similarly, Christian Frederick Schwartz, the father of Tamil Christianity, was trained in Halle in 1729. The missionary spirit was endemic in the Wesley family. John Wesley, the grandfather of the Wesleys was one of the 2000 clergy who were ejected from their livings in 1662. Before this, however, he had longed to go first as a missionary to Surinam in the Dutch East Indies and afterwards to Maryland. His son, Samuel Wesley, had formed a magnificent scheme to go as a missionary to India, China and Abyssinia, and in the last years of his life lamented the fact that he was not young enough to go to Georgia.\textsuperscript{188} He had also warned the British East India Company that they should facilitate the spread of Christianity, writing that ‘this object would be well worth dying for’.\textsuperscript{189} Susannah Wesley, the mother of John and Charles, knew the story of the Danish


\textsuperscript{187} The SPCK founded in 1698 sustained the work of the Danish Halle classes in India until 1824.


\textsuperscript{189} Findlay and Holdsworth, \textit{History}, Vol 1, p. 29.
missionaries in Tranquebar and said ‘for several days, I could think or speak of little else’. Building on this, she gave a weekly missionary instruction to her children and John later refers gratefully to this fact.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts established in 1701, sent John Wesley to Georgia in 1735. Its main thrust was focused on spiritual welfare for British colonies and dependencies and the task of providing chaplains for Government service. The Moravian James Hutton influenced Wesley to go to Georgia, and A.C. Thompson acknowledges that the Moravian Society, the Bruder-Gemeinde, set a tremendous example in their missionary endeavours. In the two decades from 1732 onwards, the Church of the Brethren called more missions into being than did the whole of Protestantism in two centuries.

A.C. Thompson felt that Methodism showed through John Wesley in almost a filial relationship to Moravianism. What was most valued in Wesley was in considerable part due to Moravianism, in particular the missionary impulse. The Wesleyan Church started to copy the Moravians about 1760 and in 1784 Dr. Thomas Coke published his Plan of the Society for the Establishment of Missions among the Heathens. Coke’s society anticipated eleven years later, in 1795, the London Missionary Society which was non-denominational, but leant towards Old Dissent, and tried to unite all the evangelical threads of missionary efforts. By 1797, spurred on in part by the efforts of the London Missionary Society and sponsored by Venn, Simon and Grant, the Eclectic Society, founded by Evangelical clergymen in 1783, launched the Church Missionary Society to bring the gospel to the ‘heathen’ world. Coke, Wesley’s close companion, went out to the West Indies in the 1780s. Single handedly, he dominated the initial Methodist mission structure. He was described at his death ‘as the most indefatigable Missionary that this or any former age has produced’. He collected vigorously in the shape of private collections, aided by local preachers, rather than by public collections, but even this

190 Findlay and Holdsworth, History, Vol. 1, p. 29.
191 Thompson, A.C. Moravian Missions (New York, 1882).
aroused a certain amount of resentment in the poorer Methodist circles. All administration of the Missions was in Coke’s hands, though the Conference made it clear that at ‘all times, Doctor Coke acted as their representative’. 194

In 1798, there appeared a Committee of Finance of the Methodist Missions which had been founded for the benefit of the said Mission; Coke naturally occupied the chair. 195 By 1804, Coke’s missionary structure passed into the legalised phase and an attempt was made to control his operations. Of two apparent problems, home finance was more significant than foreign discipline. Jabez Bunting was called in to clear up the confusion; a Committee of Privileges with seven influential laymen helped to rectify the problems. The Conference then appointed a Standing Committee of Finance and Advice, with Coke as President, but the Committee was really created to keep an eye on Coke. Regular accounts now had to be produced. This first shows up in the minutes of the committee in September 1804 with the following injunction: ‘The Committee judge it necessary to say something in a very tender and delicate manner on the subject of economy. A circular letter will be sent to those brethren who have not sent in their accounts, requesting that they do so as soon as possible’. 196 Those soft words heralded the change about to come. By 20 September, the committee including Jabez Bunting, sent out a circular letter with Coke’s name on it. It asked for ‘exact financial accounts of your affairs. Have confidence in us and you will always find us faithful friends’. 197

These were the initial words of the committee, gently chiding the missionaries to toe the line and, by inference, Coke also. One sees in this initial admonition, the velvet hand of Jabez Bunting in the corresponding iron glove. This iron glove was to firm and harden in the oncoming years. The constitution of this last committee excluded the very London laymen whose help had been sought the year before. This offended them. As Findlay and Holdsworth wrote, the ‘commercial connections and business

195 Committee of Finance of the Methodist Mission, 9 April 1798, Australian Joint Copying Project (AJCP), Film M118.
196 Fourth Meeting Committee of Finance, 11 Sept. 1804, AJCP, Film M118.
197 Committee of Finance, 20 September 1804, AJCP, Film M118.
experience were almost indispensable to a Society of this nature'.  This men were the worthiest friends of the missionary cause. By 1808, the committee’s voice was stronger and harder it declared ‘Let every missionary be instructed that in their voyages, we expect them to study the greatest economy and in no way to incur unnecessary expense’.

Bernard Semmel judges the reorganisation of the Methodist Missionary activities between 1813 and 1815 as partly resulting from Arminian idealism and the final repeal of the slave trade in 1807. There was a ground swell of feeling, not only among the Methodists but also among the Dissenters and the evangelical Anglicans. Christians were ready to convert the ‘heathen’ and Semmel cites other reasons, such as the new charter for the East India Company, allowing Christians to evangelise in their domain. He sees 1813 as a definitive year for missionary expansion when leading evangelicals in the Church Missionary Society preached sermons over the length and breadth of England. Even Anglican clergymen who had not been sympathetic to the Evangelical group made their pulpits freely available for rousing missionary sermons. Alongside this, was the Nonconformist Calvinist, London Missionary Society pursuing the same fervent path.

It was an era of confidence. Napoleon had been defeated in Russia, and Semmel suggests that, for the pious, the Devil himself now took the place of Napoleon: ‘The work of the missions had become national’. The initial force of Wesley’s revival begun in 1739 had run down by 1813 and missionary fervour was the new revival linked to the new imperial mood; ‘the best means of making Englishmen think again of their own salvation by linking evangelical religion to national missions’. Semmel considers that the inner politics of the Connexion has not been systematically explored. Coke was the jealous Superintendent of Missions, holding on to his fiefdom and vigorously promoting the expansionist theory for Methodists. He had been active in America, Wales, Ireland,
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199 Conference at Bristol, Missionary Committee, 1808, AJCP, M118.
France and the West Indies. In 1812, he headed a mission to India, at the same time making efforts to become Bishop of India. He emotionally pressured the Connexion for money to support his venture. Whilst he was out of the country, Jabez Bunting, George Morley (Leeds Superintendent) and Richard Watson planned in 1813 the organisation of the Leeds Missionary Society as a model for the Connexion. These men felt that the London preachers already had enough on their hands and consequently nothing was being done well. After the years of Trafalgar and the Peninsular War, many missionary sermons and speakers dwelt on God’s plan. Findlay and Holdsworth agree that these followed the theory ‘that through the people he had shielded with his might and in whose hand he had placed the keys of the world’s traffic, the Gospel of his glory should be published to the ends of the earth’. This feeling of the duty of reciprocity helped to bolster the idea of Missionary Societies. Despite domestic penury and unrest on the home front in Great Britain, there was the counterbalance of foreign missions’ needs.

Stuart Piggin discerns Semmel’s thesis to be ‘that foreign missions siphoned off the excessive evangelising Wesleyan spirit, thus neutralising the political thread and jeopardising the vigour of the home churches’. In contrast, he defines his own thesis as ‘that foreign missions reestablished the home churches and provided greater pecuniary and spiritual resources for the home missions’. In order to work his own thesis, Piggin has distorted and selectively interpreted for his own ends. He has chosen to concentrate on the political and revolutionary
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203 ‘Rev. Thomas Coke LL.D was an Anglican priest turned Methodist. First Superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, he expended all his patrimonial fortune in support of the foreign missions. In the Mission to the West Indies Negroes, 15,000 persons were formed into religious societies, and he set the first example of the spiritual emancipation of West Africa. He crossed the Atlantic eighteen times in the service of the souls of men. As leader of the first Methodist Mission to Ceylon, he died on the voyage and his remains were committed to the deep’. (George J. Stevenson, City Road Chapel, London and its Associations (London, 1872), Monumental Tablet.)

204 The Rev. Richard Watson, itinerant preacher and journalist, was the doctrinal voice of Methodism.


207 Piggin, ‘Halévy’, p. 32.
tendencies so often falsely ascribed to Wesleyan Methodism. Semmel certainly refers to the forces and counter forces of Methodism that predisposed towards unrest, but he also makes the point that revolutionary forces and tensions, such as they were, were constantly suppressed and controlled in Wesleyan Methodism.

This theme is certainly not an important component of Semmel’s thesis. As well as many other explanations in his work for the formation of the WMMS, he makes the additional excellent point ‘that it was certainly easier for the leaders of the Connexion to make such a decision, when there existed a body of Evangelicals who were carrying out Wesley’s mission within the establishment’. 208 Piggin makes varying assumptions about the attitudes of the Wesleyan Methodist leaders towards Lord Sidmouth’s proposed Bill of 1811 to explain and revise the Toleration Acts. He also rejects Semmel’s claim that the repeal of the Conventicle Act in mid-1812 had anything to do with the formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. 209 It was, however, of vital importance for Methodists to experience their new tolerational freedom. The haze of anxiety was lifted and the confidence that accompanied it produced a new level of maturity and activity.

The founding meeting of the first Methodist Missionary Society was held in Leeds on 13 October 1813 with Thomas Thompson, prominent Methodist layman and MP, in the chair. 210 According to Findlay and

208 Semmel, Methodist Revolution, p. 169

209 The repeal of the Conventicle Act in 1812 was a joyous occasion for the Wesleyan Methodists. The Conventicle Act of 1664 had forbidden meetings of more than five people who were not members of the same household, to prevent religious dissenting groups from meeting, thus strengthening the position of the Established Church. The Five Mile Act of 1665 had forbidden the Non–conformist ministry from coming within five miles of incorporated towns. {www.all-science-fair projects.com}. The Toleration Act of 1689 allowed for licences for Dissenting ministers and Wesley took advantage of that, through not a Dissenter at heart.

210 Thompson has already been briefly mentioned in the Introduction to this thesis as one of the few Methodist bankers. (Geoffrey E. Milburn, Piety, Profit and Paternalism, Methodist business in the North East of England 1760 – 1920, Wesley Historical Society Lectures, No. 49, delivered in the Methodist Octagonal Chapel, Yarm-on-Lees, 27 June 1983, p. 44.) Thompson was the first Methodist to sit in the House of Commons as a Member of Parliament. There is a letter to Thomas Thompson of Hull from the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society on 19 February 1823 thanking him for his magnificent donation of £500 to the fund of the Missionary Society and for his continued and universal exertions in promoting the interests of the Wesleyan
Holdsworth, ‘prior to the meeting, following Thompson’s advice, names and residences of the speakers were published in the advertisements to give weight and influence to the proceedings’. Rousing sermons had been preached before the actual meeting on 13 October. Methodists were ‘insatiable sermon hearers in those days. Texts such as ‘Have respect unto the covenant; for the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty; - Ps. IXXIV 20’ were delivered’. In fact, the premise of the whole missionary movement was to be placed on God’s covenant with the human race. Enthusiastic speakers at the meeting pushed the imperial note as well as the lucrative commercial prospects. W.G. Scarth of Leeds, proud of Britain’s new position as a commercial emporium, talked about England ‘as our happy isle which is well calculated to become the grand Missionary depot of the world’. Thompson and Scarth were the prosperous and prominent laymen who cooperated with George Morley, Jabez Bunting and Richard Watson to form the first Missionary Society. There was also a sense of urgency about the whole project. Other Missionary Societies, like the London Missionary Society, were collecting at the time from Methodists and others. The Methodists realised that they had to channel money from their adherents back into their own activities.

The Rev. Richard Watson preached the forenoon sermon on the day, supported by lay speakers such as Thompson, Scarth, Wood and Dawson, who whipped up the crowd of about 1,200 people. Watson suggested in his sermon that the Methodist Missionary Society could be a proper and effectual medium through which the bounty of the pious might be distributed to the heathen. As a missionary society is under the peculiar approbation of God as a great means of enlightening the world, Dawson

211 Findlay and Holdsworth, History, Vol. 1, p. 46.
213 William Gilyard Scarth was an active and popular local preacher in Leeds. ‘He was a prosperous man of business, a borough alderman, and a force to be reckoned with in the politics of the town. It was he who declared the missionary cause must be taken out of Dr. Coke’s hands. He said ‘it must be made a public, common cause’ (Findlay and Holdsworth, History, Vol. 1, p. 39).
214 Semmel, Methodist Revolution, p. 160.
215 Richard Watson, Sermon preached at the Albert St. Chapel, Leeds on the formation of the Methodist Missionary Society for the Leeds District, 6 October 1813 (Liverpool, 1813).
thought that Methodists, of all people, should be the first to encourage missionary efforts. Jabez Bunting made the final motion, calling the ‘Methodist Missionary Ship one among others of the Grand Fleet’ carrying the Gospel to the ends of the earth, and Watson became the Missions’ official spokesman.

Nineteen resolutions drawn up by Jabez Bunting had been carried, and the Society was called The Methodist Missionary Society for the Leeds District. All subscribers to the Society were deemed to be members of the Society, whether their contributions were paid weekly, monthly, quarterly or annually. The Conference at the time was cautious and fearful at the thought of expanding their mission because of the exhausted state of their funds, but they did promise to reduce the number of preachers at home in Britain in order to maintain missions in foreign countries. Watson, preaching the next month at Halifax, where another Methodist Missionary Society formed in November, specifically made linkages destined to appeal to the Methodist economic man. He started with the idea that the missionary spirit which pervaded Britain had not come about without its strong maritime and naval connotations. He felt that the British vessels might not carry only merchandise but missionaries as well… ‘By joining the gospel to her merchandise’, it might prove possible to concentrate the commerce which was often volatile. When seen in connection with religion, it would be fixed forever.

This in effect was a flashing green light for Wesleyan Methodist men of commerce. By joining the gospel at home or abroad to merchandise, they could pass into the realm of consecrating commerce, and it was this phrase of consecrating wealth that was to become the banner of the WMMS. This was the phrase freely used from at least 1813 to the middle of the century, and was largely due to Watson. It was also a slight theological shift from Wesley’s thundering about the Deceitfulness of Riches, but imperatives and constraints that still held true in the Connexion would always endure. Watson and fellow pragmatists like Bunting knew that, to
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216 Cited in the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society as the greatest lay preacher ever given by God to Methodism.
218 Semmel, Methodist Revolution, p. 162.
support a fledgling Missionary Society, money was vital and, despite loyal offerings by the poor, it was the substantial middle class whose support was needed.\textsuperscript{219}

We can gain an understanding of the evolution of the theory from an excellent article in \textit{The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine} of 1852 on the Consecration of Wealth. Possibly because of a downturn in contributions, this article bemoaned the fact that in the free annual income of Great Britain and Ireland, not more than £1 in £750 was given for the spread of the truth in ‘heathen’ lands. This was far below what ought to be consecrated to the cause. The article suggested two percent laid upon the annual income of the United Kingdom would yield a sum eight or nine times presently contributed to all evangelical missionary societies. The article explains the Jewish laws of contribution, and suggests that, although Christianity was freer in its movements, it should heed those edicts; ‘freely we have received, freely we are to give, we should heed the prophetic descriptions of the consecration of wealth to Christ and those of abundance and manufacture’.\textsuperscript{220}

The slight theological shift no longer saw wealth as an unacceptable burden. It was acceptable as long as it was consecrated to God, and a certain amount distributed amongst the missions to the ‘heathen’. The practical shift was moving the wealth from the poor at home in the direction of the ‘heathen’, and making the poor contribute to the ‘heathen’. All the constraints and anxieties of right behaviour were still present, but wealth itself had assumed the possibilities of being sacred when consecrated. It also gave the cachet of a holy missionary journey to those Wesleyan Methodist merchants embarking on a journey to ‘heathen’ or depraved lands. Consecrated commerce and wealth could live alongside and benefit the deprived. Business had to be combined with a missionary attitude to their surroundings.

\textsuperscript{219} Walter Powell, Launceston/Melbourne merchant in the 1840’s, knew he had to sanctify his commercial transactions with right behaviour and then consecrate the commercial proceeds. Benjamin Gregory, \textit{The Thorough Business Man}, p. 309.
Richard Watson knew that he had to push these theories to the Wesleyan Methodists engaged in commerce. In a sermon preached at Wakefield in 1814, he suggested that the enterprise of the merchant would open the way for the enterprise of the missionary; foreign commerce could evangelise and Christianise the globe. Watson declared that, ‘by making themselves agents of this process, England would prosper since that proportion of our wealth which is offered in acts of benevolence would consecrate wealth’. Lay participation on the missionary committees was vital and there was still a lingering caution on the part of some of the brethren. Edward Grindrod from Manchester, who was normally cautious and constitutional, wrote to Jabez Bunting as follows: ‘I cannot, for my part, see any evil in the institution of lay committees whose only object is to raise money for the missions and whose only authority is to remit the same, when raised, to the Central committee of Preachers in London’. Bunting was as ever practical about the matter and raised the spectre of the Dissenters gaining an advantage on the Wesleyan Methodists in the mission area.

In 1814, other areas followed with establishment of missionary societies in such areas as Halifax, Hull, Sheffield, York and Cornwall. Missionary Societies were now legitimised and the enthusiasm naturally produced more funds. Not only was money being raised, but attendances at prayer meetings had improved as a spin off from the missionary spirit. Bunting observed ‘that there was nothing like public meetings. The new system had taught the poorer classes the privileges of giving. The poor now knew the consequences and efficiency conferred on them by their number’. Watson reinforced this attitude with the suggestion that the missions were the means of enlisting the sympathies of the poor in such a fashion as to overcome their absorption with their own wretchedness.

Another element crept into the equation for the Wesleyan Methodists. Respectability was being reinforced in collaboration with

---

221 Richard Watson, *Sermon preached at Methodist Chapel, Wakefield on Thursday 7th Day of July 1814* (Leeds, 1814), pp. 8-17.
223 Jabez Bunting in Leeds in a letter to a friend in Birmingham, 25 Jan. 1815, Jabez Bunting Papers, M.C.A.
other Societies. Humphrey Sandwich at a meeting in 1814 noted ‘we are associated with the most distinguished societies, churches and governments’.  

The Wesleyan Methodists’ desire to be seen in a respectable light alongside other associations and missionary societies was a shift in Wesley’s social injunction to be exclusive socially, and to stand apart from society in general. This was a new desire to be linked with respectable controlling forces, in particular evangelical Anglican forces. Missionary endeavours and benevolences were also to be linked in the sanctification chain on the path to Christian Perfection. One Manchester Methodist, David McNicoll, declared that ‘Missionary benevolence is a noble course of God like action in which we all successfully compete for the prize in our attempts to convert the ‘heathen’. We resemble him, Christ our saviour’.  

With laymen having a greater say in the collection of funds, there was a fear that control was slipping from the hands of the preachers. Semmel sees the Leeds Plan and manifestations as part of a movement to democratise the Methodist Connexion and particularly, when it showed a new rule adopted in 1814 by the Legal Hundred. Normally, seniority was the key to becoming one of the ministers in the Legal Hundred, but now every three out of four members were elected by seniority with the fourth elected by nominees of the preachers at the conference. This is how Jabez Bunting became not only one of the Legal Hundred, but Secretary of the Conference as well.

Semmel also sees missions as the platform which dominated the Wesleyan Connexion for the greater part of the nineteenth century. The Church Evangelicals persuaded Methodists to see that there was no contradiction between the nation’s morals and commercial gain. They were inextricably intertwined. In a sense, the Church Evangelicals began to see themselves in the role of protector and supporter of the Methodists,
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226 David McNicoll, *On the Gospel or the Substance of a Discourse delivered in Bridge St. Chapel, Bolton, 17 May 1815 at the Foundation of the Missionary Auxiliary Society in that town for the Manchester District* (Manchester 1815), pp. 29-31.

and, conversely, the Methodist leadership preened under the attention. Both shared the ideals of the abolition of slavery and the conversion of the ‘heathen’. In 1823 Wilberforce described ‘his particular pleasure in being associated with the Methodists in the great task of dissipating the darkness of paganism’.

To a certain extent, Wesley’s lower orders had been shunted aside in favour of the ‘heathen’, and the Wesleyan economic middle class man was turning his drive, energies and surplus money to the same direction. The spotlight had left the poor as they had come of age in the Methodist Connexion. By 1818, the Conference had instituted a General Missionary Society which covered all the local Methodist Missionary Societies founded in England. The plan for the Regulations was the work of Bunting and Watson, and, it bore the legal, luminous and comprehensive mind of Bunting. Bollen reminds us that at this time the rising movement did not yet make a clear division between types of missionary work – the call ‘was to all fellow creatures’.

The time was ripe for the fanning out of Wesleyan Methodism to the Australian mission, Port Jackson/Sydney. It was to be part of the Evangelical Christian tradition being planted in Australia.

---
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Chapter 2

Wesleyan Methodist Plantings in Sydney, New South Wales and Hobart, Van Diemen’s Land

Introduction

This chapter refers to the need for honesty in discussing the initial Wesleyan Methodist plantings in Sydney and Hobart, but it also accepts that failed missions were in a sense part of the Evangelical Christian push into the South Seas. The Evangelical influences behind the early Anglican chaplaincy in the penal colony of Sydney are highlighted and are shown to have been entwined with such figures and elements as the Rev. Samuel Marsden, William Wilberforce and the WMMC, whose influences carried through to the appointment of a Wesleyan Methodist schoolmaster.

The foundation of the early Wesleyan Methodist Society is discussed with reference to important members, as is also the arrival of Wesleyan Methodist ministers Samuel Leigh and Walter Lawry. The discussion shows the need for a strong core lay group within the new Sydney Wesleyan Methodist Society who were prepared to shoulder the financial burdens. The presence of isolated examples of consecration of wealth were not sufficient to denote lasting success. Several other difficulties of the mission are highlighted with reasons for its failure.

The movement and push of the mission to Van Diemen’s Land are explained and the discussion is looped down to Hobart. Once again the penal nature of that settlement is discussed and the fact that it constituted a problem for the first Wesleyan Methodist minister William Horton, who was more comfortable with the respectable elements in the society. The arrival of a group of committed Wesleyan Methodists in 1822 is highlighted to demonstrate the appearance of a missionary sense aligned to commerce which in the Mather case did not persevere.

The need for a mission to be established in Launceston is also discussed and the chapter ends on the admission that the first Hobart
Wesleyan Methodist Society was essentially a failure, because it lacked a strong merchant group committed to consecration of wealth.

**Sydney, New South Wales, Mission of the South Seas**

Knowledge of the South Seas had filtered through to the Wesleyan Methodists in the 1780s. Captain James Cook’s account of the exploration of Botany Bay in 1770 was reprinted in the *Arminian Magazine* for 1787, and Methodists were exposed to descriptions of exotic birds, wallabies and a quantity of fish.\(^1\) Cook had demonstrated to the British Government the strategic possibilities of the settlement of the east coast of Australia, and with the penal settlement in Port Jackson / Sydney in 1788, the field was wide open for the planting of an overseas mission. As C.M.H. Clark comments, ‘these convict exiles were not only exiled from their families and country, but also God’.\(^2\)

In 1976 Patrick O’Farrell argued that triumphalism has ceased to be a tenable position for the serious historian of Australian religion, unless it be inverted into the triumph of the secular over the religious.\(^3\) O’Farrell further argued that ‘the tragic approach has the same advantages as the triumphal’,\(^4\) and earlier in 1968 lamented that the majority of Australian histories have concentrated on themes ‘such as distance and drought but never ourselves’.\(^5\) O’Farrell wanted the frustrations, the hatreds and the lost opportunities to be emphasised besides the triumphs – all to be viewed in a harsh, self-critical light. This is the ideal, though slightly Jeremiad, approach that fits the Wesleyan Methodists’ planting in Sydney and Hobart. Their history fulfils those criteria of negativity, but still the fact remains that the Wesleyan Methodists would provide a type of Evangelical Christian benchmark within the community. They were to be part of the
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developing nation’s conscience, transplanted from Great Britain. They would contribute to Great Britain’s expanding empire and play a part in the reforming process so desirable in penal colonies.

There was a strong background of Evangelical, Wesleyan Methodist cross fertilisation present at this period in the late 18th Century. This shows up in the subscription lists, and one of the most notable entries was William Wilberforce, friend of John Wesley and the Methodist cause. Committed to many projects, he was a moulding influence and at the centre of the entwined relationships of the Evangelical families. A project close to his heart was the Pacific undertaking, and, according to Baker, he influenced Mr. Pitt to send Mr. Richard Johnson of Methodist background as Chaplain to Botany Bay.6 The Evangelicals set the colonial agenda for missionary outreach. Baker sees Wilberforce’s hand in the educational background of the first Anglican clergymen ordained for Botany Bay. Both Johnson and Samuel Marsden were educated for the Anglican ministry at the expense of the Elland Clerical Society, founded in 1767 by Wesley’s Evangelical friend Henry Venn. Both men were from a Methodist background and had been educated at Hull Grammar School,7 as had Wilberforce. Baker thus concluded that Johnson and Marsden were Methodists in the secondary sense of being devout Evangelical clergymen. Johnson was certainly accused of Methodism in his term as chaplain.8 Yarwood feels that ‘Marsden’s own letters and sermons reveal a man whose thoughts on morality, education and family were essentially in harmony with Wesley’s teaching, although he followed the Evangelical Anglicans’.9 Johnson’s task in the colony was difficult and physically demanding.10 He wrote ‘Not a convict in the colony has laboured harder than myself’.11
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7 The headmaster of Hull Grammar School was the evangelical leader Joseph Milner.
8 Major Grose harboured a suspicion that Johnson was one of the people called Methodist, Grose to Dundas, 4/9/1793 and 19/4/1794, H.R.A., 1, p. 451 and 449, as cited in C.M.H. Clark, History of Australia 1 (Sydney, 1962), p. 159.
9 A.T. Yarwood, Samuel Marsden, the Great Survivor (Melbourne, 1977), pp. 5, 6.
10 Johnson had prepared himself for Botany Bay by visiting one of the prison hulks at Woolwich to preach to the convicts. His own wife was described as half a Baptist and half a Methodist, Neil. K. MacIntosh, Richard Johnson, Chaplain to the Colony of New South Wales: His Life and Times, 1755-1827 (Sydney, 1978), pp. 38-40.
11 MacIntosh, Richard Johnson, p. 64.
Congregations were not interested in repenting of past follies when their own circumstances were difficult. Gruelling travelling schedules took their toll on Johnson and he was relieved to hear that Samuel Marsden had been persuaded to come to his aid. Neil K. MacIntosh emphasises that Johnson’s status as a chaplain in the colony, and his standing and position, were constantly being undermined by his colonial superiors. Lieutenant Governor Grose, in particular, frequently attacked the Evangelical Johnson and denied him entitlements. Mackintosh considers that Grose’s labelling of Johnson as a Methodist had political implications in the 1790’s. It was common to link any form of dissatisfaction from the Established Church such as Wesleyanism, with dangerous disaffection to the political establishment. Once again, influenced by Wilberforce, Marsden cut short his career at Cambridge and arrived, newly married, in March 1794. Robust and twelve years younger than Johnson, he had a strengthening effect on him. Baker sees Marsden as ‘the means, if not the deliberate agent of Wesleyan Methodism being established in New South Wales, even though in that lay the potential for denominational rivalry’. A chain of control ran from Marsden to Wilberforce and from Wilberforce to the Under Secretary Robert Peel, with recommendations from the WMMC somewhere in the middle. Joseph Butterworth, the second Wesleyan Methodist Member of Parliament, was also involved in the WMMS and was possibly the connecting link. This was to be the entry of the Wesleyan Methodists into the missionary space.

Marsden requested a schoolmaster, and Thomas Bowden, a London Wesleyan Methodist class leader and Master of the Charity School in Great Queen Street, arrived in January 1812. He found amongst a few Wesleyan Methodists, one John Hosking who had also been brought out by Marsden in 1809 to be a schoolmaster for the Girls’ Orphan School. Wilberforce certainly implies his involvement in it by pointing out ‘I have at length found the schoolmaster for whose going to New South Wales the chaplain expressed so strong a desire’. In a sense, the Wesleyan Methodists were to be the outrider shock troops for the Evangelical expectations. Hard

12 Ibid, p. 76.
14 Historical Records of New South Wales (Sydney, 1892-1901), Vol. 11, pp. 479-99.
working, useful, dogged and pious, they filled the role of the religious grass roots labourers.

Sergeant James Scott of the 108th Company of the Regiment, who arrived in 1798, was also to be a strong figure in New South Wales Methodism. He had been converted whilst on service in the West Indies. He proffered his own house for preaching and later purchased property in Prince’s Street to be fitted up as a mission house and the rest of the site for the first chapel in the city.\textsuperscript{15} Bowden and Hosking both held class meetings and formed themselves into a Methodist Society with twelve people attending their first joint meeting on 6 March 1812. Hosking’s class consisted of six women, including three of the senior girls in the school and his wife. Bowden’s class for men included a husband of one of the women in Hosking’s class and a soldier or two of the 75th Regiment. These were in effect band meetings.\textsuperscript{16}

Colwell refers in his history to Bowden’s letter detailing the love feast that took place four weeks later, when a little Windsor band united with the Sydney Society. Here, as Bowden said, ‘God was eminently present and gave us such a humble loving spirit’.\textsuperscript{17} The leader of the class at Windsor was Edward Eagar, a transportee from a comfortable Anglo Irish family in Killarney. Educated for the bar, he had uttered a forged bill and was sentenced to death. He was converted to Wesleyan Methodism whilst in prison in Cork, and his sentence was commuted to transportation. One of the men who had assisted him was the Rev. Mr. R. Lee Cole, a clergyman of the Established Church, and a letter from Eagar to Cole was found in a scrapbook in 1964. Eagar arrived on the Providence in July 1811 and his letter is typical of the conversion experience of a Wesleyan Methodist. This man became the most important lay figure in New South Wales early colonial Wesleyan Methodism. The language encompasses the confident progress through grace after

\textsuperscript{15} It was unkindly said that Scott being in the Army was paid in rum, and it was the sale of Scott’s rum that built the chapel in Prince’s Street, Sydney.
\textsuperscript{16} Baker, ‘Apostle of Methodism’, listed in endnote 12, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{17} James Colwell, The Illustrated History of Methodism: Australia, 1812 to 1855, New South Wales and Polynesia, 1856 to 1902 : with special chapters on the discovery and settlement of Australia ... leading up to Methodist Union / compiled from official records sources (Sydney, 1904), p. 34.
triumphal assurance in the Lord of Hosts. It also has familiar overtones of spiritual diary writing, when it laments the coldness and deadness of the heart and the committing of every concern to God’s keeping. Eagar wrote:

I wish you to know that I go on in the way of grace, to which I have been led by your ministry... Upon my arrival here, I was a great deal disappointed in expectations I had relative to the economy of the ship, but it only drove me closer to God. May I not only endure with resignation, but with deep sweet peace at every deprivation. He continually enables me to commit every corner of my soul and body to his keeping. My feeble voice is drowned by the torrents of iniquity that surround me on all hands, but in the midst of it I can look to him who has purchased with his own blood, who has promised never to leave me. My present state is this, though I do not always feel that ecstatic bliss, which I so often have experienced before.\(^\text{18}\)

In Sydney, Eagar became the man who worked hard for the emancipists’ cause. McLachlan feels that ‘the validation of pardons and the modest instalment of trial by jury granted in 1823, and the comprehensive recognition of convicts’ rights included in the Transportation Act of 1824, probably owed much to his zealous lobbying and correspondence with the Colonial Office’.\(^\text{19}\) Initially, Marsden had helped appoint Eagar as teacher to the family of the Rev. Cartwright, Anglican clergyman, when he arrived in 1811,\(^\text{20}\) but, increasingly, Eagar was frustrated in his attempts to turn again to the law. K.L. Smith describes how ‘Eagar joined fifteen others on a committee to establish a Colonial Bank by public subscription’.\(^\text{21}\) This was to be the Bank of New South Wales, and here was the case of a Wesleyan Methodist attempting to enter the banking world. Eagar was unable to become a Director of the Bank because, as he was not yet unconditionally free, he could not stand as a candidate. Twelve months later when he was nominated, he was defeated in a ballot, so he

\(^{18}\) Letter to the Rev. R. Lee Cole from Edward Eagar, commenced 8 Dec. 1810 on ship *Providence* and posted N.S.W., 1811, AJCP, M2974, 37.2.1.
\(^{20}\) Rev. Richard Cartwright asked Eagar to read the Anglican service in one of the neighboring country places. On his own initiative, Eagar proceeded to hold class meetings after the service. Cartwright accepted this, believing anything was better than none at all. Wright and Clancy see this as the beginning of Methodism in the colony. (Don Wright and Eric G. Clancy, *The Methodists, A History of Methodism in New South Wales* (St. Leonards, N.S.W, 1993), pp. 3, 4).
never became a Director. Here was the case of status being required for the position of banking director.

Pardoned by Governor Macquarie in 1813, Eagar chose to enter commerce and his unfortunate losses inclined him more towards the emancipist cause. Manning Clark sees Eagar as a repugnant figure, who repaid Marsden’s kindness by writing a letter to the WMMS in London ‘impugning Marsden’s zeal and expatiating on his devotion to accumulating wealth, as well as his indifference to the interests of religion’. Litigious and complex, Eagar was half condemned by Walter Lawry in a letter to the Missionary Committee in London when he wrote that ‘Mr. Eagar exerts himself as much as anyone, he supports our work, but he attends to the world first and religion afterwards’. Then again in 1819, he described Eagar as ‘indefatigable in chapel building and at present his nature, his judgement, his liberality are abundant’. Eagar emerges as a man grateful committed to Wesleyan Methodism and willing to support its cause, whilst being embittered by the treatment of the emancipists, and their struggles to re-establish themselves. His liberality fitted into the concept of the pious Wesleyan Methodist economic man, and his chapel building was a form of consecrating his wealth. He had absorbed the current Wesleyan Methodist attitudes to the disposal of wealth. In 1821, he travelled to London with Dr. Redfern to plead the emancipists’ cause and did not return to Sydney. Later behaviour in London with debt and bankruptcy helped reinforce the picture of sharp practice. Eagar kept close contact with friends in New South Wales as the Rev. William Horton noted when he arrived in New South Wales.

In their roles as the energetic lay leaders of the small Wesleyan Methodist community, Bowden and Hosking wrote in 1813 to the WMMC

---

22 Smith, Colonial Litigant, p. 42.
26 Horton wrote that ‘I read a letter of Mr. Eagar’s relating in part of his proceedings as the agent of the emancipist colonists. Sir M. McIntosh was the principal advocate of the emancipist colonists in Parliament and Mr. Eagar sat at his elbow in the House of Commons’ (Rev. William Horton, Journal, 28 May 1824 (Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania)).
to appeal for a preacher. They described the Australian countryside and the conditions of the people and their spiritual needs. Bowden and Hosking continued: ‘From the description of the people not much good can be expected. The higher ranks of those who were formerly convicts are either solely occupied in amassing wealth or rioting in sensuality. The lower orders are indeed the filth and offscouring of the earth’. 

There was an opposition to spirituality in the colony, a combination of indifference and hostility. Even Samuel Marsden was worn down by it and confessed later to his people in Parramatta that ‘he had often been strongly tempted to leave the colony altogether because of the wickedness’. Bowden and Hosking continued in their plea to the WMMC: ‘leave us not in this forsaken land. We call upon you on behalf of the children. Let us not be left to perish for lack of knowledge. We call upon you in the name of the outcasts of society. Send amongst us one of yourselves and we shall rise up and bless you’.

This petition highlighted the pattern which was to be a Methodist characteristic of Australian Christianity, an emphasis on the ministry to children. Though the early Wesleyan Methodist cause in Sydney was never to be regarded as successful, their provision of educational opportunities in the Sunday Schools was their greatest legacy.

By July 1814, the WMMC recommended ‘two missionaries to New South Wales, Br. Davies of Cardigan and S. Leigh of Shaftesbury shall occupy them’. Various changes in plans resulted in Davies not going and Br. Samuel Leigh taking up the challenge. Leigh was allowed to take out complete sets of Wesleyan Methodist books for sale, provided these sets did not amount to more than £200. The resolution from the Committee on November 1814 read:

---

32 Minutes of the WMMC, 12, 13 July 1814, pp. 169, 185. AJCP, M118.
33 A sum of £450 was allowed for the mission, invested partly in books and the remainder in goods sent out with the Methodist minister. Profits of the sale were to be applied to chapel building (WMMC, 24 Jan 1817, AJCP, M118).
When Mr. Leigh arrives in New South Wales he shall call the people together to open his mission. He shall form societies on the same plan as we do in England. He shall proceed cautiously in administering the ordinances, especially if he finds the people opposed to them. He will call as a friend on Mr. Marsden, but he shall not place himself in any respect under his governing.  

This directive is typical of the cautious strain within the WMMS as well as the exclusivity of the Wesleyan Methodists in general. The position of the Wesleyan Methodist minister in relation to the Evangelical clergy softened as time went on, when later directives demanded deference to them.

It is important at this stage to gain a clear understanding of the type of men these Wesleyan Methodist missionaries were and from what background they came. Owens provides a deeper understanding of the background and calibre of these young men who were all part of the South Seas Mission. Owens contends that, when their backgrounds were closely examined, ‘we are likely to be astonished that they exerted the influence they did’. He judges that many, like Samuel Leigh and Nathaniel Turner, were familiar with farming. Others were skilled artisans such as carpenters, joiners and coach builders. Wesleyan Methodists did not have the opportunity of a university education at that time. Their schooling was elementary, combined with intensive theological studies.

Samuel Leigh had attended Dr. Bogue’s Congregational seminary at Gosport, but ‘his manuscripts indicate a man of limited education and understanding’. Leigh had not stayed at Gosport and possibly left for doctrinal reasons, finally embracing Arminianism and the Wesleyan Methodists. The WMMS felt the qualities necessary for the missionary were ‘piety, the prospect of future usefulness and a capacity for learning languages’. Further qualities required were ‘pardon for sins through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, good health, freedom from debt and good plain pointed preaching with a knowledge of the standard works’. The actual ability to have read widely in the Methodist field of theology implied a

---

34 Minutes of the WMMC, 11 November 1814, p. 197 AJCP, M118.
37 Committee Meeting Minutes, 12 March 1815, AJCP, M118, p. 273.
38 Minutes in Box B Candidates to WMMS, as cited in Owens, p. 326.
certain degree of competence. Considerable natural talents came into play for these men, and time spent abroad had a broadening experience rather than the narrow confines of the home circuit. Nathaniel Turner, who later figured prominently in the Van Diemen’s Land mission, was largely self educated through devotional works lent by other ministers. 39 One of the variants was the Rev. Joseph Orton. He was a gentleman minister and the Connexion noted that ‘he had some standing in the Connexion and of acknowledged talents in business’. 40 Orton had been trained in London as an apprentice to mercantile concerns. The WMMC correspondence contains notes on the examination of preachers, and one of the questions posed was, ‘Does he know English grammar?’ The answer in the case of John Hutchison, ordained in Sydney, was ‘Not perfectly, but his language is generally correct’. 41 This was the invariable answer, that the candidate had a good grasp of grammar, but was by no means perfect. 42

In reading ministerial diaries, letters and accounts, this discrepancy does not show up, and generally there was no sign of illiteracy. Owens presses the point that, though these missionaries had limited educational background, they had the practical self help skills necessary for pioneers. He points out that, because their reading was confined to theological works, they did not have the depth of vision or broadness of understanding to comprehend a strange culture. 43 Another slant to this attitude is Warren’s opinion that the ‘missionary movement in England at this time was in part an expression of a far wider development, the social emancipation of the underprivileged classes and a movement of the petit bourgeoisie’. 44

These men were plunged into an alien environment with little emotional and material support; they either survived well or deteriorated with health or emotional problems. Contact with officialdom and public

40 Alex. Tyrrell, A Sphere of Benevolence (Melbourne, 1993), citing WMMC Minutes, 3 November 1824, p. 89, 219.
41 District Meeting, 3 February 1824, AJCP, M121.
42 What was meant by ‘not perfectly’ was that the candidate did not know English grammar in the same way as a classically trained university graduate did.
authorities in Port Jackson (Sydney) alongside demanding activity reports to the WMMC all combined to produce the broadened minister. Their conversion experience was still the most important feature of their life, and the missionary experience was aligned to sanctification as a means of grace. These men were driven by a deep sense of God’s protection. Nathaniel Turner wrote that, ‘while sailing over the tempestuous ocean we repeatedly saw his hand stretched out for our preservation and care’. Security and status motivated these missionaries, as well as the evangelic fervour transmitted from The Methodist Magazine’s missionary intelligence.

The necessary institutional structure of the Connexion, the Conference and the WMMS were 14,000 miles away, once these missionaries came to Australia and New Zealand. No longer was there support at short notice, and the alien culture must have combined to produce considerable stress. Loneliness was the essential by-product of the missionary experience. Samuel Leigh bemoaned the fact, when writing home to a friend, that he had been in Sydney two years without speaking to one other Methodist minister, and that nothing but the grace of God supported him. At this time, Leigh was not married. Marriage for the Ministers was carefully scrutinised by the WMMC with their permission being part of the contract.

The demands of the WMMS were great. Money was tight and the missionaries had little room to manoeuvre financially. Despite this, they were forced to keep up a constant stream of communication about their successes and failures. The committee asked for ‘notification of your successes and prosperity and particularly conversions in remarkable circumstances. Do not fail to favour us in this respect as much as

\[\text{Sources:}
45\text{ Nathaniel Turner to the Rev. J. Etchells, 30 Sep. 1824, as cited in Owens, p. 332.}\n46\text{ Samuel Leigh had met Dr. Coke who fired the young preacher with missionary ardour. (Findlay and Holdsworth, History, Vol. III, p. 21.)}\n47\text{ Extract of a letter from Mr. S. Leigh Missionary to Mr. Benson, dated Sydney November 1817, reprinted in The Methodist Magazine, 1818, Vol. XII, the 15\textsuperscript{th} volume in the new series.}\]
possible’. Leigh was instructed to ‘tell us of every part of your work, your hindrances and your successes’. The details of the successes abroad were destined to produce a pleasing effect on the Missionary Society meetings. Conversion stories (particularly mass conversions) of native peoples were destined to whip up the fervour of the home Methodists and keep the financial support flowing. The WMMC stressed that it was in the minutiæ and detail of accounts sent home that the value lay. Stories of natives, tribal groups and chiefs, canoes and cannibals in the South Seas and New Zealand became much more popular than stories of the elusive, indifferent aborigines, convicts and equally indifferent settlers. Seemingly unaware of the ships’ turnaround time from New South Wales, the WMMC chided Leigh in August 1816 with ‘the Committee are very much surprised that they have not heard from you and hope you will not delay writing with the necessary information’. Leigh in his correspondence to the WMMC and friends confirmed that he could not boast of any good things done in the mission.

Another Wesleyan Methodist who fulfilled the role of strong lay support for Leigh in the Port Jackson / Sydney mission was John Lees of Castlereagh. A Staffordshire man, he had come out as a soldier in the New South Wales Corps and had originally joined in with the Corps’ misdoings. He had become a Wesleyan Methodist after a dramatic conversion experience, connected with recovering from snake bite. Lees was the fifth man to be added to the four founding lay fathers in New South Wales Methodism. In other words, he was added to Bowden, Hosking, Eagar and Scott; Eagar, Scott and Lees particularly were the financial support so desperately needed by the Society. John Lees with his generosity built the first Methodist chapel in Australia in Castlereagh,
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48 Letter to Mr. Wiggan, Jamaica, Meeting of the WMMC, London 31 October 1814, AJCP, M118.
49 Letter to S. Leigh, 11 Dec. 1818, Missionary Meeting, AJCP, M118.
50 Letter to Walter Lawry, N.S.W., 11 December 1818 from Jos. Taylor, AJCP, M118.
51 Letter to S. Leigh, N.S.W., 24 August 1816, Minutes of the Committee for Managing the Methodist Missions for the Conference held at Manchester, July 1815, AJCP, M118.
52 James Colwell, *Illustrated History*, p. 65; and see Chapter 4 of this thesis under Establishment preaching for a discussion of snake bite conversions.
which opened on 7 October 1817. He also endowed the mission with an acre of his land, contributing the full amount of produce to the mission’s funds. He was another example of the Wesleyan Methodist consecrating his wealth. Methodists did not look to the Government for handouts, but looked to their own ranks for financial support. This placed considerable power in lay hands.

Leigh’s initial meeting with John Lees sparked a significant event. In the family setting, Leigh offered to lead family worship, and, taking up the Bible, opened it at Isaiah 35, ‘The Wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and bloom as the rose’. This sermon signified the mission to Australia, and one which was oft repeated in Methodist circles. Henry Reed gave the same exhortation at a quarterly meeting in Launceston in 1838. He compared Van Diemen’s Land, in its former state, to the wilderness, but now it might be said to be blossoming as a rose. At Launceston, this exhortation had the effect of many members coming forward and crying for mercy. This sermon was the crux of the whole thinking of the mission. It was the taking of salvation to the benighted desert, where it could blossom.

In 1817, Leigh was a prime mover in forming an Auxiliary Bible Society and Thomas Bowden was secretary. The British and Foreign Bible Society had previous contact with Leigh, which resulted in several packages being sent to Governor Macquarie to be distributed. The meeting was attended by the respectable members of the colony due to Leigh’s strong cooperation with the Evangelicals. Fellow Wesleyans such as Eagar, Hosking, Bowden and George Howe were also on the
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53 Colwell, *Illustrated History*, p. 67; Castlereagh was a small farming township at the foot of the Blue Mountains.
54 Hardgrave, *Such a Time*, p. 35.
55 Ibid, p. 65.
56 Henry Jennings, Spiritual Diary, Jennings Family papers, MS 9432, SLV, 7 October 1838.
57 Ian Breward points out that ‘Leigh was not welcomed by Governor Macquarie, who had a very low opinion of Methodists’; Ian Breward, *A History of the Australian Churches* (New South Wales, 1993), p. 16.
58 George Howe was Australia’s first printer and publisher. An ex convict, his family had come under the influence of Dr. Thomas Coke, when he was a missionary at St. Kitts in the West Indies. (Gwenda Robb, *George Howe: Australia’s First Publisher* (Melbourne, 2003), p. 5).
committee. Leigh was also prominent in forming The Australian Religious Tract Society for Promoting Knowledge and Benevolence.

The Rev. Walter Lawry offered to go as a Missionary to New South Wales in March 1817, and appeared before a sub-committee before his offer was accepted. His trip was postponed for six months until the state of funds allowed for the expense of the voyage and accompanying goods. This was how closely the WMMS ran close to the wind financially. When he did finally leave in January 1818, there is a touching note in the Committee minutes, thanking a Mr. Webb of Portsmouth for his Christian kindness in entertaining Mr. Lawry at his home, free of charge, during his stay in Portsmouth, before passage to New South Wales.

Lawry arrived as a co-missionary in May 1818 on the convict transport *Lady Castlereagh*. A warm-hearted Cornishman of twenty-five years, Lawry was enterprising, energetic, full of ideas and without any previous understanding of the convict system. Virtually as soon as he arrived, Lawry applied for a printing press. The Committee’s refusal began a long term bone of contention. Lawry also complained vociferously to the Outfit Committee for some change in the clothing sent out for the missionaries. He begged for nankeen trousers instead of fustian suits and shirts. He complained of the heat because it had ‘such an effect on my clothes, that I can scarce get into my pantaloons or coat’.

Lawry’s journal kept on his voyage on the *Lady Castlereagh* transport is a remarkable document. It reveals a young idealistic Methodist preacher trying to fit into the discomforts and shocks of a convict transport. He had to come to terms with his situation to retain his sense of mission. Initially, he loathed the experience and this was reinforced by seasickness and loneliness. He longed for kindness and wrote that ‘My affliction would be much less if I only had somebody to bring me nice things, there is nothing but the richest food and gross dishes’.

---

60 Meeting of the WMMC, held 16 January 1818, p. 71-2, AJCP, M118.
61 Letter from Mr. Lawry to WMMC, dated 18 May 1818, Minutes of Committee, 18 Nov. 1818, p. 155, AJCP, M118.
62 Lawry letter to a friend Mr. John Elvins, 4 May 1818, AJCP M124.
averred that no single man should be sent on such a long voyage to a distant mission. The air was full of tension and convicts were ritually flogged, crying out for mercy and struggling to get free, so much so that Lawry had to withdraw and hide. He saw wickedness in the ship's crew, soldiers and convicts, all of which caused him to doubt his approaching mission. Oaths, imprecations and blasphemy were heard, without ceasing, from head to stern. The Captain allowed Lawry to do what he would with the convicts, and this encouraged Lawry. He felt that the convicts wanted plain dealing and that he would give it to them, charging home their sins and predicting dreadful consequences without true repentance. Reproof was administered liberally to crew and convicts, and a certain peace reigned when the military and naval officers fell out with each other and the resultant blaspheming and filthy conversation were tempered. A curious social nicety arose when Lawry wrote of the dying Chief Officer Mr. William Kennel, ‘Were he a poor man I should speak to him about his soul’s salvation, but he is a gentleman and therefore must be left alone’.  

Arrival in Sydney brought Lawry’s comments about well mannered and courteous people and the lower orders who were the vilest of the vile. The Anglican clergy also came in for praise ‘as eminent holy men and I feel that the only difference between us is the gown’. Lawry’s request for 12 chemises sprang from his marriage to Mary Hassall of Parramatta, daughter of Robert Hassall, one of the London Missionary Society missionaries expelled from Tahiti; they came to Sydney in 1798 and Mary was born in the colony in 1799 – a currency lass. The committee chided him for marrying before permission was granted and said ‘that it was not at all proper for you to speak of your reasons with such a lightness of manner, and the kind of reference you made to Scripture is improper. Further, your letters are too careless, the more detailed and full of modesty you speak the better’.  

---

64 Lawry Journal, p. 23.  
65 One of Lawry’s comments about the immorality of the colony is of particular interest, ‘Every kind of immorality prevails amongst the infidel part of the colony, but I think often, that it is not more abundant than either London or Portsmouth’. (W. Lawry to WMMC, September 1818, AJCP, M124) This remark is equally applicable to Van Diemen’s Land.  
66 Lawry Journal, approximately 1 May 1818.  
67 WMMC to Walter Lawry, 9 Dec. 1819, AJCP, M149.
couched in a bold frank style, revealing some of the underlying currents of the Society as well as practical economical advice. He and Leigh were not to be compatible, Leigh had previously paid court to Mary Hassall without success and his relationship with Lawry suffered as a result. Despite this, both Lawry and Leigh had a vision for further missions beyond Sydney. As Sydney had nothing to boast of in its success as a mission, their eyes were turned towards the Pacific.

Samuel Marsden alerted the WMMC in 1818 to the fact that a religious society was wanted for the Friendly Islands. He wrote: ‘the Church Missionary Society had adopted New Zealand, the London Missionary Society the Society Islands. This colony is a favoured spot for the propagation of the gospel amongst the ‘heathen’ in this part of the world’. Lawry also grandly talked of fresh fields such as Borneo, New Guinea, Timor and the Celebes, whilst referring to Sydney as a type of depot ‘for sallying forth, a place of refreshing for the Mission of the Lord’. Van Diemen’s Land was also coming into their consciousness as a needy place for a mission. Leigh had reminded the WMMC as early as February 1817 of the existence of Van Diemen’s Land as a place for missionary enterprise. He had requested ‘that some of our missionaries be authorised to visit each place previous to any appointment being made’. Pretyman says that Leigh was made aware of the needs of Van Diemen’s Land through meeting a magistrate from Hobart who was paying a visit to Sydney. This would have either been A.W.H. Humphrey or James Gordon, both magistrates and strong friends to Methodism. The only acknowledgment of Leigh’s supposed request is a letter to him from the WMMC in 1819 saying that ‘we have Van Diemen’s Land under consideration. By your representations we shall be guided’.

The Evangelical connection in Sydney had also alerted the WMMC. Alexander Riley had been store keeper and magistrate at Port Dalrymple in

---

68 Extract of letter, Marsden to Mr. Farn, WMMC, from Paramatta, 2 May 1818, AJCP, M124.
69 Walter Lawry to WMMC, 29 October 1818, AJCP, M124.
70 Letter Leigh to WMMC, 27 Feb. 1817, as cited in R.D. Pretyman (comp.), A Chronicle of Methodism in Van Diemen’s Land, 1820-1840 (Melbourne, 1970), pp. 7-8; (The original letter has not been traced in the WMMC correspondence).
71 Pretyman, Chronicle, p. 7.
72 WMMC letter to S. Leigh, 9 Dec. 1819, AJCP, M149.
northern Van Diemen's Land in 1804, and then deputy commissary. A favourite of the settlement’s commandant Colonel Paterson, he accompanied him to New South Wales after Bligh’s deposition and he became secretary to the colony.73

His brother Edward Riley settled in Sydney from Calcutta in 1816 and assumed a leading role, becoming a magistrate and a director of the Bank of New South Wales. He was also a committed Evangelical, and a letter written by him in 1817 alerted Alexander to the state of the New South Wales colony and the need for a mission to Van Diemen’s Land. He thought ‘it should be very beneficial to my poor ignorant and wicked countrymen that you should be acquainted with the facts of the colony of upwards of now 20,000 souls, not one fifth of whom have any instruction to enlighten their depraved understandings. At Van Diemen’s Land, where there are more than 3,000 souls, they may be said to be destitute of instruction either religious or scholastic, save a few solitary instances’.74 This letter fired Alexander to approach the WMMC with a letter recommending Van Diemen’s Land to their attention. The committee resolved to take up the case of Van Diemen’s Land at the earliest opportunity. They noted also ‘the advantages afforded by suggestions and knowledge from such gentlemen as yourself and your brother’.75 This was a clear example of the Evangelical paternal interest steering the mission further out to Van Diemen’s Land, and in a sense the WMMC basked in the interest.

Meanwhile, there were changes in the New South Wales ministry. When Lawry had first arrived, he had been sufficiently influenced by

73 Alexander Riley was a mercantile trader and from 1817 deeply interested in the pastoral and wool industry. He joined a trading partnership with Richard Jones in Sydney and the firm of Jones and Riley traded with Alexander’s brother Edward in Calcutta. Alexander Riley was one of the founders of the Bank of New South Wales in 1816. In 1817 he returned to England leaving his commercial affairs in the hands of his brother Edward. In collaboration with Edward, he imported an entire flock of Saxon merino sheep and he supported the Benevolent Society for the Propagation of the Gospel as a conventional Evangelical with a conventional piety. (Jill Conway, ‘Riley, Alexander (1778-1833)’, *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Vol. 2 (Melbourne, 1967), pp. 379-381; Jill Conway, ‘Merchants and Merinos’, *Journal Royal Australian Historical Society* Vol. 3, 46 (1960); Riley Family Papers (Mitchell Library)).
74 Letter to Alexander Riley from Edward Riley, NSW, 15 Dec 1817, AJCP, M124.
75 Minutes of Meeting 22 October 1819, AJCP M118; Letter to Alexander Riley, Clapham, 23 Oct. 1819, AJCP, M149.
Leigh’s unhappiness to write a sharp letter to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society citing Leigh’s numerous privations. One example was when Leigh had to travel without finding a bed for the night and ‘terrible hunger had forced him to join the fowls in the farm yard to fare as they did’. Leigh was broken in health and left for England for respite. His energies were to be turned to New Zealand and the South Seas. Before he left in January 1819, however, he laid the foundation stone of a new chapel in Macquarie Street, Sydney. Two more missionaries were to be added to the New South Wales Mission, Benjamin Carvosso and Ralph Mansfield. Carvosso had offered himself to the WMMS and his offer had been accepted. Mansfield had been accepted by the WMMS in October 1819. He had stipulated to the committee ‘that no time should be set on his mission, and that he be allowed to get married or to marry abroad before his four year probation expired’. This was a challenge to the committee, but Mansfield was an attractive prize and they were loath to lose him. In 1819, the WMMC were paying their dues to all those who had helped them in New South Wales. Grateful and slightly subservient letters of thanks were sent to Governor Macquarie, Samuel Marsden, Eagar and Scott for their kindness and efforts to promote morals and religion. The arrival of Carvosso in May and Mansfield in September of 1820 to join up with Lawry set in motion a series of condemnations from the WMMC, mainly fuelled by Samuel Leigh. The combination of pious Carvosso, an impetuous Lawry and a charming, educated Mansfield produced an amalgam of dynamic energy not yet evinced by the more pedestrian and cautious Leigh.

The Methodist George Howe printed the first publication of the monthly *The Australian Magazine* on 1 May 1821. His son Robert Howe had become friendly with Ralph Mansfield and had joined the

76 Letter Walter Lawry to WMMC, 19 May 1818, AJCP, M124.
77 Benjamin Carvosso was the son of the famous Cornish revivalist William Carvosso, who had enjoyed entire sanctification and died a triumphal death singing the doxology.
78 Minutes of Committee Meeting, 27 Oct. 1819, ACJP, M118.
79 Mansfield was referred to as an affectionate and amiable fellow by the WMMC. (Letter to S. Leigh, 27 Mar 1820, ACJP, M149).
80 George Howe died eleven days later on 11 May 1821.
81 When William Horton dined with Robert Howe and other Methodists in 1824, Howe’s health was drunk and in returning thanks, Robert Howe observed that he owed all his business, his prosperity, his life and his salvation to the Methodists. (Rev. William
Methodists under Mansfield’s influence. Dissipated as a young man, he experienced a ‘spiritual awakening and in his own words he was wonderfully and mercifully visited by God and snatched from infamy in this world and hell in the next’. The *Australian Magazine* was established by Carvosso, Lawry and Mansfield with the aid of the Howes. The WMMC received a letter from the three in March 1821 announcing their activities and forwarding a prospectus. They also stated that the Governor, having confidence in their prudence, had given permission for the publication. The magazine’s brief was not to be controversial, and it was to be composed of many headings such as biography, theology, philosophy, poetry, religious intelligence and obituaries. The reaction of the WMMC was typically intransigent. They praised the three men for their good intentions, but they strongly disapproved of the whole project, particularly as it had been organised without the Committee’s previous permission. It would also remove the preachers from their real work of mission. They felt no moral benefit would result from the project and steps must be taken to transfer it to other proprietors.

This was not the spirit of John Wesley and *The Arminian Magazine*, but the paradoxical, cautious spirit of the WMMC. They were not willing to seize this golden opportunity to promote their Methodist mission among the emancipists and settlers. The Howes were specialists in newspapers and they had a unique contribution to make to the mission. This would have been the ideal entreée and the WMMC turned it down. Various interpretations were given in Methodist histories to the cessation of *The Australian Magazine*. A blinkered Colwell said that ‘it was from
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83 Letter to WMMC from Carvosso, Lawry and Mansfield, sent 19 Mar. 1821, recv’d 5 Sep. 1821, AJCP, M119.
84 Minutes of Meeting of WMMC of 5 Sep. 1821, discussing letter received from Messrs. Lawry, Mansfield and Carvosso, dated 19 Mar. 1821, AJCP, M119.
85 *The Australian Magazine* existed for about eighteen months with a good circulation. After it was discontinued, Carvosso wrote moral essays for the colonial newspapers in which ‘he gave them as much gospel as they could bear’. (Colwell, p. 480). Ralph Mansfield retired from the ministry and directed himself to journalism, becoming editor of the *Sydney Gazette* in 1829. He remained a good Methodist and was prepared to return to the ministry of the WMMS. He would not accept that he had incurred debts, and said he had been unfairly taxed by the WMMC.
frequent changes of residence which in those days took place, it was found inconvenient to maintain it’. 86 Findlay and Holdsworth ‘questioned whether the suppression of the magazine was well judged’. 87

This disagreement heralded the onset of further debacles. Leigh levelled several charges against the trio of Lawry, Mansfield and Carvosso to the WMMC and a row erupted. 88 It was a long petty list of charges, provoking thirty-five pages of rebuttals from Carvosso, Mansfield and Lawry. They accused Leigh of ‘gross and exaggerated falsehoods, and that he had either lost his honesty or common sense’. 89 Their other glaring fault was the drawing of two bills of £500 each on account of building the new chapel in Macquarie Street. The WMMC thundered that ‘knowing the rules against drawing bills for chapels without previous consent, Carvosso, Mansfield and Lawry have induced Mr. Eagar to advance the sum of £1,000 assuring him that the committee would provide the money to pay the bills. This had placed the committee in the unpleasant circumstances of disappointing a friend’. 90 Finally, the WMMC paid Eagar at least £500 when he arrived in England to promote the emancipists’ cause.

There was total lack of comprehension by the despotic committee. They were a resolute, immovable group in their directions to the missionaries, and totally unaware of local conditions. They wrote that ‘the committee can never permit their instructions to be revised, qualified or altered at the judgement of an individual missionary. If the brethren of New South Wales persist in making this the rule of their conduct, the

86 Colwell, Illustrated History, p. 480.
88 The numerous accusations centred around the following points: establishment of Methodist preaching in Sydney to clash with divine service by the Established Church; the establishment by Lawry of a Parramatta Sunday School in direct opposition to the Church Sunday School; the preaching by Mr. Mansfield of what the clergy had preached the Sunday before, in order to contradict them; Mr. Lawry’s unfriendly spirit and non adherence to the WMMC principles and instructions; claiming excessive amounts for the ministers’ horses; criticism of the three ministers’ circuits in that they were not travelling far enough; taking too much ease and pleasure with no expense spared in their own comfort; irregularity in the sending home of bills. (Minutes of Meeting Held in Mission House, Sydney, 2 Oct. 1822, AJCP, M121, pp. 24-6.)
89 ibid, p. 24.
90 Minutes of Committee Meeting, WMMC, 3 July 1822, AJCP, M119.
relations between them and the Committee must necessarily be dissolved.\textsuperscript{91}

Leigh had been sent on an impossible task, to an indifferent penal community. There was no intact group of Methodists awaiting him in the convicts. Without empirical evidence it is hard to generalise, but committed Methodists would not form a large part of the penal population. Grocott discusses this fact stating that ‘in the convict population, representatives of Protestant denominations such as Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists and Quakers were very few’.\textsuperscript{92} Barrett writes that ‘the religious ignorance and carelessness in the colonies had first taken root in England and was simply transplanted’.\textsuperscript{93} Grocott supports this saying that ‘in New South Wales the English indifference towards religion was especially noticeable among the great bulk of transported felons’.\textsuperscript{94}

Leigh had Evangelical Church support, but this was not sufficient. He also had the financial support of the liberal Methodists Eagar, Forbes, Lees, Scott and Howe, all prepared to consecrate their money, but again this was not enough.\textsuperscript{95} Findlay and Holdsworth argue that the ‘New South Wales Societies were unusually small and poor and much missionary labour and means were spent on prison work, which brought no remuneration’.\textsuperscript{96} Bollen sees the commitment of English Methodism to religion for the colonies as falling far short of local means and

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{93} John Barrett, That Better Country (Melbourne, 1966), p. 4.
\item\textsuperscript{94} Grocott, Convicts, p. 2.
\item\textsuperscript{95} Wright and Clancy cite other strong support for Wesleyan Methodism as coming from magistrate Thomas Moore in Liverpool, J. Milard at Windsor and William White at Paramatta. Samuel Marsden was also kind to the mission, and he donated land for the third chapel at Windsor which opened in 1839. (Wright and Clancy, The Methodists, p. 7).
\item\textsuperscript{96} Findlay and Holdsworth, History, Vol. III, p. 41.
\end{itemize}
expectations. Money was essential for the missionaries, and the problems of the colonial situation had been underestimated by the financial wing of the WMMC. The committee was still in its teething stages and had not reached a full understanding of local conditions. Wright and Clancy stress that ‘local financial support for Leigh’s maintenance was minimal, and there was to be a long period of dependence on the English Church’. Findlay and Holdsworth also criticise the New South Wales missionaries, contending that, unlike the American missionaries, they demanded a certain style and respectability as essential. Wright and Clancy highlight the fact that ‘the method of sending goods out to the mission in Sydney to be sold for finance was unhelpful, and missionaries failed to submit the proper accounts on time’. Cordery also confirms ‘that strict accounting records, fulfilling stewardship demands were required in the New Zealand Wesleyan Methodist mission by the WMMC’.

The mix of emancipists and settlers in New South Wales did not provide fertile ground for Methodist revival. Both those groups were intent on self advancement and business prosperity. Eventually Leigh was undone by his years of hardship, frustrations and lack of success, and finally by his own rigid narrow personality which could not comprehend his more light hearted, idealistic fellow missionaries. Alison Vincent reminds us that ‘the convict clergy, like convict men, grappled with their unique circumstances, so very different from those in Britain and Ireland’. Tyrrell describes New South Wales as a place where a type of hardened heathenism prevailed.

---

103 Tyrrell, Sphere of Benevolence, p. 85.
The tensions within the mission were not conducive to success. Wright and Clancy suggest many reasons for the relative failure of the mission. The scattered nature of the settlement prevented regular contact, as well as the lack of a significant lay leadership, especially class leaders and local preachers. They feel that ‘the most crippling factor was the endemic disharmony between the missionaries themselves and the constant warfare with the London Committee’. Bollen pinpoints it when he writes that for the WMMS ‘the colonies were almost forgotten – they were regarded only as an introduction to missionary efforts amongst the ‘heathen’. The Society was happy to run into debt with missions in the South Pacific, but they placed stringent economies on the mission at New South Wales, and ‘the self supporting principle was affirmed...Australia had to pay its way’. The isolated cases of financial support from men like Scott, Lees, Howe, Eagar and Forbes were not enough. The situation required the strong coherent support of a core group of lay men committed to the self-help principle.

**Hobart Mission**

In his history of early Methodism in Hobart, R.D. Pretyman was the one Methodist writer to see the chain of events which brought Benjamin Carvosso to stop and preach on the Court House steps in Hobart. He recognised the input from the Evangelical, Alexander Riley, and he also cited Walter Lawry as having written to the WMMC that they turn their attention to Van Diemen’s Land. Pretyman also refers to the Hobart magistrate who alerted Leigh to the problem in early 1817.

Other Methodist writers like the Rev. William Moister give the impression that Benjamin Carvosso preached on the Hobart Court House steps on a whim. The Rev. C.C. Dugan also seems unaware that much

---

104 Methodism had exercised a presence in the colony since 1812, and ministers since 1815, but in 1831 the District Meeting of 22 March indicated there were only 112 members of the Wesleyan Society in New South Wales. (Wright and Clancy, *The Methodists*, p. 16).
discussion and missionary intelligence preceded Carvosso. Like the German Pietists of Wesley’s day, there was a constant flow of communication from Australia which was only tempered by the long turn around time of ten to twelve months. The circuit history of Hobart, written by G.T. Taylor in *The Spectator and Methodist Chronicle*, takes the information a step further by writing that Carvosso had been instructed by the WMMC in London to furnish a report on Hobart en route to Sydney, New South Wales. Benjamin Carvosso’s vessel *The Saracen* stopped at Hobart on 25 April 1820 before the final six day trip north to Sydney. Carvosso’s journal tells that he had a parcel for Police Magistrate, A.W.H. Humphrey, and asked him if he could preach in Hobart for a few days. Humphrey introduced Carvosso to Lieutenant Governor Sorell and the Rev. Robert Knopwood, the Anglican incumbent, and received permission to preach in Hobart. James Gordon, the Pitt Water magistrate who was also a friend to Methodism, invited Carvosso to preach in his area.

The Hobart Court House yard was recommended as ideal for preaching. Carvosso preached from the steps and hymns were sung, led by Mrs. Carvosso. The experience was repeated several times in the next few days. Prisoners in the gaol were also exposed to Carvosso’s preaching. On Sunday 30 April, he preached to 120 convicts, all in irons. Carvosso could not ‘describe the horrid noise of the chains. Most of them appeared insensible to their disgrace and misery’.

Ralph Mansfield followed in Carvosso’s footsteps, arriving in August from England. He followed the same pattern, distributing handbills and preaching most evenings for a fortnight. In both Carvosso’s and

---

111 As noted before, A.W.H. Humphrey was either a Methodist, or a strong friend of Methodism. Pretyman quotes Carvosso as saying, ‘Mr. and Mrs. Humphrey are of Methodist extraction’ (Pretyman, *A Chronicle of Methodism in Van Diemen’s Land, 1820 – 1840* (London, 1970), p. 13.)
113 At that time the Court House was situated on the south east side of Liverpool Street, on an allotment of land commencing 148 feet from the southern corner with Murray Street (Pretyman, *Chronicle*, p. 11).
Mansfield’s cases a guard of constables prevented disturbances breaking out. In between the vessels of Carvosso and Mansfield, Robert Howe paid a visit in July from Sydney, and told Walter Lawry that ‘the inhabitants of Van Diemen’s Land appear so absorbed in trade and dealing, which is replete with fraud and imposition that no Institution can ever be expected to take place till the people are awakened from their present corrupt and depraved state’.\textsuperscript{115}

At the time of Carvosso’s preaching on the Court House steps, Van Diemen’s Land had a total population of 5,468 people of whom 2,588 persons were convicts.\textsuperscript{116} New immigrants were beginning to arrive, as well as military officers deciding to remain in the colony after service. After 1820, capital was brought into the country by immigrants with resources. The main industry was sheep, and prior to 1820, the sheep helped to feed the convict population, but after 1820 signs of the wool trade appeared. The Methodist arrival had coincided with a developmental change. As Hartwell states, ‘Van Diemen’s Land was progressing and devolving from a sub structure to a commercial economy and profit considerations determined the use of natural resources’.\textsuperscript{117} The changing status of Van Diemen’s Land was going to attract more respectable middle class, economic men who would help future Wesleyan Methodist missions to be self supporting, thus achieving the goal of the WMMC.\textsuperscript{118}

After Ralph Mansfield had departed from Hobart, a portion of the 48\textsuperscript{th} Regiment arrived, and amongst them were three Wesleyan Methodist Society members, headed by a Corporal, later Sergeant, George Waddy.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{118} Letter, J. Taylor WMMC to S. Leigh N.S.W., 25 Mar. 1820, AJCP, M149; The WMMC had proposed Mr. George Erskine from Ceylon as a minister to Van Diemen’s Land, and this proposal was made on 25 March 1820, a month before Carvosso arrived. As it eventuated, Erskine had difficulty in obtaining a passage from Ceylon and ended in the Sydney mission as Chairman of the District of New South Wales.
\textsuperscript{119} Waddy was said to be a connection of the eminent Methodist family represented by the famous scripture scholar, Dr. Samuel D. Waddy (Findlay and Holdsworth, \textit{History}, \textit{Vol. III}, p. 67); He was said to have been converted by the Rev. W. Lawry in Sydney.
They met emancipist Benjamin Nokes, and a prayer meeting was formed. This occurred at the end of October 1820 at a house in Collins Street, and the number of people present was eight. They next moved to a house of a Mr. Wallis in Liverpool Street where they were threatened by a hostile crowd in the house. Nokes wrote that ‘the mob declared that they would not let us put the town in an uproar’. The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for 1822 referred to Nokes’s account as an introduction to the full diffusion of religious light and influence through the rising and important colony. The numbers increased so much that by January 1821, the Society had fourteen people and the congregation was one hundred people. They moved to a large carpenter’s shop in Argyle Street, owned by Charles Donn. Again here, the group was stoned and opposed and Nokes was forced to ask Lieutenant Governor Sorell for protection. Nokes records the incident as saying ‘the presence of God was so strong that the inhabitants opposed us with wallys (sic) of stones and bricks, dead dogs and serpents’.

Stone throwing and mob persecution has not been recorded in any of the other Australian Wesleyan missions and certainly not in Launceston. R.D. Pretyman talks about the ‘independent emancipists who commenced the mission in Hobart in a class above those stuck in servitude’. Was there a resentment from those still in servitude, or did the mob see that the only choices open to them with Wesleyan Methodism was a decision

---

120 Nokes was born 22 Sept. 1784 in Southminster, Essex, the son of Benjamin Nokes. His father appears to have spent a year in Newgate Prison in 1794 for passing counterfeit money. Benjamin junior was convicted at Essex Assizes 13 March 1809 and transported to Hobart by the Independent, arriving 19 October 1812. He married Sarah Weeks in Dec. 1820. Sarah had been transported for uttering a forged note. (Australian Vital Records Index; Proceedings of the Old Bailey, WWW.oldbaileyonline.org; Archives Office of Tasmania Colonial Tasmanian Links; Phillip Tardif, Notorious Strumpets and Dangerous Girls: Convict Women in V.D.L., 1803-1829 (North Ryde, 1990).


122 Donn too had been committed at the Essex Assizes, a year ahead of Nokes in 1810, and was transported by the Guildford to Sydney and then to Hobart. Donn was encouraged to extend the building to accommodate the increasing crowd to three hundred people. He was charging 12/6 per week for rent, and the Society members rose to thirty four. (R.D. Pretyman, ‘Early History of Methodism in Hobart’, p. 18; Tasmanian Historical Research Association, Papers and Proceedings (THRAP&P), June 1963, Vol. 10 No. 3, p. 48).

123 Pretyman, Chronicle, p. 18.

between the chapel and the public house? There were no immediate or economic hunger concerns amongst the mob in Hobart. One can only surmise that there was an echo amongst the mob of an experience with urban or rural dislocation in Britain attached to Wesleyan Methodist revival. Stone throwing mobs rioting against the Wesleyan Methodists were common in 18th century England and possibly the memory of that disturbance was still strong in the minds of some of the Hobart emancipist, ticket of leave population. They were happy with the status quo and saw the Wesleyan Methodists as a disturbing force. David Hempton discusses this in ‘Noisy Methodists and Pious Protestants’. He quotes the Cork Baptist Church Book which describes Methodists taking all ranks of people to the fields to hear them preach. This constituted a type of ‘wild promiscuous assembly’ to the magistrates who encouraged the mob to disturb them. Tasmanian Methodist historians have not attempted to explain this and historians like Moister ineffectually explained it as ‘Satan raging and a number of persons of the baser sort trying to stifle the infant cause’.

Both Nokes and Waddy followed the Methodist formalities with Nokes drawing up regulations for a new Society. Waddy appeared to consider himself still attached to the Sydney Society. He kept in touch with Sydney missionaries explaining that ‘the harvest here is plenteous, but the labourers find the room where we meet, too strait for us’. By 13 May, Nokes had established a Sunday School which he was to regard as his pet project. He requested the missionaries at Sydney to send suitable books, hymns and spelling books with catechisms. Twenty three scholars attended the opening of the Sunday School. The lack of religion in the country was illustrated when Nokes reported that he had been with a Mr. Butcher to New Norfolk, and divine service was held in a house of a respectable settler Mr. Able. He wrote in The Wesleyan Methodist

---

125 See further discussion on this later in chapter 3, with a footnote referring to the Rev. Nathaniel Turner’s English experience of mob persecution.
128 Pretyman, Chronicle, p. 19.
Mr. Francis Ewin Forbes, a Sydney Wesleyan and commercial partner of Edward Eagar in the firm of Eagar, Forbes and Co., appeared in the next few weeks and approached Lieutenant Governor Sorell for a land grant for the Wesleyan Methodists. The grant approved by Sorell was situated on the western side of Campbell Street running from Brisbane Street to Melville Street. The Rev. William Horton later referred to it as ‘an area of one and a half to two acres in as eligible situation as could be fixed up’. Eagar, Forbes and Co. appear in the WMMC correspondence as the firm which the Committee used for landing goods and packages for the Sydney missionaries. Business was always done with ‘the friends’ in Methodist circles, and this was a prime example, even to the extent of having Forbes as the intermediary between the Society and Lieutenant Governor Sorell. He would have been deputed to the task as Eagar had already left for London on the emancipists’ cause. There were obviously no Wesleyan Methodist laymen of significant standing in Hobart to approach Lieutenant Governor Sorell. On his arrival in Hobart, Horton noted in his journal that ‘Mr. Forbes is a gentleman of some connection at Port Jackson who visited the colony a short time before and obtained a grant of an acre and a half of land.’

On his arrival in Hobart, Horton noted in his journal that ‘Mr. Forbes is a gentleman of some connection at Port Jackson who visited the colony a short time before and obtained a grant of an acre and a half of land.’

---

130 Francis Forbes was steward at the Macquarie Street Wesleyan Methodist Chapel.
133 K.L. Smith writes that ‘a notice appeared in the Gazette in Sydney, 12 May 1821, that Mr. F.E. Forbes intended visiting Van Diemen’s Land shortly for health and requested that claims to be presented to Mr. Edward Eagar. He surmises that this event was the first indication of problems with the partnership; the firm of Eagar and Forbes was in difficulty at the time mainly due to management by Forbes. The co-partnership of Eagar and Forbes was dissolved 21 July 1824; (Smith, Colonial Litigant, pp. 63-66).
134 William Horton, Hobart Town, No. 1 letter to WMMC, Horton Journal, no date but probably mid 1821.
a member of the congregation. By August 1821, the *Brixton* arrived from London with the missionaries Samuel Leigh, William Walker and William Horton. They went through the same formalities as Benjamin Carvosso and Ralph Mansfield, calling on the Lieutenant Governor, the magistrates and the respectable inhabitants who were all favourable to the mission cause.\(^{135}\)

Significantly, at no time in Van Diemen's Land was Wesleyan Methodism opposed by officialdom. It always had a completely uninhibited and generous support at that level, unlike in Sydney. Leonie Mickelborough observes that ‘Sorell was less committed to the idea of an active Church (Anglican) than was his Evangelical successor’,\(^{136}\) (Lieutenant Governor Arthur), but in the case of the Wesleyan Methodists, Sorell evinced a benign patronage. The ministerial reaction to Sorell was positive. The Rev. William Horton declared ‘I have invariably received the utmost attention and kindness from Sorell. He has readily afforded me every facility’.\(^{137}\) Additionally, in November 1823, Sorell alerted the Rev. Nathaniel Turner to the ‘needs of the population of Launceston where there was a population of upwards of 500 who were like sheep without shepherds’.\(^{138}\)

The decision was taken to leave William Horton in Hobart because the needs of the mission were glaringly obvious. Carvosso had now been assigned to Van Diemen’s Land, but could not proceed there for some time owing to his wife’s pregnancy. Agitation is evident in the letter written by Samuel Leigh and William Walker to the WMMC that ‘a house has been taken for Mr. Carvosso, the rent for which is escalating’.\(^{139}\) Leigh preached several times in Hobart and met several respectable gentlemen at dinner who stressed the need for missionaries in Van Diemen’s Land.

---


\(^{137}\) Pretyman, *Chronicle*, p. 41.

\(^{138}\) Pretyman, *Chronicle*, p. 38.

Horton was twenty-one-years old when he commenced his mission at Hobart. He was an immature, untried, serious youth. His early differences with Nokes show up in a letter to his parents when he wrote that ‘I have allowed Mr. Nokes to continue as leader, but I soon found it necessary to discharge that duty myself, which I purpose to do so’. Horton calculated the number who met regularly in the Society as about twenty, all of whom had a sincere desire for salvation. He started the records of the Society and furnished the members with the Rules of the Society. Mrs. Horton started a class for the females and this consisted of reading a memoir of a religious experience of a pious female, an account of a happy death and other profitable pieces.

Horton saw the moral state of Hobart as very low, with adultery and vice to a deplorable degree among rich and poor. Connected to that was intemperance, dishonesty, hatred, strife and quarrelling with some instances of piety. He found that ‘every house is surrounded by fierce dogs to guard against nightly depredations. It is only by the controlling power of the religious principle and the Spirit of God that the corrupt, rebellious heart of man is to be sanctified to the obedience of God’. The class members begged Horton to open a subscription list for the building of a new chapel and from the subscription list of £5 and upwards the Evangelical support can be gleaned. Names such as W.A. Bethune, A.F. Kemp, Captain Reed, Lascelles, J. Faulkner, M. Meredith, Edward Lord, David Lord and Mr. and Mrs. James Gordon show that the substantial and powerful were prepared to subscribe to and support the venture.

Horton saw it as his duty to devote half an hour each day to wrestling with God for a revival hoping the Lord would pour his Spirit on

---

140 Born at Louth, Lincolnshire he had been influenced by Samuel Leigh to become a missionary. His secular education included the French language, and he had the capability of studying Latin and Greek.
144 The Australian Dictionary of Biography cites David Lord as taking an active interest in Church affairs and though he professed to be an Anglican, his interests appear to have been more sectarian. In April 1827, the Land Commissioner recorded Lord as the richest man in Hobart Town. Susan Allen, ‘David Lord (1785-1847)’, Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol. 2 (Melbourne, 1967), pp. 126-127.
them.\textsuperscript{145} He mused in his journal that the sermons most usually blessed on these occasions had been on the subject of salvation by faith.\textsuperscript{146} Horton resolved to preach for a length of time on repentance and justification by faith – this could possibly have led into the all important conversion experience for people burdened by sin and hoping for redemption. He likened his own situation to that of John Wesley in Georgia, and consoled himself by reading Wesley’s journal. He related to Wesley on the difficulty of speaking to others on the concerns of their soul.

Inquiring of people as to the state of their soul was a keystone of the Wesleyan Methodist Minister’s task. In today’s society, the question would be considered intrusive and impertinent, but in 1820 this may not have been the case, though Horton certainly received rebuffs. One experience he retells is when he approached two young men in Hobart and asked what they thought of God and religion, and they burst into violent fits of laughing. In the country at Kangaroo Point when Horton told some men ‘he would like to talk about religion, they fled as if I had brought a pestilence with me’.\textsuperscript{147} At the female prison he perceived ‘a smile of ridicule upon several faces and a few laughed out aloud’.\textsuperscript{148} In February Sorell allowed Horton to preach to the prisoners in gaol which contained ‘all the violent and abandoned characters in the colony’.\textsuperscript{149}

Squabbling was surfacing in the Society between some of the members. Charles Donn accused John Lawrence of a horrid crime and David Nye accused Benjamin Nokes for being too incautious in admitting members. Horton crowned this with accusing Nye of backsliding\textsuperscript{150}. This was the fatal flaw of John Wesley’s Methodism, the seemingly allowable, unbridled criticism of one’s neighbours if they were not coming up to standards. It was an unhealthy aspect and could only lead to further faction fighting. Woven into the culture of the class meetings and band meetings, it accounted for the reluctance of many people to become full Society members.

\textsuperscript{145} This is not revivalism, congregations had annual revival sessions.
\textsuperscript{146} Horton Journal, 18 December 1821.
\textsuperscript{147} Horton Journal, 27 February 1822.
\textsuperscript{148} Horton Journal, 18 February 1822.
\textsuperscript{149} Horton Journal, 18 February 1822.
\textsuperscript{150} Horton Journal, 18 December 1821.
Horton showed his insensitivity when he visited the hospital and addressed a man who was seriously ill. Horton proposed the question about the state of his soul and the man could not say a single word. Horton wrote that ‘he could tell me about his bodily complaint, but he appeared to be altogether ignorant and stupid’. Another young man with a dreadful disorder of the lungs had difficulty speaking, and then only in a whisper; Horton asked him ‘what he thought about his soul and eternity, and the man said he was a Deist’. Encouragingly, he was pleased on 5 March 1822 on a visit to the gaol to see a group of ill-looking rough men bound in large iron fetters listening attentively to the word of God. Inevitably, the prisoners had no choice in the matter. The road gangs in the huts on the way to New Norfolk were equally attentive to Horton. This raises the question of what Horton actually did preach. The doctrines of justification, sanctification and Christian perfection are not necessarily crystal clear concepts and one wonders if Horton simplified them down to the simpler concept of eternal salvation for everyone. Horton, though untried, had a strongly humane streak in his attitude to the convicts. He believed that ‘they cannot be reformed with corporal punishment – they are rather provoked and inflamed by the strokes of the whip. The transportation system needs to be connected to a plentiful supply of ministerial labour’. It is hard to gauge the effect Horton had on such congregations, but, as postulated previously, the Wesleyan Methodists provided a silent witness and moral benchmark despite apparent failures.

Two reputable gentlemen Horton met at a dinner at Humphrey’s in March 1822 acknowledged to Horton the many excellencies contained in the Scriptures and that the morality was exceptional. However, they continued to say that it might be right, but was too mysterious for their

---

151 Horton Journal, 1 April 1822.
152 Horton Journal, 1 April 1822.
153 Horton Journal, 26 March 1822.
154 Horton’s Journal provides some feedback about attitudes to his mission and on 22 April 1822, he delineated the following reasons from people for lack of conversion interest: a general acknowledgment of religion and repentance, but would wish to defer it; a man says he is a Roman Catholic and another is in the communion of the Church of England, another says God is merciful, but this is a wicked country; another says that he knows he is going to hell, and does not pretend to offer a pretext (Horton Journal, 8 April 1822).
comprehension. They believed that Jesus Christ was a good man, but not that he was a divine person.\textsuperscript{155} These were the general attitudes Horton faced. Fatalism and indifference combined with polite interest; a slightly different mix from the greater indifference and hardened heathenism in New South Wales. The respectable gentlemen in Hobart were there for one purpose, self-advancement and business prospects.

Horton’s plan of attack included visits to the outlying areas of New Norfolk, Kangaroo Point and Clarence Plains. The formula included visiting a pious respectable contact in the area (a previously known component) and then in his company radiating out to settlers’ homes. Humphrey was very cooperative and paid Horton considerable attention. As Chief Magistrate and Superintendent of Police, he was the most powerful man in the colony next to Lieutenant Governor Sorell.\textsuperscript{156} He was hated by the convicts for the punishments he meted out, though curiously, he was married to a convict in 1813. Time was spent with Humphrey at his farm at Plenty River and, when Mrs. Horton was indisposed, Humphrey took her there for a holiday. A.F. Kemp was another supporter, taking such tracts as ‘A Word to Drunkards’ and displaying them on his shop counter.\textsuperscript{157} Mrs. Horton was delighted to see such expressions of interest and produced more tracts.\textsuperscript{158} After visiting James Gordon at Pittwater in August 1822, Horton went on to Tea Tree Brush, seven miles from Coal River with Joseph Johnson, a man of considerable substance and a sincere friend to religion. Johnson, a native of Staffordshire, had been transported twenty years previously. Horton and Johnson went around the settlements of Tea Tree Brush and Black Brush endeavouring to gather a congregation. Johnson offered to open his

\textsuperscript{155} Horton Journal, 26 March 1822.
\textsuperscript{157} Anthony Fenn Kemp, magistrate, entrepreneur, a principal merchant of Hobart, had a store in Macquarie Street which sold a wide range of European and English goods as well as most of the wine and spirits consumed in Van Diemen's Land. He was President of the Bank of Van Diemen's Land and chairman of the movements to procure separation of Van Diemen's Land from New South Wales (Nicholas Shakespeare, \textit{In Tasmania} (London & Sydney, 2004), pp. 80-82.)
\textsuperscript{158} Horton, Journal, 9 March 1822.
home for the purpose. Here was the man of substance supporting the missionary endeavours.159

Horton had difficulties on several fronts. There had been trouble with the Rev. Robert Knopwood in early June 1822 when a baby born to the Hortons had died and Knopwood refused burial. The baby had been baptised soon after birth by Horton, but Knopwood had insisted on baptism in the Anglican Church.160 The Lieutenant Governor had to adjudicate between them and Horton had already written resentfully on 2 February 1822 that ‘Mr. Connolly the Roman Catholic priest is afforded every accommodation. It appears that in the eyes of the Protestant clergy, a Papist is better than a Methodist’.161 This was a case of a member of the Anglican clergy taking a hard line on Methodism and refusing to accept Methodism as an acceptable religious movement.162

Nokes wished to keep the management of the Sunday School in his hands and he advertised in the Hobart Town Gazette of 15 June 1822 to that effect. It was really in reply to Horton’s published report of the Sunday School, Hobart in May 1822. The Sunday School had been formed by emancipists (Nokes appeared to have only a partial ticket of leave at this stage and did not have a full pardon until September 1830), and Nokes wanted to keep it that way. A committee of Horton, Nokes and four other persons was suggested for the school, but Nokes refused. He denied opposing Horton, but he did not want any interference in the running of the Sunday School. He bitterly refused the inclusion of free persons in the committee. Once again, the matter was referred to the Lieutenant Governor, and a difficult Nokes was persuaded to have a committee formed. This was not to be, however, with a final refusal from Nokes and a

159 When Philip Oakden arrived in Van Diemen’s Land in 1832 as a wool merchant, he had to form connections who would sell him their wool. Joseph Johnson of Green Ponds as part of the Methodist network sold his 1800 fleeces to Oakden in October 1834. (Anne and Robin Bailey, An Early Tasmanian Story with the Oakdens, Cowies, Parramores, Tullochs and Hogs (Melbourne, 2003), p. 26.)
160 Horton Journal, 2 June 1822.
161 Horton Journal, 2 February 1822.
withdrawal from the Society. Following the rift many of the following names do not appear again in the class lists: Nokes, Lemon, Nye, Burgess, Stewart, Kelly, Dennett, Shelly, Hillier, Matthew, Simpson, Hold, Moore, Cliphold, Donn, Saddler, Walton, Knox, Woolf, Cheeseman, Dick and Monday.

Pretyman discusses the causes of conflict in the infant Society and stresses that the emancipists in Van Diemen’s Land ‘seemed to have been determined to avoid acceptance of other classes of immigrants’. He quotes squatter and author Edward Curr as corroboration, when Curr wrote ‘In Van Diemen’s Land a line of distinction has ever existed between convicts and free persons, which the future acquisition of their freedom has never enabled them to overstep’. The smaller community brought tighter boundaries. Nokes accused Horton of being the prisoners’ enemy, and treating them all with contempt. If Horton had been more mature, with more life experience, he would have allowed Nokes to continue in his original structure. Time and the influx of settlers in 1823 would have softened the situation. Nokes had after all established the group and needed the respect given to an energetic leader. This situation should be viewed against the later Launceston situation where the Wesleyan Methodist egalitarianism was strongly supported by tact and consideration towards those of convict origin. Nokes compounded the fracas by trying to influence Charles Donn, the owner of the chapel, to sign a document letting the chapel to him at a higher rent and soliciting subscriptions for the Sunday School. Corporal Waddy had gone to Macquarie Harbour in early 1822 as part of the first party of convicts to go there. He established a prayer meeting there, but expected to leave at any time with his detachment.

---

163 It is possible that when Nokes resigned he took with him many of the early names of the members of the Wesleyan Methodist Society at Hobart Town for the quarter ending 23 August 1821.
164 R.D. Pretyman, Missionaries in Conflict, p. 12.
166 Pretyman, Chronicle of Methodism, pp. 55-36, citing a letter from the Rev. W. Horton to WMMC, June 1822.
167 Horton Journal, 10 June 1822.
168 Horton Journal, 7 April 1822. Waddy left for India with his regiment the, 48th, in late 1823 early 1824. His mission at Macquarie Harbour was regarded as disappointing.
At this time in June 1822, two missionaries Nathaniel Turner and William White arrived in Hobart on their way to New Zealand. Horton wrote that they had endured many sneers from the cabin passengers, not being allowed to preach there, and only preaching in the steerage. Both men preached and exhorted at the chapel, gaol and hospital. Turner did not proceed to New Zealand because of trouble with the Maoris, and stayed in Hobart until April 1823. White continued on to the New South Wales Mission. Horton’s description of his parting with White is touching: he said, ‘We shook hands and exchanged the kiss of peace, and with tender emotions bid each other farewell, uncertain that we should meet again on this earth’. Turner was a great support and added an even tone to the disturbed Society. It was all activity in September 1822, with tenders being put out for walls for the proposed chapel on Melville Street, and there was movement towards the first Hobart Methodist Book Depot.

With the added ministerial support, Sandy Bay, Hollow Tree, Tea Tree Brush and Glenorchy were being added to the list of potential missions. In September 1822 there was the arrival of Wesleyans in the Heroine in the Derwent. In her reminiscences, Sarah Benson Walker states that ‘Rev. William Horton wrote home desiring some Wesleyans to come out, he thought that they would do a great deal of good and help to settle the Society’. John West refers to ‘the considerable religious immigration which took place in 1822, because Carvosso transmitted accounts of the material and moral prospects of the colony, which determined several of that class to settle in this island’. Horton’s was probably not the only voice requesting respectable Wesleyans to

---

(WMMS Sydney District Dispatches, No. 46, 21 September 1826). He appears to have died in India as the Sydney Gazette 20 May 1826 reports the arrival of the ship Lady Rowene on 17 May from Ireland; Mrs. Waddy widow of Sergeant Waddy of the 48th Regiment was a passenger.

emigrate. There are letters from Wesleyan Missionaries in New South Wales to Robert Mather, commencing in 1819. Robert Mather was married to Anne Benson, the daughter of the Rev. Joseph Benson, who was a prominent biblical scholar and one of the pillars of Wesleyan Methodism.

With her father Joseph dying on 16 February 1821, and an infant daughter on 22 January 1821, Ann Benson Mather was free to cut ties with England, and in June there was a meeting of Wesleyan Methodists and others who proposed to sail to Van Diemen’s Land in the ship *Hope*. Messrs. Shoobridge, Whytall, Jones, Drabble and Mather were present with Mr. Dean in the chair. Peter Degraves, who owned the ship, was asked to prepare and victual the ship and a quantity of tracts were to be placed on board for later distribution. The barque was not seaworthy; Peter Degraves had swindled the passengers and, after it left, it was forced to run into Ramsgate Harbour. Joseph Butterworth, the Wesleyan Methodist

---

173 A month before in 1822, William Horton’s cousin, Samuel Horton of the East India Company, sailed into Sydney in the *Aurora* and he sent down gifts to William, consisting of a box of Imperial Tea, box of sugar candy and a beautiful China crepe dress and scarf. (Horton Journal, 11 August 1822). It is probable that William Horton then persuaded Captain Samuel Horton to emigrate to Van Diemen’s Land and certainly this fact is alluded to in the *THRAP&P*, Notes on Excursion to Ross, 15 September 1961 and referred back to C.C. Dugan. (*THRAP&P*, 10/2 December 1962), referring to C.C. Dugan, *A History of Tasmanian Methodism: 1820-1892* (Hobart, n.d. but 1920). No primary source for this statement can be located, but it is more than probable since William Horton in his journal of 3 June 1823 gave his father an account of Samuel’s affairs and an earnest ‘plea for my brother Samuel and cousins Ian and Thomas to come to this country’. (Horton, Journal, 23 June 1823). William Horton was isolated and his solution was to import people of like mind who could bond together and support each other. Captain Samuel arrived in Hobart on 2 April 1823 and was investigating the country by May with a view to settle. For an account of Captain Horton’s journey to Ross with the Parramores and the Powells, see Anne and Robin Bailey, *An Early Tasmanian Story*. Captain Horton was to be the founder and nurturer of Wesleyan Methodism in the Midlands. His home, *Somercotes* was the cradle of Wesleyan Methodism and the Parramores were earnest supporters. The Powell family who accompanied them to Ross took Walter Powell, a young baby, with them. Walter Powell was to be the ultimate Wesleyan Methodist business man, alongside Philip Oakden and Henry Reed.

174 The Rev. Joseph Benson had been classical master of Kingswood school in 1766, and headmaster of Lady Huntingdon’s College at Trevecca. He wrote a Commentary on the Bible in eight years and was editor of *The Methodist Magazine* which he doubled in size in 1811. His two sons John and Samuel were Anglican clergymen and when he died in 1821, the City Road Chapel Trustees offered to place his body in John Wesley’s grave. With Dr. Adam Clarke and Richard Watson, he was regarded as one of the Wesleyan Methodist leaders (Stevenson, *City Road Chapel*, pp. 388-90).

175 Minutes of Meeting of Persons proposing to go to Van Diemen’s Land in *Hope* 29 June 1821, Walker Papers, cited in *Reports on the Historical Manuscripts*, p. 120.
Member of Parliament, came to the rescue and brought the case before the House of Commons and, because of the distress, another vessel was supplied, the *Heroine*. The Wesleyan Methodist names in the ship were Robert and Ann Mather, Drabble, William Shoobridge, John Dunn, John Dean and wife, John Hiddlestone, Isaac Chapman and wife as well as Sarah and Henry Hopkins, the latter being devout Congregationalists. The Rev. George and Martha Clarke were also on board, under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society, en route to New Zealand. This was the true missionary voyage of Wesleyan Methodist laity, and, with the presence of Ann Benson Mather, the pure essence of Wesleyan Methodism from the Rev. Joseph Benson was being transmitted to Hobart.

The Mather saga is worthy of some discussion in this thesis, because it follows the progress of Wesleyan Methodist laity, combining the missionary sense with commerce; commerce and Christianity were being conjoined. Evidence of this appears in the Mather correspondence. Writing to a friend in January 1824, Ann Benson Mather referred to the missionary spirit when she recalled ‘I was, my dear friend resolved to make the experiment and I know Robert’s motives were pure. I believe hesitation on my part would have frustrated the Allwise design of a gracious and overruling Providence’. This understanding of the missionary aspect of the voyage is supported by a statement from the Rev. Benjamin Carvosso when writing to Robert Mather in January 1826. Carvosso commended Mather for leaving his ‘native country to do good to souls in this land’.

The conjoining of the commercial aspect is evinced in reminiscences of Sarah Benson Walker (daughter of Robert Mather). She wrote ‘my father thought he might well come out to Van Diemen’s

---

176 John Dunn was later manager of the Commercial Bank, Hobart, friend of Philip Oakden and one of the leading Wesleyan Methodist business men.
177 Hiddlestone was immediately Superintendent of the Sunday School on arrival in Hobart.
178 These were people close to the heart of Methodist affairs. In the WMMC correspondence it is evident that there were letters back and forth to the Rev. Joseph Benson at the City Road Chapel. Samuel Leigh was a contact correspondent to Benson and this would have been initiated for inclusion in *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*.
179 Ann Benson Mather, Hobart Town, to a friend in England, January 1824, Mather Papers, University of Tasmania Special/Rare Collection, M.10/10..
Land, if my mother agreed, as it was represented also that money could be easily made here’. 181

Dissension and discord among the Wesleyan Methodists had been inherited from the fracas of the ship Hope’s journey, 182 and this was transferred to Hobart. The fact is constantly alluded to by Tasmanian Methodist historians, but never fully explained. Horton obliquely referred to ‘some disturbances which arose between several of our friends’ during the voyage to Van Diemen’s Land; this ‘provided a great deal of evil speaking, envy and contention, which my utmost efforts could not remove’. 183 This matter was still being discussed by the Rev. Benjamin Carvosso and Robert Mather in 1826. 184 Carvosso regretted ‘that you should find it necessary to cherish the remembrances of grievances which you have received from certain members of the Society some years ago, the precepts of the gospel are utterly opposed to this’. 185

At this time in 1826, Robert Mather was apparently slipping away from Methodism. Carvosso chided him for ‘never stopping after the Meeting on Sunday evening to talk, missing the Sunday morning service.

182 The Wesleyan Methodists of Hobart who embarked on the ship Hope in October 1821, and finally arrived on the Heroine in Hobart in September 1822, were subject to great criticism in Godwin’s Emigrant’s Guide to Van Diemen’s Land published in London in 1823. Eight pages were devoted to an explanation of the incident, heaping total blame on the Wesleyan Methodists for their intransigent behavior. Obviously written from the point of view of a ship owner, the article exonerates Peter Degraves from blame and attaches considerable blame to the harbour master at Ramsgate where the Hope was forced to put in. The Wesleyan Methodists are described as ‘a self styled religious party, impatient and quarrelsome, who drew up a long list of complaints against the owners to excite the commiseration of the Government and procure a free passage’. (Godwin’s Emigrant’s Guide to Van Diemen’s Land (London, 1823, Hobart, 1990 reprint), p. 76). The article points to the inevitable ruin of the ship’s owners and the seizing by customs of the ship and cargo, and highlights ‘the brutal exultation of the Wesleyan Methodists in the successful result of their wicked machinations’. (Ibid., p. 78). Joshua Eynon Drabble came in for particular criticism for penning an article to the newspaper called ‘A Caution to Emigrants’. The intricacies of the situation with reference to legal consequences, Lloyds insurance and the Honorable Board of Customs are all spelt out in the article and one is left with some understanding of the combative attitude of some of the Wesleyan Methodist passengers, which is later referred to in the Hobart Wesleyan Methodist mission histories.
183 Pretyman, Chronicle, p. 39.
184 Rev. Benjamin Carvosso had succeeded to the Hobart Mission in May 1825 after the departure of the Rev. Ralph Mansfield.
and the week night preaching’. Carvosso added that ‘you testify your love for Methodism but I never meet you at a prayer meeting, at a class meeting or a love feast. Are you just in forsaking God’s cause at this time on their account’. Carvosso gave more advice with reference to secret prayer, reading of the scriptures, self examination, and availing oneself of the means of grace. All this was a way of helping Mather in his dilemma. Carvosso saw Mather as being lost to the Wesleyan Methodist cause in Hobart. Mather was an upright economic businessman, the ideal person for the Wesleyan Methodist cause in Hobart, a man who could consecrate some of his wealth to the mission.

Another letter in the same month of January 1826 shows Carvosso’s growing fear. Carvosso was ‘now fully satisfied that you have not a sound argument to show why you should not become instantly a member of the Methodist Society in Hobart Town’. Carvosso asked that these letters not be shown to Mather’s wife, Ann Benson Mather, in her weakened state. She was a chronic invalid, confined to their farm ‘Lauderdale’ and unable to to rise before 1 PM each day owing to weakness. She had only managed to be present at two services in Hobart Methodist Church, but was a devout and committed member of the Wesleyan Methodists. All her correspondence back home to England emphasises her illness and her spiritual acceptance of it. Her letters are almost in the nature of spiritual diary writing, not for personal use but for communication to others.

Ann Benson Mather died on 27 August 1831, and, with the coming of James Backhouse and George Washington Walker, the Quaker

---

186 Ibid.
187 Ibid.
188 At this period whilst his wife was on their land grant at Lauderdale, Robert Mather ran a large general store called ‘London House’ in Hobart. It stocked a very wide range of goods from ready made clothes and fancy goods to sugar, soap, cheese, salt and ironmongery. Robert Mather’s son-in-law George Washington Walker made the comment that ‘to Mather’s upright mode of transacting business and attentive tradesman like habits may be attributed his great success, he began with nothing, with capital advanced by friends, and the second year at stocktaking they cleared £960’. (Letter G.W. Walker, Clan William, South Africa, to Charles Bragg, England, 8 April 1840, Walker Papers, Reports on Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania, Nos. 1-5, Revised Edition (Hobart, 1964), p. 132.)
189 Carvosso to Mather, 26 January 1826, Mather papers, R.7/47b.
190 An amusing highlight on one of these visits to the chapel is contained in her diary. She writes ‘Mr. Carvosso is a faithful servant of the Church, but he speaks much too loudly’. (Diary of Ann Benson Mather, 6 May 1829, Mather Papers, M19/4.)
missionaries, in February 1832, Robert Mather and his family joined the Quakers. 191 This would have been an unlikely step while Ann Benson Mather lived. A letter from the Rev. Ralph Mansfield to Robert Mather in 1835 comments on the surprise that heralded this action. He wrote ‘I rather wonder at your falling in with the Friends. I esteem them very highly in love, but cannot help thinking that their quietism and passiveness present a chilling contrast to the ardour and activity to which you as a Methodist have been accustomed’. 192

Evangelical support had helped start the building of the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, but this was not enough. In an effort to rally more, Horton accompanied James Kelly, the Harbour Master, and boarded several ships in the bay to solicit subscriptions. Generally, the response was good but it was not enough. Hobart lacked a group of liberal Wesleyan Methodists, who were prepared to build a chapel at their own expense, and so consecrate their wealth. There were no Eagars, Lees, Scotts or Howes in Hobart. Waddy and Benjamin Nokes had given their energies, and the Evangelical establishment had initially given to the cause. John Dunn, who had come on the Heroine, was the only substantial Wesleyan Methodist who would emerge, but he was one man. 193 ‘To a lesser degree Esh Lovell could also be considered as the emerging man of commerce.

Horton’s hopes were not realised. The District Meeting in New South Wales in December 1822 noted that ‘Bro. Horton is building a large commodious chapel and hopes that its expenses will be defrayed by public subscription’. 194 Launceston was still being strongly recommended as a new station along with Macquarie Harbour. Horton told the WMMC in September that ‘I feel a growing conviction of the importance of an early occupation of the station for missionary exertion. The population is

191 Michael Bennett, Quaker Life in Tasmania, The First Hundred Years (Hobart, 2007), p. 28.
192 Ralph Mansfield, Sydney, to Robert Mather, Hobart, 21 May 1835, Mather Papers, R.7/49.
193 John Dunn withdraw his $50 donation to the chapel in 1837 as a protest against the intended site. This was the wealthy lay controlling protest. (Pretyman, Chronicle, p. 102.)
194 Minutes of the New South Wales District Meeting, Sydney 31 December 1822, AJCP, M121.
increasing daily... I should have no objection to being appointed to Launceston'.  

John Hutchison, a local preacher who was to start the mission at Launceston, arrived in Hobart on 16 May 1823, stayed a few months, clashing with Horton, and proceeded to Sydney. He had not been ordained in England, because his age of thirty years was deemed to be too old. By 10 December 1823, the Sydney District Committee had decided to receive him on trial, as an accredited missionary. Hutchison was said to have talents for oratory and the Rev. John Thomas sensed that 'he had some of the old Methodist flair about him that I love'.

Horton was resented in certain areas of the Hobart Wesleyan Methodist Society. The Sydney District Chairman informed the WMMC that members resented his off hand manner of doing business without consultation with the leaders, and petitioned a change in preacher. This would explain Horton’s anxiety to leave Hobart for Launceston. Ralph Mansfield arrived about 26 July 1823, having a more diplomatic and conciliatory manner of doing business. Horton’s last report before going to Sydney emphasises his excellent relations with Lieutenant Governor Sorell, the subordinate Government officers and the influential members of the colony. This was where his strength lay. When it came to managing the active Society members, emancipists and prisoners, his skills were not so apparent. He records in his journal that many respectable people regretted his going and the magistrate said that if Horton left, he would no longer attend the chapel. Horton and Mansfield were together in Hobart for three months until December 1823, as Mrs Horton awaited the birth of a child. They both contacted the Sydney District Committee and admitted there was no chance of closing their debt of £69-11-6. Further, there was no hope of extra assistance; some £1,500 was required to continue the building of the chapel which only had its walls up.

195 William Horton, Hobart Town, Van Diemen’s Land, letter to WMMC, 2 Sept. 1823, AJCP, M133.
196 Minutes of the New South Wales District Meeting, Sydney 31 December 1823, AJCP, M121.
198 Pretyman, Early History, p. 52.
The Chapel Trust members\(^{199}\) sent a petition on 24 October 1823 attributing the lack of money to the unprecedented embarrassment of colonial agriculture and no reasonable hope of any further support from the Colonists:

Your mission here in the settlement can now calculate on only one promising means of raising pecuniary supplies. We allude to the formation of a Branch Missionary Society…. We solicit from you partly as a grant, partly as a loan £1,000 and we undertake to guarantee the gradual return of the principal and payment by interest, on the portion as you may supply by loan. If you allow the proceeds of the Branch Missionary Society to be placed to our credit, we will be responsible for the payment for the principal and interest of that also.\(^{200}\)

The Branch Missionary Society was established and that contributed to the funds. Lieutenant Governor Sorell was petitioned, but he forwarded the petition to Sydney. He was sympathetic to the Wesleyan crisis and recommended aid. It was not until Lieutenant Governor Arthur arrived that the Wesleyan Methodist predicament was solved. Arthur now had wider powers, being responsible to London rather than Sydney and being able to act on his own discretion. Assistance was agreed to and this heralded a new era for the Hobart Methodists.\(^{201}\)

The WMMC had hoped for local preachers in the mission, men who had come out as settlers, but Mansfield disenchanted them in February 1824, saying that they would be greatly disappointed in that area. He cited the case of Jesse Pullen, the senior local preacher, who had been reduced to severe pecuniary embarrassment because of the shock suffered by trade and agriculture.\(^{202}\) In March 1824, Mansfield stressed the scattered nature of Van Diemen’s Land population over its vast expanse. He spoke feelingly about the need for an additional labouring minister in the southern part of the island but pleaded ‘with all my might for Launceston. The population is earnestly desirous of material help and a few of the respectable and opulent settlers of the district declared that they will

\(^{199}\) These members consisted of Isaac Chapman, Esh Lovell, John Hiddlestone, Robert Household, Jesse Pullen, Robert Mather, Thos. Clark and John Dunn. It is noted that five of these members are from the *Heroine* emigration.

\(^{200}\) Petition from Hobart Chapel Trust Members to WMMC, 24 October 1823, AJCP, M133.

\(^{201}\) Pretyman, *Chronicle*, p. 50.

\(^{202}\) R. Mansfield to WMMC, 25 Feb. 1824, AJCP, M133.
liberally contribute to the missionaries’ support. It would seem that the expense of this mission would not be a burden on you’. 203

This last remark was to be the incentive to the WMMC to provide help to a proposed Launceston Mission and, in a sense, Mansfield’s words were prophetic in that the ultimate Launceston Mission did not prove a burden to the WMMS – it was essentially totally self-supporting with economic men prepared to consecrate their wealth. The Hobart and New South Wales missions had not lived up to the self-supporting principle, so desirous of the WMMS for their colonial missions. The Launceston mission would reverse all this.

---

203 R. Mansfield to WMMC, 6 Mar. 1824, AJCP, M133.
Part 2
Chapter 3

Launceston Development

Introduction

This chapter discusses the preliminaries that finally led to the successful Wesleyan Methodist mission planting in Launceston in 1834. The difficulties in Hobart having already been highlighted, the reader will be reminded of the Rev. William Horton’s inability to combine the respectable and penal sections of the Society.

Considerable focus will be placed on the collaboration between Lieutenant Governor George Arthur and the Wesleyan Methodists, particularly in his support and patronage of them. His shared sense of a holy mission with them will also be discussed. Within the discussion of Lieutenant Governor Arthur’s role, the claim that he used a Wesleyan Methodist minister as a quasi-spy at Macquarie Harbour will be strongly refuted, in order to reveal a true understanding of a Wesleyan Methodist’s minister’s role.

The chapter will consider the early development of Launceston, particularly in the economic sense, and will go to some lengths to describe the imperial London merchant interest in the growing town; the important Hamburg wool interest will be a part of the discussion. The reasons for the failure of the first Launceston Wesleyan Methodist mission with the Rev. John Hutchinson and Esh Lovell will be explained, whilst recognising at the same time, the unique contribution of Lovell. Next, there will be a discussion of some of the individual merchant/professional men who, in a sense, were waiting to become the elite Wesleyan Methodists; figures such as Henry Reed and John Gleadow, as well as figures such as Isaac Sherwin and Philip Oakden who were already Wesleyan Methodists.
The ministerial input is discussed briefly, and the ingredients for the successful mission of 1834 are spelt out and drawn together in the conclusion. Factors such as a burgeoning wool trade, renewed Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (WMMS) interest and the presence of a group of merchant/professional men prepared to embrace Wesleyan Methodism with spiritual and financial commitment. The role of Philip Oakden is emphasised as the example of the wealthy merchant missionary, prepared to ignite the fires of revival, and shoulder the financial burden of the mission as a form of consecration of wealth.

When Horton left the Hobart Town Mission on 5 October 1823, he left a Society which did not have a strong supporting group of Wesleyan middle class men who were prepared to consecrate their wealth and fulfil the self help principle. The Rev. Ralph Mansfield reiterated this in 1824 by complaining that ‘the miserable chapel was buried in an obscure part of town stopping many people of consequence and respectability attending’.¹ Nokes rejected reaching out to these middle class elements, describing it as ‘counting the favour of the opulent and rich and neglecting the humble and contrite souls and showing a coolness to those who have been unfortunate’.²

There was another conviction that Horton should have carried to the colony, the basic Wesleyan Methodist belief of spiritual status. As Alan Gilbert discerns, ‘Evangelical Nonconformist ideology (including Methodist, Congregational, Baptist) propagated the belief that the most important division in human society lay between those converted and travelling to heaven and those who were without God’.³ As Gilbert continues, ‘this would be of more than spiritual comfort to men whose social position placed them on the least desirable side of the most conventional social divisions’.⁴ It is argued that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Mission was to be remarkably successful in achieving

¹ Rev. Mansfield to Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee (WMMC), 30 Sept. 1824, AJCP, M133.
² Benjamin Nokes, Hobart Town to Mr. Watson, Mission House, 16 Jul. 1821; B. Nokes to Joseph Taylor, 18 Dec 1821, AJCP, G010307
⁴ Ibid, p. 83.
egalitarian/spiritual balance, whilst at the same time retaining a strong base of middle-class merchant support.

**Governor Arthur’s Collaboration with the Wesleyan Methodists**

Six months after Horton’s departure, Lieutenant Colonel George Arthur arrived as Lieutenant Governor of Van Diemen’s Land on 1 May 1824. He had undergone his own transforming religious experience. Manning Clark quotes a letter from Arthur that says ‘whilst stationed in the Honduras he had through the free grace of God come to believe that he would one day enter eternal life’. A.G.L. Shaw describes Arthur as ‘assuring his sister he was not a Methodist, but he had no doubts of his depraved condition’.

It is sometimes difficult to separate those who had a defining religious conversion from the more sharply defined and often lengthily documented Wesleyan Methodist experience. Whatever its nature, this experience put Arthur on the same level of understanding as the Wesleyan Methodists. He was to embrace them as fellow travellers on the road to Perfection, and more importantly was to understand and collaborate with them in their sense of mission in Van Diemen’s Land. Manning Clark sees Arthur as ‘having a source of undying pain during his days in Van Diemen’s Land, pain connected to the assault of Satan with desperately wicked men’. The solution to this, as Robson details it, was ‘the moral improvement and discipline of the convicts’. Arthur had ‘a deep interest in morality in all its shapes and forms’. Morality, force and method were common to both Arthur and the Wesleyan Methodists. Robson notes Arthur’s patronage of the Wesleyan Methodists in Van Diemen’s Land because of his attention to strict moralistic piety, but at the same time

---

Robson adopts an unnecessarily semi-jocular, patronising tone about the Wesleyans for their earnestness and endeavours.\textsuperscript{10}

It was the broad-minded Governor Brisbane in Sydney ‘who considered the Wesleyan Methodists and Catholics as deserving of support’.\textsuperscript{11} Brisbane asked Arthur to assist the Wesleyan Methodists in Hobart: ‘I shall be glad that you will give them every countenance and support in your power to promote their objectives. I shall approve of any assistance you may give them’.\textsuperscript{12} Methodists were being seen as people who might be usefully encouraged. Arthur was generous, but needed the assistance of the Wesleyan Methodists, particularly in the penal system. This was not to be in the quasi-gaoler sense, but as partners together in the great moral plan of redemption for the convicts. Richard Ely describes ‘Arthur as autocratic and remorselessly efficiency-minded in realising the reformist, redemptive side of his programme. In regard to religion, his approach was managerial; he was pastor-in-chief as well as commander-in-chief.’\textsuperscript{13} Arthur sent for Benjamin Carvosso to discuss the subject of two extra missionaries being sent out for the penal settlements of Macquarie Harbour and Maria Island.\textsuperscript{14} At Macquarie Harbour, there were 250 persons including the military. Arthur believed that ‘no persons were calculated to benefit the degraded individuals of the two stations as much as Wesleyan missionaries’.\textsuperscript{15} The added lure was the promise of accommodation and competent salaries for the missionaries. The Wesleyan Methodists, themselves, saw these stations ‘as fields of usefulness’.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{10} Robson, \textit{History}, pp. 275-278.
\textsuperscript{11} Roger C. Thompson, \textit{Religion in Australia, a History} (Melbourne, 2002), p. 8.
\textsuperscript{12} Letter Sir Thomas Brisbane to Sir George Arthur, Arthur Papers, Vol. 6, 22 Jan 1824, Mitchell Library.
\textsuperscript{14} Classes at Macquarie Harbour had been suspended late 1824. Sergeant Waddy, class meeting leader, was not able to find a replacement on his removal with the 48th Regiment to India, but he left sixteen members in the circuit (Letter R. Mansfield to WMMS, 9 Dec. 1824, AJCP, M121.
\textsuperscript{15} Rev. B. Carvosso to Secretaries of the WMMS, 19 April 1821, AJCP, M133.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
Not only were the Wesleyan clergy to be incorporated into Arthur’s grand plan, suitable Wesleyan lay people were to be involved as Superintendents in the Female Factory system. Joshua Drabble, who had come out on the Heroine with the Wesleyan Methodist group, was made Superintendent of the Female Factory in Hobart. Thereafter, that position was held by a succession of Wesleyan Methodists such as Esh Lovell, Jesse Pullen and his wife and John Hutchinson and his wife.\textsuperscript{17} At a later date, Wesleyan Methodist, Francis Lewis von Bibra of Launceston, went from being a shopman in 1838 to being Superintendent of the Launceston Female Factory in 1846.\textsuperscript{18} According to Tony Rayner Wesleyan Methodists were ‘perfect people for running government institutions under Governor Arthur, as he demanded sobriety, respectability, vigour, honesty, integrity and high moral and religious zeal’.\textsuperscript{19} Rayner emphasises that ‘as Methodists were of a substantially lower class than most gentlefolk, they fitted ideally into the situation’.\textsuperscript{20} I do not regard this as a major part of Arthur’s thinking. I consider that Arthur leant more heavily on the aspect of collaborators in the great reforming system, more of a partnership status.

Arthur’s collaboration with the Wesleyan Methodists is confused by Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield in their article on religion at Macquarie Harbour. They do an injustice to the Wesleyan Methodists, viewing the Rev. William Schofield\textsuperscript{21} as an ‘agent of the State with an infamous charter’.\textsuperscript{22} They place Schofield in the role of a spy working for Arthur, and have taken some of Schofield’s comments and regulations and re-slanted them. They do not understand that Schofield’s regulations at Macquarie Harbour 8 Mar. 1828. (R.D. Pretyman, \textit{A Chronicle of Wesleyan Methodism in Van Diemen’s Land, 1820-1840} (Melbourne, 1970), p. 73.) Esh Lovell had been recommended for the position at Macquarie Harbour but he was not enthusiastic (Quarterly Meeting of Hobart Town Methodist Society, 15 Aug. 1824, NS499/118, AOT).

\textsuperscript{17} Tony Rayner, \textit{Female Factory, Female Convicts} (Dover, Tasmania, 2004), pp. 126-128.
\textsuperscript{18} Baptisms in the Wesleyan Chapel, Launceston, Methodist Church Records, NS 499/975, AOT.
\textsuperscript{19} Rayner, \textit{Female Factory}, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{21} Rev. William Schofield arrived at Macquarie Harbour (R.D. Pretyman, \textit{A Chronicle of Wesleyan Methodism in Van Diemen’s Land, 1820-1840} (Melbourne, 1970), p. 73.) Esh Lovell had been recommended for the position at Macquarie Harbour but he was not enthusiastic (Quarterly Meeting of Hobart Town Methodist Society, 15 Aug. 1824, NS499/118, AOT).
Harbour were the pure sinews of Wesleyan Methodism. He was repeating what he knew best, the laws, regulations and rules of the Wesleyan Methodist Society.

In one instance, Schofield, writing to Captain Butler at Macquarie Harbour, stipulated that the convicts ‘shall continue to evidence their desire for salvation by rendering obedience to the powers that be. Honour to whom honour, fear to whom fear’. Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield interpret this as being ‘that salvation can only be sought by tugging the forelock, doing the Commander’s bidding with alacrity’. Schofield, like any good Wesleyan Methodist, was merely reiterating John Wesley’s message that honour must be paid to the authorities. Maldwyn Edwards strongly insists that Wesleyan Methodists were ‘anxious to be seen to be utterly loyal to the King and Constitution’. If Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield had examined a Digest of the Laws and Regulations of the Wesleyan Methodists, they would have understood that good order and submission to the powers that be was the catch cry of the Wesleyans. Their motto was ‘fear God, honour the King, be subject to principalities and obey magistrates’. To a certain extent, the Wesleyan Methodists who were in Van Diemen’s Land had a bonded loyalty to Arthur. He represented authority to which they paid honour, and yet they were partners in the general missionary work.

Submission to authority was the message for ministers and laity alike. The missionaries had been specifically instructed before they left England to ‘have good behaviour towards local governments and all who are in authority’. Additionally, Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield discuss Schofield’s informer’s charter. He had laid down the rule, ‘not to speak evil of anyone in his absence, nor hear anyone without reproaching it. Consequently, if any member does wrong by commission of sin or omission of duty he shall tell him of his fault alone. If he does not report it, he shall report him
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23 W.S. Schofield to Captain Butler, n.d., CSO1/209/4957, AOT, as quoted in Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield, p. 86.
24 Ibid, p. 86.
26 Samuel Warren, A Digest of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodists (London 1835), Rule V, p. 129.
27 Warren, Digest, p. 123.
to the minister before the accused’. Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield see this as convicts being encouraged to inform on their work mates. Schofield was merely reiterating the close intimate scrutiny, accountability and self examination which were an essential part of Wesleyan class and band meetings. It was a tool for spiritual self-awareness, all part of Wesleyan Methodist formulaic practice. Watson writes that ‘advice, reproof and correction were all part of the discipleship of the class meeting of the Wesleyan Methodists’. Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield also link Schofield’s comments about the ‘conversion experience and the admission of guilt’, as ‘abject grovelling indistinguishable from the state’s agenda’. Again, it shows a lack of understanding of the Wesleyan Methodist conversion experience and its accompanying language. The words ‘depraved’, ‘hardened’ and ‘weakened’ were all part of the ritual, quite separate from any convict associations. To illustrate this, it is appropriate to look at the written conversion experience of Esh Lovell, lay preacher and part of the first Launceston mission. This conversion experience account was written at the request of the Rev. Ralph Mansfield and the New South Wales Wesleyan Methodist Committee. Esh Lovell refers to his ‘lost and sinful corrupt condition’ and how he was ‘prey to him that goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour’.

Arthur certainly did have a form of intelligence system and secret government agents for specific purposes as mentioned in Petrow’s article on ‘Policing in a Penal Colony’, and R.W. Giblin comments ‘that there is little reason to doubt that Arthur had at his command a very active Intelligence’.
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30 Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield, ‘Beyond Hell’s Gates’, p. 86.
31 This language which accompanied conversion experiences was what Edward Thompson referred to as ‘the lurid figurative expression of the conversion narrative’; (Edward Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (Harmondsworth, 1968), p. 404).
32 Esh Lovell, Launceston to the Rev. R. Mansfield, Port Jackson, Dispatch No. 41, 3 Jan. 1826, AJCP, M133.
pervaded during Arthur’s term. My contention is that Wesleyan Methodists were not a party to this activity. They had a clear view of what was required of them and their mission. They were not agents of the State, but agents of Wesley and Jesus Christ. They were partners with Arthur on a more elevated plane than Maxwell-Stewart and Duffield suggest.

Arthur’s collaboration with the Wesleyan Methodists extended to the newspaper business in the person of George Terry Howe, a committed Wesleyan Methodist. He was the third son of Wesleyan Methodist George Howe, the Government Printer in Sydney and discussed in Chapter 2 of this thesis. Robert Howe, another son, and editor of the Sydney Gazette, was one of the patrons of the Wesleyan Methodist missionary drive from Sydney to Hobart, and he probably aided his brother to set up The Tasmanian and Port Dalrymple Advertiser in January 1825. He certainly advertised in the first issue that George was to be his Port Dalrymple agent for the Sydney Gazette. This newspaper only lasted until 18 May 1825, when Arthur asked George Terry Howe to set up a rival newspaper to Andrew Bent’s Hobart Town Gazette, which had become an increasingly critical voice. Arthur needed an ally, and printing presses were fairly rare in this society.

The new paper, also called the Hobart Town Gazette, was to be under direct government authority and Howe was in partnership with James Ross, publisher and editor. Bent was forced to change the name of his paper to the Colonial Times and Tasmanian Advertiser. Manning Clark cites ‘James Ross, as having all the outward terrible signs of the God fearing man Arthur admired’, but he failed to make the same observation about George Terry Howe and his Wesleyan Methodist connection. Likewise, John West omitted the connection when discussing the
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35 John West, History of Tasmania: With Copious Information Respecting the Colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, etc., etc. (Launceston, 1852), Vol. 1, p. 181.
36 George Terry Howe appears as an elected trustee for the Melville Street Chapel, Hobart Town. Minutes of Trustees, Melville Street Chapel, Vol. 1, NS 499/140, AOT, 23 July 1823 – Aug 1825.
37 Tasmanian and Port Dalrymple Advertiser, 1825, Issue No. 1.
38 Written note made by E. Morris Miller re the Tasmanian, 1825 Launceston’s first newspaper, included on separate page of microfilm of the newspaper, AOT.
39 Clark, History, Vol. II, p. 120.
newspaper saga. Patricia Ratcliff in her article ‘Some Colonial Pressmen’ refers to the Rev. Ralph Mansfield as a ‘Non Conformist Methodist’ collaborating with the Howes, but does not connect George, Robert or George Terry as strong influential members of Wesleyan Methodism. Wesleyan Methodism was not sufficient glue to bond Arthur and George Terry Howe who wished for freedom of his press and became increasingly critical of Arthur. He was active on the Wesleyan Library Committee and continued to appear in the minutes of the committee until the end of 1826. He also reminded Arthur through the Colonial Secretary of the promise which Arthur had made at Launceston ‘to advance his interests to the utmost of his power’. This was a case of Arthur’s patronage and the reciprocity, thereby demanded, going sadly awry. Howe left Hobart permanently for Sydney in August 1827.

Launceston Development

The question has to be asked, what was the nature of the town of Launceston to which the Wesleyan Methodist missionary came in 1826? What were the reasons for its existence, and was its demeanour penal or commercial? Port Dalrymple, as the settlement was originally named, had been a free port with Hobart since 1813. This meant that, ‘ships could proceed to Van Diemen’s Land without heavy duties being assessed and collected. Port Dalrymple could levy their own duty’. Launceston was certainly penal. When the Rev. John Youl, the Anglican minister appointed to George Town, arrived there in November 1819, ‘there were 240 houses and a population of 1,200, whilst in George Town, there were 500 – 600, mainly convicts’. A good percentage of the population of Launceston were emancipated convicts or ticket of leave men. Irregular relationships flourished in the louche atmosphere and Reynolds quotes the Rev. J. Youl

42 Minutes of the Wesleyan Methodist Library Committee, Hobart Town, NS 499/232, AOT.
43 Letter J.D.A. Collier, State Librarian to Mr. G.F. Howe, Auckland, N.Z., 16 Oct. 1953, Correspondence File, G.T. Howe, AOT.
45 Philip Charles Blake, John Youl, the Forgotten Chaplain: a Biography of the Reverend John Youl (1773-1827) First Chaplain to Northern Tasmania (Launceston, Tas., 1999), p. 32.
saying that ‘he saw a great deal of depravity and dissipation, but the population was not irredeemable’.  

Launceston did have these elements, but one has to consider that these were kept tightly under the control of a rigid authority. The major role that the convicts had to play in the developing economy was that of a convenient labour force. The framework of the existing penal system was to add to the development of Launceston. Barrie Dyster refers to the presence of such departments as customs, survey, lands and courthouse as ‘underpinning the domestic market and ensuring that men of means must resort to it’. This is backed up to a certain extent by J.A. Abbott and N.B. Nairn’s opinion that ‘it would be misleading to underestimate the important roles of convict and commissary in the initial stages of development in Van Diemen’s Land’.  

Launceston was to be a merchant adventurers’ city and in 1821, Commissioner Bigge recognised the fact when he recommended that greater attention should be paid to Launceston, where the inhabitants were establishing themselves. Governor Macquarie had favoured George Town on the mouth of the Tamar Estuary as the main settlement, but he lost out to the vested interests of the settlers and merchants who had interests and investments in the hinterland. George Town had a risky anchorage and the surrounding country was poor quality. As Michael Roe comments, ‘The Tamar is a fine stretch of water, but not an easy one’. Sixty kilometres in length, the Tamar had a difficult lee shore at George Town, and a prevailing north west wind in the Strait. As well, there was the notorious Hebe Reef and the fluctuating currents; navigation on the river was always a concern. Despite this, Commissioner Bigge had noted in his 1821 report that the Launcestonians were ‘receiving consignments

of goods from Sydney and Hobart, which they were exchanging for wheat’.

Building on this, Dyster considers that ‘Launceston grew as Sydney’s satellite and Hobart’s rival’. The first generation of farmers in the hinterland of Launceston produced wheat, oats and barley in abundance, and Hartwell considers ‘that with the growth of the wheat trade, Launceston grew in importance. It was in the right position for wheat export to Sydney and speculative trading to Mauritius and the Cape of Good Hope’. The abolition of the all powerful East India Company’s trading monopoly in 1813 had opened the door to free trade east of the Cape of Good Hope, except for China. China was too valuable to be relinquished, because of the tea trade. Trade was paramount in the minds of imperialist Britain and not least in the minds of the missionaries.

Byrnes’s work has focused on the independent group of merchants located in Blackheath, London. These were the shadowy figures interested in the Pacific trade, men like Samuel Enderby and Buckles-and-Bagster, who engaged in convict transportation and Southern Whale Fisheries. Enderby headed the London pressure group who broke the exclusive privileges of the East India Company. Byrnes considers that the whole Blackheath connection deserves further investigation and bemoans the fact that the intertwining prosopographical business and marriage connections of the group, as well as connectional intrigues, have not been examined in the light of their influences on commerce in the Australian region. The book, The Founding of Australia, edited by Ged Martin, brings together eight eminent historians discussing various theories for the founding of Australia. Dallas, H.T. Fry and Ged Martin support the

51 Giblin, Early History, p. 262.
54 It is an interesting aside to note that in 1796, the London Missionary Society received a special charter from the East India Company for their missionary ship The Duff. After dropping their missionaries at Tahiti, the ship was allowed to backload tea from China. In 1798, this cargo netted £4,000 in London and covered all expenses. (Dan Byrnes, Blackheath Connection, www.danbyrnes.com.au/blackheath).
theory that Australia was founded mainly as a trading base and Michael Roe concedes that ‘commercial activity could have been underplayed by officials in London because of the East India Company’s jealous protection of their trade, particularly in China’.\(^{57}\) He concludes that all sorts of interpretations can be made, but in the end one has to accept the bona fide documents.\(^{58}\)

These issues are of some importance to Launceston. This helps us to focus and understand that opportunistic merchants quickly followed any type of settlement and establishment, and indeed they may have had a hand in the establishment in the first place. It helps to show the progression and pattern of merchant movement to Van Diemen’s Land and in particular Launceston. Byrnes commends Frank Broeze for having broken the drought and written a history about one of these particular merchants, Robert Brooks and the Australian trade.\(^{59}\) Brooks arrived in Hobart in 1822 on a fact-finding mission meeting with another entrepreneur Anthony Fenn Kemp, who became his agent in Hobart.\(^{60}\) Brooks and the London city merchants and business men understood that Sydney and Van Diemen’s Land were not only penal colonies, but had growing exports and required imports; this was the basis of trade. Broeze also discusses ‘the optimism about the Australian trade. It was all part of the general boom atmosphere of the years 1822–3’.\(^{61}\) Brooks was a good example of the imperial merchant eyeing prospects in Launceston. He finally established permanent shipping links and agencies in Launceston in 1832.

Seal skins, kangaroo skins, oat, wheat and barley were being traded out of Launceston in 1832. The seal skins were bought from the sealing gangs in Bass Strait; as well, one has to acknowledge merchants like Jonathan Griffiths, William Barnes, Thomas and James Reiby and William Effingham Lawrence. Jonathan Griffiths and his sons moved to Launceston
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\(^{58}\) Ibid; Roe was referring to documents to establish a colony in New South Wales.


\(^{61}\) Broeze, *Mr. Brooks*, p. 31.
in 1822 on their own ship *Maid of Richmond* which they had built on the Hunter River in New South Wales. Griffiths ‘sent out sealing expeditions into the Strait’,\(^\text{62}\) and consolidated his position with land grants. The land grants were the deciding factor. Settlers had to have a certain amount of capital to bring into the colony, and then received generous land grants in return. The peak of the land grant system came in 1823 when, ‘the greatest number of grants ever made in a single year in Van Diemen’s Land were issued’.\(^\text{63}\) Morgan sees these settlers as ‘mercenary, racist and exploitative’,\(^\text{64}\) which they very probably were, but on the other side of the coin there was John Leake’s revealing opinion that ‘I have thrown my fortunes across the Rubicon and I must follow them’.\(^\text{65}\)

One group of these settlers included Leake, the Wesleyan Methodist merchant Benjamin Horne, Lewis Gilles and the Wesleyan Methodist Captain Samuel Horton. These men received grants in 1823 in the Macquarie River, Ross district. With the exception of Captain Horton, these can be termed the Hamburg group. They are part of the background merchant interest of this thesis. The Parramore family came out to Van Diemen’s Land on the *Woodlark* in July 1823 and the Powell family were also on board. Walter Powell, who was to become the noted Wesleyan Methodist business man, was a child of fourteen months at the time. Travelling out with Captain Horton to the land grant at Macquarie River, the Parramores were to be strong midland supporters of Wesleyan Methodism. As with Benjamin Horne, Lewis Gilles and John Leake, they were to become noted sheep breeders. The Rev. John Manton refers to George Parramore as an ‘old disciple’.\(^\text{66}\)

Whilst other London merchants were eyeing sealing, whaling and wheat prospects, the Hamburg connection was eyeing wool prospects. The éminence grise at the head of this Hamburg group was Osmond Gilles. Opportunities for trade existed in Europe after the departure of
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\(^\text{64}\) Morgan, *Land Settlement*, p. 4.

\(^\text{65}\) Letter, Osmond Gilles to John Leake, date water damaged but probably 1832, University of Tasmania, Special/Rare Collections, L.1/B, 394A.

\(^\text{66}\) Rev. John Manton Journal, NS 1234/1/1, AOT, 5 Jul. 1836.
Napoleon, and after 1812 fine wools were sourced in Germany. Saxon wool and later merino wool came down the River Elbe in barges to the port. A group of English merchants bought wool for the English manufacturers, who were moving towards steam as a source of power. Hamburg was a dynamic mercantile city. There were considerable grievances for the English residents in Hamburg and Osmond Gilles, Philip Oakden and John Leake had to fight for their rights. These men were wool merchants and commission agents, involved also in the Baltic and Mediterranean trades. They traded in anything that produced a commission, but mainly wool.

It was not a light-hearted decision for Leake, Horne and Lewis Gilles to emigrate to Van Diemen’s Land in the Andromeda in May 1823. These were Morgan’s ‘rapacious men’; merchants with a propensity for profit. Primary sources reveal that Osmond Gilles was the driving force. From 1821, wool was beginning to become an important export from Van Diemen’s Land. D.E. Fifer contends that the ‘merchants played a vital role in the expansion of the colonial wool trade’ and feels that historians like S.H. Roberts have tended to denigrate the merchant’s role in the wool trade. He asks for more attention to be focused on merchants such as Buckles-and-Bagster, Robert Brooks and Gore and others to show ‘the interdependence between them and the pastoral industry’. Leake, Horne and Gilles were not only pastoralists and merchants, but had the ability to move into the banking stream. Their connection to the merchant fraternities in Hamburg and England gave them credibility. I consider that Osmond Gilles’ influence has not been fully recognised or documented. An Evangelical, he was the brother-in-law and business partner of Philip

---

68 John West in his *History of Tasmania* was aware of the connection when he wrote ‘the adoption of these colonies for the growth of wool first drew the attention of several gentlemen of Hamburg, whose importations afterwards promoted the improvement of fine wools’ (John West (ed. A.G.L. Shaw), *The History of Tasmania* (Melbourne, 1971)), p. 59.
70 Ibid.
Oakden, who is possibly the main Wesleyan Methodist figure in this thesis.\footnote{134}

In the Archives Office of Tasmania, there is a ledger notebook of memoranda made in Hamburg regarding the wool trade and other trades in Van Diemen’s Land.\footnote{71} It is headed ‘Memoranda for Tasmania, made in Hamburg in May 1825’.\footnote{72} This was produced by Osmond Gilles scrutinising Van Diemen’s Land closely for the possibilities and prospects of the ports of Hobart and Port Dalrymple. Figures show the amount of wool imported from New South Wales in 1820-3 and comparative figures imported into Hull and Great Britain for the same period. There are extracts and comments on John MacArthur’s and Alexander Riley’s flocks and Thomas Henty’s merino rams as well as Adolphus Schayer of the Van Diemen’s Land Company. Gilles was in touch with them all. Gilles gave directions to his brother Lewis to view the Saxon sheep coming in the \textit{Prince Regent} and bought by William Dutton. He described how ‘he, Hector and Griffin\footnote{74} had overseen Dutton’s sheep from Hamburg to London and had gone on board the \textit{Perseverance} to see the pens fitted for the sheep’.\footnote{75}

Commissioner Bigge’s second report in the Memoranda cites the sums required for interest of Grants in Van Diemen’s Land. There is also a report of wool samples sent from Van Diemen’s Land and New South

\footnote{71} An historical biography, \textit{OG, The Colonial Treasurer} has been written by Valerie Hicks, mainly dealing with Osmond Gilles’ period as Colonial Treasurer in South Australia. There is also an open book on the World Wide Web by Eleanor Yelland, \textit{Sheep May Softly Graze: Osmond Gilles’ Legacy}. Once again, this deals with Osmond Gilles in his South Australian connection. (Eleanor Yelland, \textit{Sheep May Softly Graze: Osmond Gilles’ Legacy} (Adelaide, 1999)).

\footnote{72} I was led to this manuscript by a note in the THRA article by Mary S. Ramsay, ‘Eliza Forlong and the Saxon Merino Industry’, \textit{THRAP&P}, Vol. 51, No. 3, September 2004, p. 124. The manuscript was purchased at Dr. Clifford Craig’s sale, and Ramsay is correct in assuming that it may have come down through the Gilles or Leake families in Van Diemen’s Land. I consider it came down through the decendants of Lewis Gilles as there are comments from Osmond directed solely to Lewis Gilles and Eppendorf, the property he and Lewis shared at Ross. Eppendorf later became known as Lewisham and then Ashby.

\footnote{73} This is not in Osmond Gilles’ hand writing, possibly in a clerk’s hand, but it is interspersed with marginal comments by Osmond Gilles in his hand and signed \textit{OG}. (Memoranda for Tasmania, Made in Hamburg May 1825, NS 473-10 AOT.)

\footnote{74} Hector and Griffin were English merchants in Hamburg. John Hector later emigrated to South Australia and was the founder of the Savings Bank of South Australia; he also served as a Director of the Glen Osmond Mining Company.

\footnote{75} NS 473-10, AOT, Sept. 1825.
Wales and their prices. There are pages of advice in the ‘Memoranda’ about the properties of wool, discussing elasticity, strength, fineness, softness, methods of washing and loss of weight. Osmond was also telling his brother Lewis that his knowledge of German was a great advantage, enabling him to read certain German lectures on wool not available in England. He also gives a stern admonishment to Lewis that he is to be aware of the time, research and inspection of flocks which he, Osmond, had put into the purchase of Lewis’s small flock. Osmond felt that he had a decided advantage over other ventures and that ‘he knew the colony as intimately as anyone. In fact, he was quite the Australian oracle in Hamburg’. He concluded that ‘if wool, fine wool is absolutely your approved staple, you have nothing to fear’.

Osmond’s commercial vision for Van Diemen’s Land and Launceston was that which Rimmer discusses when he states that ‘exporting the new staple export to the mills of the West Riding brought the colony into contact with the industrial world of the 19th century whilst reinforcing town growth’. In a sense, this manuscript information was the business man’s equivalent of such prospective emigrants’ handbooks as those written by William Charles Wentworth and Edward Curr, *The Statistical Description of New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land* and *An Account of the Colony of Van Diemen’s Land* respectively. Osmond’s information, however, was for the benefit of the closed circle of Leake, Horne, Oakden and his brother, Lewis.

The prospective settler in 1823 had relied on Godwin’s *Emigrant’s Guide to Van Diemen’s Land* This had every conceivable piece of information relating to settlement, labour costs, agriculture and the state of society, as well as the breeding of fine wool. In Godwin, the line was taken that Van Diemen’s Land was a more attractive spot for emigration than America or the Cape of Good Hope, as the convicts were an excellent source of labour. It noted that, ‘these convicts were under the paternal care of the Government who determined that they will repent and return
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76 Ibid.
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to the paths of virtue’. In effect, Governor Arthur’s message was reinforced in Britain. Morgan mentions Leake as settling next to other Hamburg merchants but does not develop the concept. When Lewis Gilles had come out in the Andromeda he had brought Saxon Merino sheep with him, as had John Leake. We gain some idea of the value of them when Leake told his wife that they were ‘a valuable property and if we should lose them it would strike at our very comfort’.

Through the 1820s Osmond Gillies advised John Leake on the wool industry. He thought that ‘if regular bred and clean washed, the fleece will always ensure sale. Never ship wool to London. Send it to the Yorkshire manufacturers, better to Liverpool. I have seen good wools in Leeds from Hobart either from Mr. Archer or Mr. Cox’. In 1825, the separation of Van Diemen’s Land from New South Wales boosted the commercial life of Van Diemen’s Land. The bureaucratic machinery was able to move more swiftly in making immediate decisions. Arthur showed support for the developing north by visiting Launceston in January 1825, and in the same month The Tasmanian and Port Dalrymple Gazette reported that a Wesleyan missionary was ‘expected daily to assist the labours of the Rev. Mr. John Youl’.

Improvements were planned for the town of Launceston such as Government stores, hospital, Commandant’s House and Anglican church. Plans were made to move headquarters from George Town to Launceston. Arthur’s visit prompted the main streets of Launceston to be named with the principal places in each; e.g. Paterson Street parallel to Brisbane Street in which are the barracks, gaol and Government windmill. John Pascoe Fawkner brought a civilising note to the town by advertising a reading room for Launceston. Wheat was one of the main topics of interest in the newspaper. Advertisements were placed at this time in the Tasmanian
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82 Osmond Gilles, Hamburg, to John Leake, Van Diemen’s Land, 23 July 1829, Leake Papers, University of Tasmania, Special/Rare Collections, L.1/B. 393B.
83 Tasmanian and Port Dalrymple Gazette, 5 Jan. 1825.
and Port Dalrymple Gazette for supplying the Commissariat Stores at George Town and Launceston with barley and wheat. This was all stimulating the economy; by February and March, all the stores in Launceston were taking wheat in payment for all goods such as tea, sugar and clothing. One of the store owners, Mr. Williams, estimated that he could export 'ten to twelve thousand bushels of wheat during the present year of 1825'.86 The barter system was the beginning of the credit system which the shopkeepers were going to take through to the wool growers. They were to advance wool growers a proportion of the value of their wool clip, so commencing a circle of wool, money and goods, where money did not change hands. Hartwell describes this as 'a static situation waiting for the growth of the wool industry and the export of fine wool to London and then private investment'.87 He explores the theme of credit especially how wool manufacturers bought wool on credit. Imports into Van Diemen's Land were bought on credit from merchants who had credit from London export houses.88 This allowed merchants to dominate colonial society.89

First Wesleyan Methodist Mission

Into this developing town the Wesleyan Methodist missionary the Rev. John Hutchinson arrived in April 1825, bringing with him the missionary push, aligned to confidence in Arthur’s patronage and interest. Considerable urging had come from the Rev. Ralph Mansfield to commence the mission, and it would appear from the Rev. Benjamin Carvosso’s correspondence that little research had been done into the size of possible congregations, support etc. The ensuing difficulties and complications and what Carvosso referred to as ‘the perplexities of the mission’ were spelt out in a letter from Carvosso to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee (WMMC).90 The Rev. John Hutchinson
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86 Ibid, 2 Feb. 1825.
87 Hartwell, Economic Development, pp. 94-5.
90 Letter Carvosso to WMMC, Hobart Town, 10 Sep. 1827, AJCP, M133.
initially had a loan of the Court House as a preaching venue, but Carvosso described this as 'precarious and disagreeable'.

An allotment of land was given by the Government for a chapel, and the New South Wales District Meeting talked confidently about a highly respectable group forming the management and erection of the chapel, and subscribing £200 - £300. The subscription list for the Chapel exists, and it was filled with the respectability of the town. These men were Evangelical Christians, and for the most part not Wesleyan Methodists. They were happy to contribute to the initial list and be part of a broad Evangelical and reformist push in Launceston. Only Theodore Bartley and William Gray later became Wesleyan Methodists. Figures in Launceston in 1827 show only six actual members of the Wesleyan Methodist Society and three on trial. To add to the uncertainty of the mission, Hutchinson was torn away from Launceston after only nine months and sent to the mission in Tonga on 13 January 1826. In retrospect, this move appears to be inept bungling by the WMMC. It is hard to sift the truth of the matter from the correspondence, but it seems that the WMMC insisted on his removal to Tonga. A descendant, R.C. Hutchinson, infers that Hutchinson was longing to go to Tonga, and certainly had no sense of failure in the

91 Ibid.
92 Minutes of New South Wales District Meeting, 3 Jan. 1826 for the year ending 1825, AJCP, M121.
93 Hobart Town Courier, 25 May 1825:
Subscription List for Erection of a Wesleyan Chapel in Launceston
£3 Donation: Richard Dry, Captain Barclay, Donald McLeod, George Hull, A. Friend.
There were twenty seven donations of £1 and several other donations of ten shillings and five shillings. Theodore Bartley contributed £1-1-0. The total amount came to £207-10-0. As well J. Fawkner Jnr. contributed £25 in materials and Messrs. Sprout & Marr four window sashes, Gribble and Evans two window sashes, John Fawns two window sashes, Messrs Duncan and French three days with cart and bullock, John Fredlan six days with cart and bullock.
The Hobart Town Courier by 31 December 1825, p. 3, then added several extra names to the £207-10-0, including John Dunn, Hobart Town and John Batman, £5. The first named ten gentlemen on the list (excepting Lt. Col. Balfour) with Rev Mr. Hutchinson were the committee for building the Chapel.
94 Minutes of New South Wales District Meeting, 2 Jan. 1827 for the year ending 1825, AJCP, M121. The term 'on trial' refers to a probationary period before being accepted as a full member of the Society.
Launceston Mission. A petition from the people of Launceston failed to change the situation.

In desperation, the New South Wales District Committee decided to appoint Esh Lovell, who wound up his affairs in Hobart and went to Launceston. In his *Chronicle of Methodism in Van Diemen's Land*, R.D. Pretyman gives no sense of the hand wringing of the District Committee at the arrogance of the WMMC. This is curious as Pretyman had access to all this correspondence and utilised it for the facts, but never to attempt any analysis of the situation. By 14 February 1826, Esh Lovell had set off for the Launceston Station to relieve Hutchinson. As the bridging plank between Hobart and Launceston Wesleyan Methodism, and as an example of a Wesleyan Methodist merchant missionary prepared to consecrate his wealth, Esh Lovell deserves some detail spent on him. For the argument of this thesis, even though Esh Lovell’s mission failed, it was a truly sincere and groundbreaking attempt towards the self-sufficiency and self-support demanded of the colonial missions.

Lovell had arrived in 1823 with assets equivalent to £906, and these included £100 worth of sheep. He set up a general clothing goods store in Hobart soon after arrival and his wife worked as a dress maker. Carvosso described Lovell as ‘well read with an extensive knowledge of the Scriptures and a little acquaintance with Latin and Greek, particularly the former’. Lovell had preached in Hobart on Sundays when Carvosso journeyed into the interior. Lovell was the epitome of the respectable, comfortable, middle-class Wesleyan Methodist and his attraction for the New South Wales District Committee was as follows: ‘He would maintain himself independently of the funds of the Society and cheerfully engaged to do so should the Committee require it’. The one difficulty that the New South Wales District Committee saw was that he ‘was one of the
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96 The New South Wales District Committee covered itself against the wrath of the WMMC by saying that, ‘there is no alternative... and we would not violate an unconditional mandate from the WMMC’. (Minutes of New South Wales District Meeting, 3 Jan. 1826 for the year ending 1825, AJCP, M121).
97 Despatch 50, 51, Carvosso, Hobart Town to WMMC, 14 Feb. 1826, AJCP, M133.
98 Correspondence File, Esh Lovell, AOT.
99 Despatch 50, 51, Carvosso, Hobart Town to WMMC, 14 Feb. 1826, AJCP, M133.
100 District Despatch No. 34 re Bro. Lovell’s Examination, New South Wales District Committee 3 May 1826 to WMMC, AJCP, M121.
exalted of the earth, but he did not receive the doctrine of Christ’s eternal Sonship’. They brushed this aside pragmatically by saying that it was hardly going to matter to them and that Lovell was not the type to indulge in theological debate.

Carvosso discussed Lovell’s contribution to the Launceston Mission in a letter to the WMMC in 1827. He described how Lovell found the walls of the Launceston Chapel up when he came and felt that he would proceed with the work. Lovell ‘raised another £200 through subscriptions but that went little further than putting on the roof’. It needed another £200 spent on it and that was not forthcoming; Lovell advanced the money out of his own pocket. Carvosso angrily wrote that ‘With some difficulty and sacrifice, the Chapel was completed’. His frustration grew when he heard from the WMMC that the Launceston Station had been abandoned altogether, as they had decided to limit their expenditure in the colonies. Carvosso was left carrying the can so to speak, and fulminated that ‘the subscribers could complain of injustice and injurious effects might follow’. Carvosso stressed that ‘the congregation was small and feeble and that Governor Arthur viewed the subject in the same light’. Additionally, ‘the ‘friends’ in the colony could not maintain a mission there at their own expense’.

Unwittingly, Carvosso had put his finger on the two important facts in his letter to the WMMC. These refer to the respectable gentlemen who filled up the initial list and the feeble nature of the actual Society. Two of them, William Barnes and Lieutenant W. Kenworthy, advertised a meeting to consider giving up their interest in the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel. Barnes had emigrated to Launceston in 1824 and established Launceston’s first brewery, The Port Dalrymple Brewery, and Kenworthy was the Inspector of Public Works, which engaged the convicts. These were

---
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102 Lovell’s conversion experience has already been mentioned in this thesis as it took the reader from ‘the overwhelming vision of the damned in Hell to the melting of his heart at a Class Meeting’ (Letter E. Lovell, 20 Feb. 1826, AJCP, M133).
103 Letter No. 69, Carvosso to WMMC, Hobart Town, 20 Sep. 1827, AJCP, M133.
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107 *Cornwall Press and Commercial Advertiser*, 23 November 1829.
Evangelical men of substance, positioned with sympathy like the original Hobart Town Wesleyan Methodist subscription list, but not men who had any intention of committing as actual church members. It was not apparent to Carvosso or later historians that the entire success of such a mission rested solely and wholly on having as Wesleyan Methodist chapel members, a group of merchant / professional class who were prepared to pay for the chapel and continue to support the mission financially. What was wanted were the Wesleyan Methodist economic men with the missionary gospel spirit who consecrated their wealth by supporting new missions, building chapels and removing financial responsibility onto their own shoulders from the WMMS.\textsuperscript{108}

Lovell had made a sterling attempt to be that economic model by advancing £200 of his own money, but he was not substantial enough to carry the burden forward by himself. In the New South Wales and Hobart plantings there had been isolated single instances of benevolence, but the shining example of benevolence and success was to come in Launceston’s second mission, certainly not in the first failed mission. Carvosso was left to pick up the pieces and answer the criticisms of the \textit{Launceston Advertiser}, which demanded in April 1829 ‘that before the chapel was sold, a meeting of the subscribers must be held’.\textsuperscript{109} The inference was that the Wesleyan Methodists could add a few pounds of their own to the building, claim it as their own and dispose of it as their own property. The article went on, ‘we only say, do not do this great wrong, for evil attends it’.\textsuperscript{110}

The voice speaking was John Pascoe Fawkner, proprietor of the newly-commenced \textit{Launceston Advertiser}. The decision was made to put the money into a trust fund administered by Fawkner and later some of it aided the First National Scottish Church in Charles Street in 1831. The subscribers did not want their money back. It had been given in the spirit of consecrated wealth of Wesleyan Methodism. Hayward and Tyson describe the subscribers ‘as having given their money to a religious object

\textsuperscript{108} This benevolent activity would thus consecrate the giver’s wealth and temper further anxiety about the Stewardship of his Riches.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Launceston Advertiser}, 6 April 1829.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.
and declined to appropriate it to their own use’.

Bethell suggests that the concept of men of differing denominations helping each was ‘engendered by Arthur who looked with equal favour on all’.

The concerns of 1829 in Launceston show up in the *Cornwall Press and Commercial Advertiser* as to the state of the streets and the supply of pure and wholesome water for the town. The years 1828-1829 had seen an influx of settlers ‘diverted to a relatively prosperous Van Diemen’s Land from a depressed New South Wales’. The Derwent Bank in Hobart Town commenced in November 1827, and John Dunn, Wesleyan Methodist who had come out on the *Heroine* was a director, Stephen Adey, Van Diemen’s Land Company Commissioner was cashier and John Leake opted to be the accountant to supplement his income. Two years later, John Dunn left the Derwent Bank in 1829 and commenced the Commercial Bank, which was ‘the first bank in the colony to offer interest on deposits’. Once the pastoral boom had ceased, a prolonged depression then followed. The boom had been instigated by an influx of capital from such companies as the Van Diemen’s Land Company and The Australian Agricultural Company. The Commercial Bank had opened its doors in Launceston in January 1828 in reply to the Derwent Bank and to foster trade.

**Merchants in Waiting**

In the late 1820s in Launceston, there was a small group of men who were to become the backbone of Launceston Wesleyan Methodism, and, with the exception of one person they had not yet experienced conversion. These were John Gleadow, Henry Reed, Theodore Bartley and Captain Patrick Dalrymple. Isaac Sherwin was the one person in the group who was already a Wesleyan Methodist.

---

112 Bethell, *The Story of Port Dalrymple*, p. 88. See also discussion in Chapter 4 of this thesis.
Isaac Sherwin had arrived with his father John and two brothers in January 1823 on the Brixton. He had been born in 1804 in Burslem, in the Potteries district of England. Burslem was a strong centre for Wesleyan Methodism and Isaac’s grandfather had come to Burslem from Macclesfield, bringing his family and experiencing conversion. Similarly, the Rev. Ralph Mansfield wrote an enthusiastic letter to ‘all his friends in Burslem’.

In her biography of the Sherwinds, Ann Fysh details how ‘Isaac spent some time in Germany as a young man obtaining experience in merchandising’. There are also links with Isaac’s sister to other Wesleyan Methodist china dealing families in Poseldorf, Germany. After spending two years in Van Diemen’s Land, Isaac returned to England and Germany on the Denmark Hill. Carvosso utilised his services by sending his journal back home with Isaac and wrote to the Secretaries of the WMMC as follows: ‘The Journal I do not send by post, I have committed it to the care of Mr. Isaac Sherwin; he is a worthy respectable young man who for some time has been Secretary to our Sunday School’. By July 1829 on the Prince Regent, Isaac was back in Van Diemen’s Land. He commenced a general merchandising business in Launceston in 1831 as Cook and Sherwin of Charles Street, dealing in a wide range of merchandise. The Independent advertised saddlery, tea, tobacco, silks, velvet, ribbons, sugar and earthenware; the inevitable grains, wool, bark and kangaroo skins were taken as payment.
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117 The connection is shown to Wesleyan Methodism when the Sherwinds brought a letter of introduction and a parcel from the Rev. Joseph Taylor at Mission House in London to the Rev. William Horton. Taylor wrote, ‘Mr. and Mrs. Sherwin who are the bearers of this are friends from Burslem in Staffordshire’; (The Rev. Ralph Mansfield to Charles Barnes, Burslem, Staffordshire, 27 Mar. 1824, AJCP, PLP 73-8-1).
119 Hatton Family of Lightcliffe (Pritchard and Edmunds History, WWW.mypritchardfamily.co.uk, 2004).
122 Independent, 9 May 1831, 15 October 1831.
Of the group of Wesleyan Methodists in waiting, John Gleadow and Henry Reed were fellow Yorkshiremen. Born in Kingston-on-Hull, Gleadow had arrived on the Andromeda in September 1825. He had been admitted as a solicitor in England in 1823 and was admitted to the Tasmanian Bar in March 1826.\(^{123}\) He had substantial wealth when he arrived, citing ‘items of haberdashery, stationery and household utensils as worth £2,681-10-0, and that in addition he could find £1,500 when required’.\(^\text{124}\) He was granted 2,000 acres of land soon after his arrival and placed it under an overseer. In 1827, he came to Launceston working first as a solicitor from a cottage in St. John Street, whilst at the same time running a merchandising business. In 1828, he asked to be appointed as Deputy Clerk of the Peace and Registrar of the Council of Requests in Launceston. From the early days, he was involved in the life of Launceston as a respectable professional man and merchant. He was noteworthy, like his Yorkshire confrère Henry Reed, for enjoying the race track.\(^\text{125}\)

Born in 1806, Henry Reed had a commercial apprenticeship at Hull from the age of 13 and obtained an excellent background in trading and shipping matters. His aunt Hannah was married to William Grubb, who was the proprietor of ‘The Bank Coffee House’ in Cornhill, London from 1822–1838.\(^\text{126}\) ‘The Bank Coffee House’ was the centre for merchants, timber trading, diamond merchants, insurance and stockbroking, and in 1826 it was the venue for meetings of the SPCK.\(^\text{127}\) Anthony Clayton details how the London coffee houses evolved to meet various social and commercial needs such as postal centres, employment agencies, auction rooms, lecture venues, business arrangements, stock trading and up to date business information.\(^\text{128}\) ‘The Bank Coffee House’ became an enduring and helpful commercial base for Henry Reed in London until 1838. Reed arrived in the Tiger in Hobart in April 1827 and walked to

\(^{123}\) Memorial of John Ward Gleadow to the Honourable John Lewis Pedder, Supreme Court, Hobart Town, in AOT Correspondence File, J.W. Gleadow.

\(^{124}\) File CSO/1/156/3757, AOT, as cited by A.E. Browning, Acting State Librarian, AOT correspondence file, J.W. Gleadow.

\(^{125}\) In December 1831, John Gleadow was Launceston’s Clerk of the Course. In February 1832, he was one of the Stewards for the Cornwall Race Ball (Independent, 15 February 1832).


\(^{127}\) Ibid.

Launceston to introduce himself to John Gleadow who gave him a clerking position in his store. A land grant of 640 acres at the Nile Rivulet and 60 acres on Norfolk Plains followed in December 1828-9 because he had assets of £605-7-0 and a further £1,800 in England. A letter to his sister described his prospects and what he had achieved.

This is a most delightful country, tho’ you cannot pick up money on the streets anymore, you must look sharp if you intend getting on… I am becoming a man of property. I never in my life had a better prospect… If I get sufficient to keep me, I will go home.  

Reed let his land at the Nile for five years at £60-0-0 and carried on the farm at Norfolk Plains. He imported a stallion which stood at stud, raised horses at the Launceston Show and took prizes for sheep and cattle. Reed left Gleadow’s employment and went into partnership with James Duncan in operating a merchandise store where the usual seed and grain were taken in payment. This partnership lasted eight months but before it was dissolved Reed and Duncan had entered the chartering business in December 1829 with a charter for the brig Mary Ann. This was followed in September 1830 by a more complex charter with James Henty of Swan River, bringing goods and merchandise to Fremantle in a joint venture.

By May 1830, Henry Reed was sufficiently noteworthy in Launceston to be aligned to merchants such as William Effingham Lawrence. He became joint owner with Lawrence and John Sinclair of the brig Henry purchased from the owner John Griffiths. This was really the commencement of the whaling business out of Launceston and there was an initial whaling trip to Circular Head. Hudson Fysh comments that at the time with all this activity Reed was also immersed in horse racing and
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129 Henry Reed to his Sister, 15 Oct. 1827, Reed Envelope, Tasmaniana Library, Hobart, Lot 169, TCP 994.6.
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134 The Henry was built in May 1827 on the Tamar by John Griffiths with the William. These were the first two ships built on the Tamar River.
card playing and ‘never thought of God nor thanked God’. He was a friend of John Batman’s and was a witness at Batman’s wedding. In 1831 the Independent newspaper hailed the commencement of whale fishing as ‘the furnishing of an export article as well as boat building and victualling them from Launceston’s interior’. A typical victualling of the Henry was twelve casks of beef, one ton of flour, 30 cwt. of bread, slops, tea, sugar and soap. In this same month of May, 20,000 bushels of wheat were shipped to Sydney from Launceston. Later in the year 1831, Henry Reed returned to London on the Bombay for the first of four return voyages to England. Dyster comments on Reed’s voyages that ‘each time he returned it was as richer than the last time’. Reed’s energy and perception urged him to repeat these journeys. He knew that he had to keep a very close contact with the British markets and merchants for successful trading. and that often it was the man on the spot who gained the prize.

Reed married his cousin Maria Susannah Grubb on 22 October 1831 at St. James’ Westminster. He was now aligned in a firm relationship with the Grubbs and ‘The Bank Coffee House’. Though there is no documentary evidence, it is reasonable to assume that it was this connection that gave him an entrée to Mr. Buckle of Buckles & Co. Margaret Reed, Henry Reed’s second wife, whose book about her husband is full of moralising material, was sufficiently alert to realise that the Buckle connection was paramount. She draws attention to it as one ‘of the most important features of Henry Reed’s life’. Twenty five years old, Reed became Buckle’s agent in Launceston. Reed had obtained the prize

136 Marriage Certificate, Box 502/7, M57591, SLV; John Batman who was the first man to settle Port Phillip typified Reed’s former louche connections before he experienced conversion.
137 Independent, 18 May 1831.
138 Independent, 25 May 1831.
140 Margaret Reed, Henry Reed, An Eventful Life Devoted to God and Man (London, 1906), p. 41.
141 Buckles & Co. (formerly Buckle, Bagster and Buckle), Robert Brooks and John Gore & Co. were the trio of London merchants looking for agents in Launceston as its fortunes rose. As Broeze comments, they needed entrepreneurial control over long distances in the time of sail, a resident agent who was a close relative or reliable
of a firm connection with a London company. His extraordinary energy
and business connections placed him in a powerful position in
Launceston. An inkling of his developing Christianity had appeared on the
Bombay trip to London in 1831. When the ship was rounding Cape Horn,
it encountered a raging storm. Fearful of drowning, he had a religious
revelation that enabled him to see God’s hand in his life. He said that he
realised that there was a God. This was passing, however, and he reverted
to old habits.142

Another figure in Launceston at the time who was to become a
Wesleyan Methodist was Theodore Bryant Bartley. An Anglican, Bartley left
England in 1819 at the age of sixteen. He was an orphan and had joined
the navy as a member of the crew of the transport ship Bencoola. Well
educated, he was recommended in New South Wales as a tutor to
Governor Lachlan Macquarie’s only son. After a visit with Macquarie to
Van Diemen’s Land, Bartley decided to stay as a free settler. He was
granted 500 acres near Launceston.143 By 1830, he had received Lieutenant
Governor Arthur’s patronage and was appointed Controller of Customs at
the Port of Launceston. Captain Patrick Dalrymple was another early
resident of Launceston who eventually embraced Wesleyan Methodism.
He had come from New South Wales in 1825 where he had been a
commissariat clerk and he was employed as a commissariat clerk in
Launceston from 1826 to 1828 and appeared to have a grant of land of
500 acres in the Macquarie River.144

None of the preceding four men appear to have had any previous
connection to Wesleyan Methodism, so it was as converts to the
missionary thrust that they were to embrace the denomination. They were
all to add to the public profile of the Wesleyan Methodism Society,
something which Robertson refers to in his work on Nova Scotia.145 He
talks about the Wesleyan businessmen who through their community

142 Reed, An Eventful Life, pp. 14-17.
143 Yvonne A. Phillips, Bartley of Kerry Lodge, A Portrait of a Pioneer in Van Diemen’s
Land (Blackwall Tasmania, 1987), pp. 16-20.
144 Assignment of Deeds, Registry Index, Hobart.
145 Allen B. Robertson, John Wesley’s Nova Scotia Business Men: Halifax Methodist
participation raised the profile of the denomination’s laity. In Launceston’s case there was an added fillip because these men were to be part of Launceston’s development and Wesleyan Methodism developed in tandem with many of the institutions.

From correspondence between Osmond Gilles and John Leake, it can be seen that Henry Reed was in close networking contact with Osmond when he was in London on his first 1831 trip. Osmond appeared to value Henry Reed’s opinion.\textsuperscript{146} One of the letters from Osmond introduced Thomas Henty to John Leake, when Henty arrived in Launceston. Osmond commented that Henty had a name celebrated in the colonies and that his choice ewes would rival Leake’s Saxons.\textsuperscript{147} On Reed’s return to Launceston in the\textit{ Sovereign} on 31 March 1832,\textsuperscript{148} Reed bore letters and parcels from Osmond Gilles to John Leake.\textsuperscript{149} He was accompanied by his wife Maria and young brother in-law William Dawson Grubb.

By 1832, a local Wesleyan Methodist preacher Francis French had begun preaching in the open air at the foot of Windmill Hill, and following that there was activity in Franklin Village where John Leach was a catechist to the road parties near the village.\textsuperscript{150} He also held a class meeting in Launceston at a Mrs Roger’s home. She had been a Wesleyan Methodist member under Esh Lovell.\textsuperscript{151} It was probably Mrs Rogers’ home that James Backhouse, the Quaker missionary, described in his diary in early 1833: ‘In the evening we met a little company in a very humble cottage. They were persons professing Wesleyanism, who at the time had no congregation in Launceston’:\textsuperscript{152}

In every way, Launceston was still a frontier town lacking certain amenities. The complaint in\textit{ The Independent} was that they lacked ‘roads,
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bridges, street lamps, water moorings, buoys, beacons, lights, telegraphs and pilots as well as a regular mail and various public buildings proportionate to taxes’. This developing frontier town proved receptive to the second Wesleyan Methodist mission. This time there was a group of respectable merchant/professional men who, although not Wesleyans, were ready for some vehicle in which to express their maturing evangelism. It was virgin territory for a Wesleyan Society dropped by the Conference and WMMC for lack of funds. Treated with indifference by the WMMC, who had large global responsibilities, Launceston merited very little interest in the scheme of things. Any new attempt at restarting the mission had to understand that financial responsibility had to be transferred from ministerial shoulders to the laity. Philip Oakden was to effect the rescue package for the Wesleyan Methodists. He was the merchant missionary, who reignited the flame of revival and piety, drawing other respectable merchant adventurers into his orbit. Financial demands, the great bugbear of the Conference and WMMC, were to be swept away.

As noted in the introduction, David Hempton, in his work Religion of the People, called for more local studies on Wesleyan Methodism in various parts of the world, ‘and what it was in the local conditions that enabled Wesleyan Methodism to make gains’. Allen B. Robertson in his work does just that, revealing the layers of the Wesleyan Methodist community. Though his work is largely about a second generation of Wesleyan Methodist merchants ready for political involvement, there is enough discussion about the qualities brought to that frontier society and enough similarity in his work for it to be brought into this thesis occasionally in a comparative sense. It is reminiscent of the first failed Launceston mission when Robertson observes that ‘a high turnover in ministerial absences could temper Wesleyan expansion. It curtailed the consolidation of or the pressing ahead of conversion gains’. He sees the merchants’ assertiveness and business experience being translated into

155 Robertson, John Wesley’s Nova Scotia Business Men, p. 67.
Wesleyan Methodism and, because of ‘their familiarity with the workings of the non Methodist world’, they had an extra skill added to their mission.  

**Coming of Philip Oakden**

Philip Oakden, business partner and brother in law to Osmond Gilles, was born in 1782 at Bentley Hall, Longford in Derbyshire. His partnership with Osmond dated from 1816 when he went to Hamburg as a commission agent. Previously, he had experienced bankruptcy which he explained as follows:

> In a partnership I was in, I was obliged after some struggle to compound with our creditors which we did by assignment all debts over £100, the remainder of the estate paid 15/-. I was still owing a considerable sum, individually borrowed, which I paid some years hence and in my last trip to England, I paid the creditors my share of the balance with interest.

The bankruptcy had some publicity and was known as ‘The Messenberg Affair’. By 1827, Oakden had returned to England and paid his creditors with interest and had been presented with a silver bowl signifying the occasion. Its inscription is as follows:

> Presented to Philip Oakden by gentlemen once his creditors in testimony of the sense they entertain of his high honour and moral rectitude evinced in paying full with interest after a lapse of 15 years his partnership proportion of debts from which he has been honourably as well as legally discharged in 1827.

The *Times* newspaper had an article about Philip’s payment in 1828 and the article was headed ‘Praiseworthy Conduct’. The article expressed amazement that in a sometimes dishonest, mercantile world, there was a merchant deserving of great praise. Three of the creditors are mentioned, James Lownds, Alex Clugston and John Mair, who expressed the opinion ‘that instances of honourable conduct such as you have shown are not frequent in the mercantile world’. There is no evidence to show when
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Oakden became a Wesleyan Methodist. Hamburg was a town committed to Lutheran Orthodoxy and the English community were intent on preserving their rights to their Anglican Church. His sister Betsy (Elizabeth) Sherwin and her husband Thomas, as well as Catherine, another Oakden sister, show strong signs of Wesleyan Methodism in their correspondence of 1833 with Philip, so Philip’s conversion may well have taken place in Derbyshire.

I consider that Oakden’s conversion dated from just before 1827. The key to this is the payment of the money to his creditors. It was a public statement of his credibility as a merchant, but it was also what was required of a committed Wesleyan Methodist. In the Rules of the Society of the People Called Methodists, commercial failure was regarded as scandalous, and was immediately investigated and reported upon. The defining statement in the Rules is ‘If any of our members who have formerly failed in business shall afterwards by the blessing of God have acquired property, it is their plain duty to pay their whole debt’. In effect, this is what Oakden did. He paid his creditors in a public gesture, thus absolving himself of any judgements of the Wesleyan Methodist Society.

When Oakden left Hamburg he amicably dissolved his partnership with Osmond Gilles, who commented ‘a more strictly honourable man has never been – Thank God for him’. Oakden returned to Liverpool and formed another partnership, styling it as McGregor Oakden. By the middle of 1833, Oakden had made the decision to sail for Van Diemen's
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Land. Through connections, he had been given a sum of money to invest by wealthy Manchester merchant Robert Gardner of the firm Gardner and Atkinson. Gardner was a confirmed Evangelical and his firm were cotton spinners and gingham manufacturers. He was also a founder of the great Manchester firm of Tootal, Broadhurst and Lee. There is a copy of the agreement formed between Oakden and Gardner on 8 June 1833:

We, the undersigned, believing a profitable speculation may be made in the purchase of wool or other produce of Australasia agree as follows viz: Robert Gardner agrees to advance eighteen thousand to twenty thousand pounds, say fifteen thousand pounds Sterling, in a letter of credit with Smith, Payne and Smith, Bankers, London and the remainder say three thousand to five thousand pounds in the payment of various goods to be shipped on the joint account, with which said goods and the letter of credit, Philip Oakden agrees forthwith to go to Van Diemen's Land or any other part of Australasia for the purpose of selling the goods and investing the proceeds as well as the amount of the said letter of credit in any produce he may believe will be for the mutual advantage of the parties undersigned, which produce shall be consigned to the said Robert Gardner of Manchester to be disposed of as soon as he may think it for the mutual advantage of the parties to do so.

Out of the said proceeds, he, the said Robert Gardner shall pay himself the capital advance in the letter of credit and goods purchased and shipped to Van Diemen's Land if the said goods should realise so much. Any lesser profit that may accrue or be sustained to be equally apportioned. 165

There are further clauses to the agreement regarding goods purchased, as well as Gardner receiving 2½% interest on his capital before any profits were divided. The original intention was for Oakden to use the funds to buy wool, but if that was unprofitable the money was to be invested as he saw fit. The trust that Gardner displayed in Oakden reflected the trust shown by the business community to Wesleyan Methodist businessmen; their integrity, honesty and sense of responsibility were all factors in making them a good business risk. Additionally, they shared aspirations and religious values that bonded Wesleyan Methodists closely with Anglican Evangelicals.

Osmond Gilles saw Oakden off in the Forth at Gravesend as well as William Fletcher. Fletcher was another Hamburg merchant set to invest his

---

165 Manchester Archives & Local Studies, Manchester Library and Information Services, M72/25/7 Central Library.
own money in Van Diemen's Land. Gilles was again in a type of financial investment situation with Philip Oakden. Oakden had Saxon sheep on board with him and his £5,000 in goods consisted of porter hogsheads, ale, rum, brandy, port, wine, sherry, hats, marine soap, barrels of pigs tongues, hams, hosiery, wearing apparel, champagne, sheeting, mustard and oatmeal. Spiritual advice flowed from Philip’s family on his embarkation, with his sister Catherine writing that ‘I have heard that there is no one on board with whom you could converse freely on spiritual things. I pray that you may be strengthened to acknowledge Jesus before them all’. It is easy to sense the missionary aspect of Philip’s voyage with the knowledge that he conducted divine service on board with other senior passengers and gave out hymns, sermons and readings. However, the steerage passengers were Scottish, and unfamiliar with the Episcopal form of service. They were destined for Circular Head and indentured labour with the Van Diemen's Land Company. They were not interested in Philip’s rendering of Wesley’s sermon Matthew Chapter 16 verse 26 ‘What a man profits if he shall gain the whole world’. This spiritual activity was backed up by small gatherings in his cabin ‘where some of the gentlemen read alternately from sermons and The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine’. Oakden would have had the copies from 1830 to early 1833 of The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine with him and they were being read in the cabin. It is relevant briefly to examine these magazines to understand what were the important messages of the day in the Wesleyan Methodist world.

The 1830 Wesleyan Methodist Magazine gave a clear picture of the Rev. Schofield’s endeavour in Macquarie Harbour, showing that he had opened an evening school for fifty seven men who had wanted to learn to
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168 Letter C. Oakden to P. Oakden, Bentley, Derbyshire 12 Oct. 1833, letter held in private hands.
read. A lengthy sermon on Christian Responsibility was also printed in the year 1830. It was a sermon about honesty in the sight of God and also man. The article stated that

Cases will often happen with men in business, where owing to unforeseen circumstances, there will be an appearance of overreaching or hard dealing though every thing is perfectly honest. In such cases, sacrifice of property should be cheaply made rather than bring reproach to the Christian name. This was one of the hard checks and balances which were part of every day life for a Wesleyan business man. The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine gave global insight into other world missions ranging from South Africa to Mauritius to Tonga and New Zealand. In the September 1830 edition there was also an eight page letter about Temperance and Temperance Societies from a Belfast correspondent. This letter was an early sign of the Temperance movement and encouraged Methodist support, saying that ‘Methodists had already discouraged the buying and selling of spirituous liquors unless in cases of extreme necessity’. One sees a possible source of future conflict for a Wesleyan Methodist such as Philip Oakden, who had rum and brandy as part of his £5,000 worth of goods on board the Forth. In 1832, an eight page article by Benjamin Carvosso detailed the history of the mission in Van Diemen's Land and referred to the ‘unsettled nature of the place, naturally attended on new colonies and the feverish state of business which keeps the mind continually on the rack. Where there are large interests of state with small capital and little confidence, the effect is paralysing to the moral and religious character’. This was a remarkably shrewd assessment of Van Diemen’s Land society by Carvosso and Oakden would have absorbed it all.

A feeling for the beginnings of the Launceston Mission is imparted through a printed letter of Nathaniel Turner dated 4 April 1832 in The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine. He describes how he and the Rev. J.A. Manton rode up to Launceston and preached three times on the Sabbath Day in the Court House. The 1833 Wesleyan Methodist Magazine contains another letter from him, dated 31 October 1832, bemoaning that ‘Our expectations relative to the new ground we have been attempting to break, up country, have not been realised’. This would have been virtually the last issue Oakden carried on the Forth with him. The magazines put him in touch with semi-current events in Van Diemen’s Land and also the current behavioural expectations of the Wesleyan Conference, such as handing out tracts to penal communities in Van Diemen’s Land. It also conveyed a sense of urgency and need to Oakden about missionary requirements in Launceston.

It was the true missionary sense which Oakden demonstrated when the Forth reached Circular Head on 24 October 1833. The ship was there for eighteen days and Oakden visited prisoners in their various stations at Circular Head, handing out tracts and conducting divine service. As Philip wrote, ‘the prisoners sang well and appeared attentive and a promise was made that the prisoners would be assembled every Sabbath day in the future’. This was an early example of the delusional attitude that the Wesleyan Methodists adopted towards mustered convicts in road gangs, settlements and on settlers’ properties. The oft repeated phrase ‘they listened attentively’ showed no understanding that the convicts had no other choice. These were to be the instant congregations that muddied the waters in the Wesleyan Methodist perception of their own success, and Oakden had fallen a victim to this. On his departure, Philip left a copy of the Wesleyan Hymn Book and a copy of The Daily Help by the Rev. E. White. He had come prepared with tracts and books to meet a missionary/penal society and field of endeavour.

He also had the opportunity to meet with Adolphus Schayer, a Silesian German and a friend of Osmond Gilles. Schayer was experienced

175 Oakden, Journal of Voyage, 24 October 1833.
in sheep management and looked after the Van Diemen's Land Company merinos until 1842. Oakden came to Launceston as a man of substance, albeit that £20,000 of the substance belonged to somebody else. It gave him the immediate cachet of wealthy merchant and assured him of a certain entreée into Launceston society. A new field of social prominence was open to him in Launceston. He was already assured of the help of his supportive Hamburg group, John Leake who was the accountant of the Derwent Bank in Hobart and Lewis Gilles who had vacated his farm, in favour of being cashier of the Launceston Branch Bank, of the Van Diemen's Land Bank since 1832. John Dunn, Hobart Wesleyan and manager of the Commercial Bank, aided Oakden in the disposal of his private bills. The private bills he had brought with him needed some form of private endorsement to show that the purchaser was dealing with a man of substance and backing. Benjamin Horne, ex Hamburg merchant and fellow Wesleyan Methodist, obliged by taking a bill for £500. The bills were the reservoir of credit extended to him by Robert Gardner. At this time in Van Diemen's Land, there were difficulties with them as there had been a change in the money market. Treasury Bills were now at a premium of from 3.7% and private bills were unsaleable. Hartwell sees 1832 ‘as having the difficulty of getting treasury bills, specie and bank discounts, with the years of 1833, 1834 relatively better’.  

The barter system, prevalent at the time of Oakden’s arrival, negated the taking of bills. The sale of goods he had brought with him gave him a financial basis to pay for the wool he was sourcing. Initially, he rode hundreds of miles over Van Diemen's Land working hard to source wool and make contacts with wool growers. He obtained wool from such Wesleyan Methodist supporters as Joseph Johnson of Green Ponds and Thomas Parramore of Ross. On one of these rides he fell in with the Rev. Nathaniel Turner, who was returning to Launceston for his second visit. Turner was a native of Cheshire, born 1793. At fifteen, he had gone to work with his uncle who had found religion with the Wesleyan

---

176 Letter Book Philip Oakden, 15 Jan. 1834, NS473, NS1290, AOT.
177 A bill can be roughly equated to a modern traveller's cheque with variable dating; discounts were the equivalent to modern bank charges.
Methodists. By the time he was nineteen in 1812, he was convinced that ‘God was willing to save mankind’. Chapter 2 of this thesis describes Nathaniel Turner’s arrival in Hobart in June 1822, and the time thereafter spent in New Zealand and the Tongan Mission. Ten years after 1822, he was reappointed to the Hobart Mission.

Turner’s evangelistic rides to Launceston in 1833 and early 1834 sought to investigate the state of the frail mission, but there were social considerations also. Isaac Sherwin was the cousin of his wife Anne Turner. She had been a native of the Potteries district at Etruria in Staffordshire. The rides across the island from Hobart were almost 242 miles. The riders stopped at Joseph Johnson’s at Green Ponds and Captain Horton’s at Ross for respite and what the Rev. J.G. Turner terms ‘small but interested congregations’. In truth these were assigned servants. The Rev. N. Turner later recalled when he and Manton ‘arrived in Launceston some time ago, we did not know a single individual except a slight acquaintance with Mr. Sherwin; until we became acquainted with Mr. Henry Dowling who assisted us to provide a place where we could conduct a service in the Court House’. One needs to be aware of the sometimes inflated claims of some of the Tasmanian Methodist histories, writers such as the Rev. C.C. Dugan, the Rev. G.T. Hayward, the Rev. J.J. Turner and M. Tyson. With regard to Isaac Sherwin and his wife, claims were made that it was the influence of Nathaniel Turner which converted them to Wesleyan Methodism and started them in the path of giving their lives to the church. This is not accurate and R.D. Pretyman is the only Methodist writer not to make that mistake. Sherwin was always a Wesleyan Methodist, as is attested by the correspondence and records previously

179 Nathaniel Turner’s son retold incidents of a persecuting mob who disturbed his father’s early attempts at preaching in rural England. In these cases, the mobs were incited by local clergy to ring bells, play drums and fife and generally break up meetings of the Wesleyan Methodists. In one case at Ashby, the mob aided by the local clergyman clasped hands around the church building and cried out ‘the Methodists shall never take the church’. The stone throwing mob of Hobart Town appeared to have a fear of more general disorder rather than the specific one of the Anglican Church being threatened. Rev. J.G. Turner (his son), The Pioneer Missionary: Life of Nathaniel Turner (Melbourne, 1872), pp. 3, 7.

180 Ibid, p. 142.

181 Launceston Examiner, 18 December 1847, p. 811.

noted. At that time, Sherwin was very open to other ministers of religion hoping to make foundations in Launceston.185

At this period, Henry Reed was strongly consolidating himself and had purchased the ship *Socrates* in April 1832. Thomas Umphelby asserted that he worked for Reed as a boy of thirteen at this time and also at the end of 1830 or beginning of 1831 when Reed had a whaling station at Portland in conjunction with William Dutton. Reed also had whaling parties at Kangaroo Island and Spencer’s Gulf. He sent men to Westernport to chop wattle bark and then sent it to London in the *Burrell*. Captain Jones used Reed’s schooner *Henry* to take stores to the whaling depots and bring back the oil to The Black Store near the wharf at Launceston.184 In February 1833, Reed purchased the Whaler *Norval*185 and he and his wife Maria Susannah and his brother in law Master William Dawson Grubb left in the *Norval* on 3 April 1833; it was a month later, that Captain Jones skippering *Henry* made an important landmark survey of St. Vincents Gulf.186 Reed spent a year away and arrived back in November 1834 on the *William*.

Concurrently in this period, other main figures of Wesleyan Methodism were arriving in Launceston. Lieutenant George Palmer Ball had arrived on the *Platina* from India and Lieutenant Matthew Curling Friend R.N. had first arrived skippering the *Wanstead* in 1830. He had returned home to England and reappeared on the *Norval* in July 1832. He obtained the post of Pilot Officer in George Town in July 1833. Builder, John Drysdale had arrived in the *Norval* in 1835 and took up a post as foreman in Mr. R. De Little’s building, architecture business in Clarence Street. Lastly and probably most importantly, Henry Jennings, the son of a

---

185 Patricia Ratcliff cites Isaac Sherwin as a confidant of the Quakers James Backhouse and George Washington Walker, and it was Sherwin who housed Charles Price, the Independent minister, when he came to Launceston on 24 September 1832. Patricia Fitzgerald Ratcliff, *The Usefulness of John West: Dissent and Difference in the Australian Colonies* (Launceston, 2003), pp. 34, 40.

184 Letter Thos. Umphelby c/- Chas. N. Umphelby 60 Collins Street Melbourne to Henry Reed, 25 Sep. 1877, Hudson Fysh Papers, LMS 0049, Box 1 / 2/ 0049/2/-, State Library of Tasmania, Launceston Branch.

185 *Launceston Advertiser*, 7 Feb. 1833.

Congregational minister had initially arrived in Hobart in 1824 on the *Heroine* with his brother Joseph Gellibrand Jennings. He left the colony in 1826 and returned to England, but by 1827 he had returned to Hobart, and was admitted as a barrister and solicitor in Hobart. In June 1830, he married socially prominent Alicia Legge, whose sisters had made highly acceptable marriages into the Dumaresq and Pitcairn families. He then moved to Launceston in 1833. At the beginning of November 1834, the Rev. John Manton was officially appointed to Launceston. Oakden had been there for ten months and this was sufficient time for him to regenerate the mission and pull some of the respectability of the town into his orbit. Henry Reed arrived back at the same time and John Gleadow gave a dinner in his honour inviting a large number of his friends. There are two accounts of this period which signalled the beginning of the revival and which have the air of veracity about them.

The Rev. C. Irving Benson detailed in *The Spectator and Methodist Chronicle* how Henry Reed sat next to Oakden at the dinner and asked him to come to his home after the dinner. (It would stand to reason that Reed had known of Oakden through the mutual friend Osmond Gilles.) Philip declined, explaining that he was going to attend a Wesleyan class meeting. Reed insisted on accompanying him and as Benson explained, ‘He sat down in the company of eighteen or twenty plain looking men and women and one by one they told of their struggles to be good and how they had surrendered to God and accepted Christ’. This was the beginning of Henry Reed’s conversion and he told the group, ‘Friends, this wonderful thing you have is the thing I need’.

The other account of this time is from the notebook of the Rev. J.A. Manton. Born in August 1807 in Biggleswade, Bedfordshire, John Manton

187 Notice in *Colonial Times*, 7 September 1827, ‘Henry Jennings has been admitted to practice in the Supreme Court as a Barrister, Solicitor, Attorney and Procter’.
188 Henry Jennings himself was a cousin of Joseph Tice Gellibrand, the first Attorney General of Van Diemen’s Land. The Jennings family and the Gellibrand family were closely bonded and, as Philip Brown comments in *Clyde Company Papers*, ‘The members of this family group were believing Christians brought up in the tradition of religious practice’; Philip Brown (ed.), *Clyde Company Papers*, Vol. II, 1836-40 (London, 1952), p. 427.
190 Ibid, p. 801.
was the youngest child of Thomas Manton, who translated and compiled *The Manton Bible*; the family was strongly Wesleyan. In 1831, he arrived in Van Diemen's Land, stayed briefly in New South Wales and was appointed in 1832 to Macquarie Harbour and later Point Puer, the boys’ prison at Port Arthur.\(^{191}\) When he had been at Launceston seven months, he recorded these telling words in his notebook:

> At our quarterly meeting which was held a few days since, it was found that we had an increase of twenty two members during the quarter, this is a matter of joy. Some of the respectable and influential members of the community are casting their lot with us. Oh that they may be faithful...We have lately seen such things as we could not have expected in such a short a time.\(^{192}\)

He goes on ‘but why should I wonder, The Lord is always able to work for his own glory’.\(^{193}\) This statement is fairly typical of missionary behaviour. J.H. Owens highlights in his New Zealand article that the belief that God was present in all things, all events was a strong aspect of Wesley’s teaching and influenced missionary behaviour.\(^{194}\) Manton was speaking as he was trained to speak and think as a missionary. Indeed, it was quite possible that it was the hand of God, but it was also the hand of Philip Oakden, the merchant missionary, who had restarted the Wesleyan Revival. Wesleyan successes tend to be attributed to ministers and God. There was a realisation that the wealthy laity was necessary, but there was a cut off point in fully acknowledging their contribution to revival.

The ingredients were present in Launceston 1834-35 for a Wesleyan Methodist revival and second successful mission. The economy was strong, with imperial connections, the wool trade was burgeoning, due in part to Osmond Gilles and the Hamburg group, and there was a group of merchant adventurers in Launceston ready to embrace greater spiritual commitment. The town of Launceston was still in a developmental stage and Wesleyan Methodism had arrived early in its development, making it easy for both to run in tandem together. The WMMC were prepared to commit another minister to the mission and the energy and dynamism of

\(^{191}\) Copies of Diaries and Letters of the Rev. J.A. Manton, NS1258/1/1, AOT.
\(^{192}\) Journal, The Rev. J.A. Manton, NS 1234/1/1, AOT, 8 July 1835.
\(^{193}\) Ibid.
Philip Oakden, the merchant missionary prepared to consecrate his wealth, helped light the fires of revival. Revival is discussed at greater length in the following chapter.
Chapter 4

Composition, Consolidation, Consecration of Wealth, Independence and Outreach

Introduction

This chapter will commence with an examination of the social composition of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. Through a small demographic sampling it will be shown, over a ten year period, that the Society had fifty six per cent of its members with a convict background. Given this fact, it will be further illustrated that the wealthy elite, who were a small percentage of the Society’s membership, showed the true spirit of egalitarianism in their dealings with fellow members, albeit with some small difficulties. Up to date, Tasmanian Methodist histories have not contained any demographic studies, particularly not of their social composition. The concept of Providence will be discussed as pertinent to the time frame and to the Evangelicals of the period, in particular to the Wesleyan Methodists who were Evangelicals par excellence. This is deemed necessary in order to understand much of the ministerial correspondence with its appeals to Providence.

To understand the fabric of a completely new Society such as the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, the building blocks and strategies of the system will be examined. This is also being laid out to alert the reader to the fact that the liturgy of the new Society was to be based on the institutions which had been formed in the tight partnership of minister and laity. These were such systems as class meetings, band meetings, love feasts, Sunday Schools, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society and watch nights. A description of these foundations will lead through to a discussion of revival and enthusiasm, both of which were strong elements in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. The practice of preaching in the large country establishments of wealthy settlers will be viewed in the light of British itinerancy and a new sense of community in Van Diemen’s Land.
The consecration of wealth by the wealthy elite in the Society will be shown to centre around donations of land for chapels and money towards their building. An example will also be given to show how the concept of the consecration of wealth permeated the artisan class in Launceston. There will be a short discussion on the self-help ethos present in all Launceston denominations.

As Chairman of the Van Diemen’s Land District, whilst the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were establishing themselves, the Rev. Joseph Orton will be discussed in some detail. It will be shown how his difficult character provoked two incidents where the Launceston wealthy elite showed their independence and power. The Crookes case will be discussed in order to show how the wealthy elite side-tracked Orton and drew into their orbit a man who was later to become a powerful figure in Launceston Wesleyan Methodism. The second incident of the Liturgy Struggle, again provoked by Orton, is an excellent example of an infant Society forging its own path and rejecting and shedding some of the trappings of the Anglican liturgy. This will be seen as an inevitable shift in colonial Wesleyan Methodism which issued out of the global missionary experience. It will also reveal the power of the wealthy core elite, who were prepared to challenge ministerial direction and at the same time were completely confident of their position to set the agenda.

The concept of speculation will be shown to be anathema to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists divorcing them from an active participation in the Port Phillip Association and the initial commercial settlement of Port Phillip. Lieutenant Governor Arthur’s continuing patronage of the Wesleyan Methodists will be a thread through the chapter, from the initial support for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Chapel to a bonding with the group concerning the mission to the Aborigines of Port Phillip. Additionally, it will be demonstrated how the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists took their consecration of wealth in a continuity from land donations and financial help for chapels to support for an Aboriginal mission to Port Phillip. This last was, in effect, the crowning peak of the consecration of wealth and possibly could be regarded as support for missionary work among the ‘heathen’.
The Wealthy Spiritual Elite

In the years 1834-37, a spiritual elite of the Wesleyan Methodists was being formed in Launceston, similar to what Patricia Ratcliff refers to in her work as ‘a spiritual aristocracy evolving in Hobart’.¹ The Wesleyan Methodist elite stood on equal terms with the Rev. Dr. W. Browne of the Anglican Church, Charles Price of the Independent Church, Henry Dowling, the Baptist Minister, as well as the Presbyterians. There was also the added cachet for the Wesleyan Methodists of being a successful commercial elite. Self help became a feature of the town, and spiritual leaders were prominent in fostering the concept.

The core group was to include Philip Oakden, Isaac Sherwin, Henry Jennings, Henry Reed, John Ward Gleadow, George Palmer Ball, John Crookes, Major William Gray, Theodore Bryant Bartley, Matthew Curling Friend and Captain Patrick Dalrymple. These men entered the Society at varying dates within the period. Thomas Parramore, Benjamin Horne and Captain Samuel Horton were settled in the Ross area and formed a close link in the chain. John Ward Gleadow’s conversion to Wesleyan Methodism was remembered by Miss Catherine Dean, a staunch Wesleyan Methodist.² She related that ‘Mr. Reed and Mr. Gleadow were, I have been told, great friends when they were of the world. After Mr. Reed’s change, he did not forget his old friend but was, I heard, the means in God’s hand of bringing him to salvation’.

David Hempton’s discusses Wesleyan Methodism as an international global movement, which produced different shifts of interpretation in different places. In Methodism: Empire of the Spirit, he alludes to the fact that Methodism had the capacity to move and expand into new social

¹ Patricia Fitzgerald Ratcliff, The Usefulness of John West: Dissent and Difference in the Australian Colonies (Launceston, 2003). p. 21.
² Miss Catherine Dean had come to Launceston in 1832 with Mrs. Thomas Henty to help her with the children. She was also in the households of Henry Jennings and Theodore Bryant Bartley. She was converted to Wesleyan Methodism in 1834. In 1904, she received the March quarterly ticket having an unbroken record of class meetings for seventy years. She was the sister of William Boswell Dean, baker of St. John Street Launceston. Launceston Examiner Supplement, 2 December 1986, Launceston Branch, State Library of Tasmania Biography File, also Methodist History of Victoria and Tasmania, reprinted from Spectator Special Issues, Nos. 1-36 (Melbourne, 1898-1902). (Hereafter referred to as Spectator.)
He stresses that the mobility of the Methodists facilitated this easy movement into social spaces. This was entirely the case in Launceston, and this thesis contends that there was a social and spiritual space that had not been completely occupied in Launceston. Hempton further argues that ‘Methodism grew vigorously in those parts of the English speaking world where it abandoned its dependency on Anglicanism and became the instrument and beneficiary of the more populist and egalitarian branches of Christianity’. He further develops this view with the idea that in the new frontiers, Methodism substituted egalitarianism for deference. Two literature reviews by Jennifer Snead and E. Brooks Holifield make a feature of Hempton’s stress on Methodism’s gains in the disadvantaged area. This is yet another ratification from Hempton that is applicable for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. The disadvantaged penal convict element in Launceston found tangible advantages and improvement through Wesleyan Methodist conversion.

**Social Composition and Egalitarianism**

It is important for this thesis to explore the social configuration and egalitarianism of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. In 1834, Philip Oakden had entered a Society of almost forty people of which there were two gentlemen, himself and Isaac Sherwin. Nine were women, seven of whom were wives of existing members. Of the remaining thirty one, eighteen appeared to have been of convict origin. Already in the group of thirty remaining men there were two blacksmiths, one servant, one iron

---


4 Hempton, *Empire*, p. 22.


8 Launceston Members’ Roll, 1834, contained in Schedule of Hobart Town Circuit, NS 499/215, AOT; also AOT, Index of Tasmanian Convicts.
founder, two cabinet makers, one carpenter and one labourer. This type of Society was a new one in imperial experience. A Society already half convict in origin presented a considerable challenge to the desired Wesleyan Methodist egalitarian spirit of the elite Wesleyan Methodists in Launceston. It was necessary for them to fit into the existing environment and social conditions of a penal colony if they were to be successful and true to their commitments. The Society had to continue to be welcoming to emancipists who needed opportunities and who were longing for some form of respectability, social inclusion and acceptance.

This was to be the shape of the Launceston Society. The Hobart Society had lost opportunities early in its history, when the Rev. William Horton had failed to comprehend its penal nature and diminished ex convict Benjamin Nokes and his sterling efforts. In his push for respectability, Horton had neglected the egalitarian requirements of Wesleyan Methodism. He had failed in what Hempton refers to as ‘that requirement of Methodist zeal, an ability to form partnerships with local people and not lord it over them’.\(^9\) In Launceston, the 1834 member’s roll was composed of half convict origin and half free. It then had an injection of a group of men of substance and standing, which raises the question was the mix of the Society altered, was an egalitarian spirit maintained and what were the contributions of the men of substance?

It is contended that the men of substance prayed and co-existed alongside the ex-penal element, drawing them into their own respectability. In order to support this contention, the thesis will follow the work of Clive Field on the ‘Social Structure of English Methodism: eighteenth – twentieth centuries’.\(^{10}\) Field produces research to back up his argument regarding the change in Wesleyan Methodist social composition and it is a useful starting point for this thesis. Field provides a framework and classification system for assessing Wesleyan Methodist social composition. This framework is suitable with some changes for the Launceston situation. Field refers to the Registrar General’s 1851 Grading

system which is as follows. Classes of people are divided into these
groups.\textsuperscript{11}

1. Merchants, bankers, professional people and major employers,
2. Minor employers, teachers, clerks, local government officers, non
   manual workers,
3. Artisan crafts, skilled manual tasks,
4. Semi skilled employees in transport, agriculture, mining, wood,
   textile services,
5. Labourers and unskilled persons.

For the purposes of the Launceston study it is proposed to retain the
classifications 1, 2, 3 and 5 and eliminate classification 4. The category
farmers has been added under number 2 classification.\textsuperscript{12} As Field says, ‘In
Wesleyan Methodism, occupational data can only be derived from four
types of material - membership books, baptismal entries, marriage
registers and special surveys’.\textsuperscript{13} In the Launceston case, unfortunately,
only the early membership rolls for 1833 and 1834 are extant and are
contained in the Hobart Circuit Records, and there are no further
membership rolls until 1890. Early baptismal data is more satisfactory,
commencing at December 1834, as also are marriage registers. Other
Wesleyan occupational data is gleaned from newspapers and biographical
details.\textsuperscript{14}

The limitations of being confined to baptismal and marriage data are
that there were many Wesleyan Methodists who did not marry and did not
have children. Moreover not every marriage partner (particularly male)
could be regarded as a Wesleyan Methodist.\textsuperscript{15} Women are not included in
this study as they are not linked with occupational data in the registers
and their names in the baptismal and marriage registers give no clue to
any maiden name convict origins. Additionally, some Wesleyan Methodists

\textsuperscript{12} Classification 4 has been eliminated as no Launceston Wesleyan Methodists fit into
   the category ‘transport, mining or wood textile services’ at this period. Agriculture
   would have covered farmers, and that has been added to No. 2 classification.
   Agriculture could also have covered labourers, but they have a classification of their
   own No.4; sawyers could fit into wood, textile services but they are under No.3
   classification.
\textsuperscript{13} Field, ‘Social Structure’, p. 199.
\textsuperscript{14} Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Baptismal Register, December 1834 – 1867, NS 499/
   975A, AOT; Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Marriage Register, October 1839 – 1869,
   NS 499/980, AOT.
\textsuperscript{15} Field, ‘Social Structure’, p. 200.
may have married in the Established Church for convention’s sake, such as Thomas Gange and Margaret Robinson at St. John’s Church Launceston.  

**Demographic Study**

A period of ten years from 1834 to 1843 has been selected in the Launceston Wesleyan Society and the extracted data has been placed under the four headings as below:

1. Major Employers, Merchants, Bankers, Professional Men
2. Intermediate Non Manual Workers, Teachers, Clerks, Minor Employers, Farmers
3. Artisans, Skilled Manual Workers
4. Labourers

The numbers above are by no means the full complement of Wesleyan Methodist members of the period. It is merely a sample. The largest group was the artisan and skilled manual group, and the second largest group was the intermediate non manual workers, teachers, clerks, farmer’s group. The artisan strength of Field’s study is maintained in Launceston and, at either end of the spectrum, the wealthy merchant group and the labouring group were comparatively small. The groups of members of the second, third and fourth were then broken down into their occupations, and each person was checked against the Index of Tasmanian Convicts in the Archives Office of Tasmania; none of Group 1 had a convict background.

**Group 1**

This was composed of two attorneys, seven pastoralists, six merchants, one port officer and one physician.

---

16 Marriage 2 March 1836 by the Rev. W. Browne, ref. No. 367/1836. Gange was a Swing Rioter transported to Van Diemen’s Land, and Margaret Gange worked in the household of Henry Jennings and they both later migrated to Port Phillip; both were Wesleyan Methodists.
### Group 2

**Intermediate Non Manual Workers, Teachers, Clerks, Farmers, Minor Employers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Convict Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Proprietor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Surveyor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Foreman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairyman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Draper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Messenger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Keeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Mariner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaoler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 3

**Artisans, Skilled Manual Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Convict Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Founder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Maker/Joiner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Painter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Man / Brazier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Convict Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunsmith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonemason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayer builder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastrycook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 4**

**Labourers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Convict Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the identification of men of convict background, duplication of names within the convict lists detracts from a complete certainty of these figures, but, without more specific data in the Wesleyan Methodist records, it is not possible to check any further. The convict connections of groups 2, 3 and 4 were remarkably even, showing first that in Group 2 with 50 people, 28 people had convict background; of the artisan group of 71 people, 49 had convict background and of the labouring group of 27 people, 16 had convict background. Therefore out of a given sample over a ten year period of 165 members, nearly ninety three had a convict background. As previously explained, the sampling process has its limitations and cannot possibly encompass the whole group of people who were members of the Wesleyan Methodist Society in that period 1834-43, remembering also that women commonly often formed half of Wesleyan Methodist Society.

What this study does show is that from the 1834 Wesleyan Methodist members roll when Philip Oakden entered the Society and brought in the prominent wealthy elite, the egalitarian situation of 1834 was preserved and maintained. The mix continued to be the same with slightly more than half of the Society with a convict background. The ruling elite preserved the egalitarian spirit of Wesleyan Methodism and accepted the
penal factor, offering them respectability and salvation – the elite were in harmony with the social space in Launceston.

It is important to note in this context, that according to the census of 1842, there was a total population of 8171 in Launceston with 4931 listed as arrived or born free. Ex-convicts and bonded comprised 40% of the total population. This percentage is lower than the 56% convict background of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. In 1842, there were 598 persons claiming to be Wesleyan Methodists in Launceston, that is 7.3% of the population there. In Hobart, Wesleyans were 949 persons in a population of 15,061, that is 6.3%. The Wesleyan Methodist total in Van Diemen’s Land was 2,263, 4% of the population; essentially, this shows that Wesleyan Methodism was very strong in Launceston.

There was certainly ministerial surprise and admiration in the Rev. William Butters’ letter when he wrote after a visit to Launceston in 1840, ‘I saw kneeling at the same form a notorious convict, an eminent lawyer and a man of science, all in agony of penitence’. This was obviously a sufficiently unusual situation upon which to comment. In describing the Bathurst Mission and the Rev. Joseph Orton, Alex Tyrrell comments that one of the reasons the chapel was built was because of the unwillingness of the free settlers to be penned up in a room with people who had come to the colony at the Government’s expense. Similarly, the Rev. Joseph Orton could only see respectability in the Society in 1836 when he wrote to the WMMC that ‘The Society in Launceston is in many ways composed of very influential and respectable persons, but they are without a doubt,

---

17 Children are included in the total numbers of each denomination in the Census, but in the case of the religions they may not have been yet formally accepted.
19 Ibid. In Launceston in 1842 there were 5,224 persons in the Church of England, 793 persons in the Church of Scotland, 883 Roman Catholics and 613 persons other Protestant Dissenters.
simple humble pious Christians’. It appeared that those with convict heritage had merged happily into the respectable portion.

All this respectability had an inevitable downside for the wealthy elite group. Humility and acceptance were required of them. Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary provides an excellent insight into some struggles with the egalitarianism in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. At the commencement of 1836, Henry Jennings wrote ‘My chief objection is the very assembly and class. I do not like meetings in such intimate intercourse with those with whom I have no previous acquaintance’. Then again late in August 1836, in what was judged to be a type of revival, where prayer meetings were held every night for one week from 7 to 10 p.m. and members were taught to cry for pardon and found it, Henry Jennings wrote: ‘before this I should have considered such meetings as some statement of the animal nature. But to bring out the spirits, I was constrained to acknowledge that it was no other than the work of God’. It was difficult for Henry Jennings to cross the social divide and even more difficult for his wife Alicia. She was obliged to leave a Quarterly Meeting with her sister Sarah Pitcairn because she could not endure, as she said, ‘the sight of a man who was led and in a fit, under conviction of mind, started screaming terribly’. Ex-convict and Swing Rioter John Tongs had been exhorting at this particular meeting and as a contemporary John Glover Jnr. remarked ‘his sermons were rough and homely and possibly made a suitable impression on the less educated portion of the prisoner population’.

Methodist exhortation emphasised the intermediary of grace. It emphasised that now was the right time to respond and that the people addressed were the specific ones God was calling – hence the screaming and crying out. Tongs was an example of what Hempton calls

---

22 Rev. J. Orton to WMMC, 20 August 1836, District Letter Book 1826-, A1716-1-2, ML.
23 Henry Jennings Spiritual Diary, 3 January 1836, Jennings Family Papers, MS 9432, SLV.
24 Jennings Spiritual Diary 28 August 1836.
25 Jennings Spiritual Diary, 7 October 1838.
‘Methodism thriving on the raw edge of excitement’. Methodism could be a noisy movement and these excesses were hard for a gentleman such as Henry Jennings to absorb in the spirit of egalitarianism. This religious enthusiasm had been accepted in a limited fashion by John Wesley, who saw it as God working in the lives of humble people. According to Knox, ‘his pose was one of marble detachment from the passions of his age. He was determined not to be an enthusiast’. Knox paints a picture of Wesley as a somewhat clinical and dispassionate figure, observing ‘the phenomena of conversion’.

Jabez Bunting certainly discouraged enthusiasm as much as he was able, but there was more than an element of it in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. A contemporary diarist George Best gives a good insight into the subject. Best, a cabinet maker, had arrived in Hobart in October 1833 and ‘walked nearly all the way to Launceston’. His father, a solicitor, had been private secretary to the Countess of Huntingdon. According to his obituary, George Best had been trained in the tenets of George Whitefield, which he held tenaciously. On arrival in Launceston, he had a letter of introduction to Henry Dowling Snr., the Baptist minister, who was anxious to form a Baptist Church. Best’s letter book gives a good contemporary account of aspects of life in Launceston, and particularly Best’s own spiritual dilemmas regarding baptism, but as well, it gives his jaundiced overview of the Wesleyan Methodists. Best opined that:

The Wesleyan Methodists are most diligent in meeting together for prayer but their ways are as Mr. D. used to say all of the flesh. I heard a great noise one evening in a room. When on listening, I found they were converting someone and nearly all speaking at once and groaning. They had worked themselves up into a pitch of

28 Hempton, Empire, p. 41.
29 Ronald A. Knox, Enthusiasm: a Chapter in the History of Religion, with Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries, (Oxford, 1950); as cited in Hempton Empire, p. 34.
30 Knox, Enthusiasm, p. 452.
31 Letterbook of George Best, 1833-53, NS 252, AOT, 21 December 1833.
32 George Whitefield co-leader with Wesley in contributing to the Evangelical Revival in England had joined Selina, Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion which had Calvinist leanings and separated from Wesleyan Methodism.
33 Launceston Examiner, 21 August 1889.
enthusiasm crying out ‘Now Lord, Save us now’. It put me in mind of the worshippers of Baal who leapt up on the altar.34

From these contemporary accounts of Henry Jennings and George Best, it can be seen that enthusiasm was a strong force within the Launceston Society. It was something that was encouraged rather than repressed. It seemed to suit most adherents, and diffident members such as Henry Jennings were forced to see such outward displays as God working amongst the group. It is hard to reconcile this behaviour with Philip Oakden who was referred to in the Spectator Magazine as ‘calm, cultivated, enterprising, methodical and deeply pious’.35 Henry Reed’s personality certainly fitted the mould, as shown in Rachel Cowie’s letter to her daughter Georgiana.36 Rachel Cowie wrote in answer to Georgiana’s comment that Reed carried things to extremes: ‘I hardly understand how far you have gone in following Mr. Reed and I fain hope you do not intend to separate from the Church you have been brought up in. True piety is confined to no particular sect and do not think me wrong, if I caution you against extremes’.37

Hempton stresses that Wesley ‘generally tempered enthusiasm with discipline, and rugged individualism with communal accountability’.38 Excellent examples of this are seen in the Launceston Society in the following instances. Thomas Cox, one of the early 1833 members, was reproved at the Quarterly Meeting and urged ‘to send away an assigned servant not his own, who lodges in his hut. The Government regulations being that assigned servants shall sleep free beneath his master’s roof’.39 Likewise, another early member John Smith was urged ‘to remove his

34 Best, Letterbook, 1 January 1836.
36 Georgiana Cowie married Philip Oakden 28 October 1839. She had been in a governess, companion situation in the homes of Henry Reed and William Effingham Lawrence. She had been converted to Wesleyan Methodism at Henry Reed’s establishment, see Anne and Robin Bailey, An Early Tasmanian Story with the Oakdens, Cowies, Parramores, Tullochs and Hoggs (Melbourne, 2004), p. 169.
38 Hempton, Empire, p. 34.
39 Minute Book of Quarterly Meetings, Launceston, Meeting 4 February 1835, NS 499/928, AOT.
servant Thomas Dykes not actually engaged in his service’. These men were bonded and ex-convict, and, even though there was an egalitarian spirit in the Society, there was also a watchful discipline, particularly when it related to Government regulations and authority.

In regard to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist situation Arthur continued to put himself out considerably in their support. The Launceston Society had asked through the Rev. Nathaniel Turner and John Dunn for a loan of £600, bearing interest to secure the contract of £1,700 for building the chapel; £600 had already been donated by subscription. At the meeting of the Executive Council on 14 October 1835, the Chief Justice opposed a loan or gift and the Colonial Secretary thought it advisable to wait. Arthur pressed the point for aid to the Launceston Chapel because ‘the Wesleyans in particular have been found the most beneficial in the instructions of the convicts and the lower classes, many of whom, at least in their outward conduct, have reformed’. Arthur took the view that ‘the measures of encouragement had to be given to sects such as the Wesleyans because of the mixed character of the population and the importance of removing the convict taint’ and pointed out that ‘the Wesleyans have rendered the most essential service to morals, if not to religion’. Arthur did add a scribbled note to this petition admitting ‘that he could see errors in the Wesleyans which could be avoided. Some followers may have been drawn to a change of heart which is, in reality, nothing more than a strong feeling of excitement’. By July 1836, his request was granted as a reasonable claim. The Launceston chapel building was secured through wealthy donations and Arthur’s patronage.

Arthur had been recalled in January 1836 and, before he departed in October, the Wesleyan ministers and preachers in Van Diemen’s Land led by the Rev. Joseph Orton thanked him for ‘facilitating the operation of the
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40 Meeting at the House of Isaac Sherwin, 21 January 1835, Minute Book, NS 499/928, AOT.
41 Minutes of Executive Council, 14 October 1835, A1274, Despatches 1835, ML.
42 Minutes of Executive Council., 19 October 1835.
43 Despatch from Lieutenant Governor Arthur to Right Hon. Lord Glenelg, Van Diemen’s Land Government House, 26 January 1836, A1274, Minutes of Executive Council, ML.
44 Ibid.
Society of Christians to which they belonged’. Arthur’s reply in July praised the Wesleyan Methodists, particularly for their labours to the road and chain gangs. He appeared delighted with his collaboration, admitting that he had not anticipated such success. He appreciated ‘an expression of respect from so respectable, peaceable and legal a portion of His Majesty’s subjects’. They were precisely the accolades that the Wesleyan Methodists relished. Respectability had been the initial aim of the Hobart Town Mission, that is a close alignment to society’s standards of moral behaviour. The use of the terms peaceable and legal acknowledged that Van Diemen’s Land Methodism had not brought any revolutionary or disruptive elements with it. This was in conformity with the teaching of John Wesley and in particular, Jabez Bunting, then the most powerful Wesleyan Methodist figure in the Connexion. Respectable, peaceable and legal they may have been in Van Diemen’s Land, but there were different forces at work to make Launceston Wesleyan Methodism, in particular, a different type of Methodism. It was inevitable that Wesleyan Methodism was going to be modified as it moved out into the Empire. Launceston appeared initially to be conforming to the norm with its enthusiastic adoption of egalitarianism, but it was to prove itself to be a highly independent and powerful body ready to challenge ministerial directives.

In discussing disruptive elements, it is important to know that three known transported Swing Rioters were members of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society; they were John Tongs, John Silcock and Thomas Gange. Agrarian unrest and resentments in England in 1830 had produced a strong labourers’ rising against wage reduction in south-eastern England. The rising took the form of rick burning and machine breaking, and Rudé traces the riots ‘to the features of tithes, rents, wages, poverty, poaching and the game laws’. The introduction of threshing machines to supplant labour was the final straw and there was also a specific and ingrained resentment of the Anglican clergy and the unjust

45 No date, but possibly June 1836, M126, AJCP.
46 Letter, Lieutenant Governor Arthur to the Wesleyan Ministers of the Societies in Van Diemen’s Land, 9 July 1836, M126, AJCP.
tithing system. Tongs and Silcock came from the Hampshire area and were charged in the Winchester Assizes. Hobsbawm writes of the Captain Swing episode that ‘of all the machine breaking movements of the nineteenth century, that of the helpless and unorganised farm labourers proved to be the most effective’. He also considers that ‘often revivalism followed on the heels of this riot and defeat, the two flared up together’.

There is no suggestion that Silcock, Tongs and Gange brought any unrest with them to Van Diemen’s Land. Tongs had an exemplary life as a Wesleyan Methodist lay preacher in the Longford area, and, after moving to Geelong in Port Phillip, Gange did likewise. The Captain Swing riots were ‘not a desperate and embittered lunge against the oppressors, so much as a massive collective and peaceful assertion of the labourers’ rights as men and citizens’. Hobsbawm reiterates that these men were generally very respectable convicts and ‘that there was nothing in their later careers to suggest that they brought any political opinion or ideology from England’. Certainly Tongs’ main ideology which he had brought with him was Wesleyan Methodism.

**Providence**

David Hempton says that the Methodists who were converting the American West ‘believed that the goal of world evangelism depended upon the means, energy and self reliance to seize the opportunities opened up by Divine Providence’. Providence is the key word here and a sense of Providence was a major factor in Wesleyan Methodism lives and it is important to sense what it meant in the lives of Wesleyan Methodists in the 1830s and 1840s.

---

49 In November 1830, farmers had attended a vestry meeting to discuss the labourers’ wages. One hundred labourers gathered around the vestry and then a number of men ran to Hall Farm demanding their money; John Tongs was armed with a hammer; they went to the barn and destroyed the threshing machine. Tongs said ‘I went with the mob at their desire. I had no intention of injuring any person’. (extract from Jill Chambers, *Hampshire Machine Breakers: the Story of the 1830 Riots* (2nd Edition, Letchworth, 1996), pp. 49, 124).

50 Hobsbawm and Rudé, *Captain Swing*, p. 298.


53 Ibid, p. 279.

54 Hempton, *Empire*, p. 162.
Providence was judged to present a balance between good and evil. Since the late seventeenth century, doctrines of Providence had been an important feature in English Protestantism. Basically, God was the supreme governor who ordered the physical universe in a series of natural laws, but, as James McCosh wrote in 1850, the natural laws were ‘subordinate to the purposes of his moral government, which thus found observable expression in the distribution of rewards and punishments both to individuals and nations’. The doctrine of Providence had been discussed in William Law’s *A Serious Call to a Devout Life*, and consequently John Wesley was a serious believer in Providence. *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* espoused the notion that superimposed on the understanding of Divine Providence was the insistence that there was one divine purpose, that everyone on earth should be full of the knowledge of the Lord. The *Magazine* also wrote that the purpose of Britain’s large territorial success was that the British should be God’s almoner, scattering the seeds of virtue and commerce.

It is possible to pick up on this sense of Providence in ministerial diaries of the period in Van Diemen’s Land. They often spoke of the superintending Providence of God. They were also anxious to record instances of special Providences. Hempton believes that special Providences were a big factor in Methodist growth. They had a supernatural element to them and ‘special Providences sustained their missionary zeal in what was otherwise a hostile environment’. The Rev. Joseph Orton told Lieutenant Governor Arthur on his departure that he ‘continuously adhered to Providential guidance of the Great head of the Church’. George Best told his mother that ‘the most trivial circumstances of our life are but a link in the great chain of Universal Providence’.

---

59 Address of the Wesleyan Ministers and their Society to Lieutenant Governor Arthur, AJCP, M126.
60 George Best, Letter to his mother, 11 February 1844, NS 252, AOT.
this was the universal thinking of the spiritually and Evangelically aware of this period. Good and evil were interpreted in the light of Providence.

**Strategising of the Mission**

**Fund Raising**

In *Empire of the Spirit* Hempton refers to an initial strategising of the mission with overseas missions, similar to the pattern of the home body. There was the importance of preachers, the organisation of the laity, and of class meetings from which local talent could flow. Additionally, there was ‘the slow development of indigenous liturgies and styles and the formidable enterprises of fund raising and institution building’.

![Wesleyan Chapel and Mission Premises, Launceston – circa 1839](image)

The burden of the fund raising was to be shouldered by the wealthy, spiritual elite in Launceston. It flowed smoothly. The Rev. J.A. Manton describes how in 1835 ‘one of the friends happened to pull out his subscription book at the Trustee Meeting for making arrangements for building the chapel, and in a few minutes £300 was subscribed. A day

---

61 Strategising the mission will cover fund raising, class meetings, band meetings, love feasts, Sunday School, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, watch nights, itinerant estate preaching.

later, we had £500 to my great joy and surprise'.\textsuperscript{63} £50 of this money had been subscribed by Philip Oakden in the name of Robert Gardner and himself\textsuperscript{64} and £100 had been given by Henry Reed.\textsuperscript{65} This was the level of consecrated wealth by Oakden and Reed, with Reed always heading the list. On the same day in his diary, Orton commented ‘Mr. Reed’s lady is very amiable who has been accustomed to the gaieties of life and is now struggling with these former habits of a gay life and breaking off with them’.\textsuperscript{66} Reed’s conversion, which took place at this time, was also affecting those around him. The foundation stone of the chapel was laid by Oakden on 20 April 1835. Manton referred to him as ‘a pious prudent and consistent man, one who has everyone’s good word and wishes’.\textsuperscript{67}

This picture of Oakden is derived from what other people have said about him from primary source journals, letter books, correspondence and newspapers. A sense of his spiritual commitment was gained from his ‘Account of the Journey of the \textit{Forth}, 1833’ but his own Letter Books are almost completely devoid of spiritual allusions, except for one instance. He revealed to his agent William Tarbot in Liverpool that ‘there is a great want of religious society amongst us and a deadening influence with harmful effects’.\textsuperscript{68} His Letter Book is given over entirely to business matters such as investment, shipping, banking, land purchases, bills, wool and payments, and his strong business connection to John Dunn in Hobart. Any spiritual papers and diaries of Oakden were probably lost when a descendant destroyed a large number of his papers. The spiritual and commercial elite were being gathered in by Oakden and were preparing to consecrate their wealth in two specific ways, donations of money and of land. Firstly, however, the building blocks were being put in place of the newly formed Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, and these were to cover such things as class meetings, band meetings, love feasts, Sunday Schools, a Missionary Society, watch nights, revival and

\textsuperscript{63} Rev. J.A. Manton, Diary, 9 March 1835, NS 1258/1/1, AOT.
\textsuperscript{64} Anne and Robin Bailey, \textit{An Early Tasmanian Story}, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{65} Rev. Joseph Orton Journal, Launceston, 8 March 1835, A1714/5, ML.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{67} Rev. J.A. Manton Diary, 20 April 1835, NS 1258/1/1, AOT.
\textsuperscript{68} Oakden to Tarbot, 14 October 1834, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, NS 474, AOT.
services at country establishments. It is necessary to discuss all these foundations to give some idea of the development of the Society and its resultant liturgy tastes.

Class Meetings

Further strategising of Class Meetings was established and the first class leaders were John Leach (preacher), Peter Jacobs (teacher), George Stephenson (preacher), Isaac Sherwin (merchant), John Williams (iron founder), Philip Oakden (merchant), George Gould (preacher and farmer) and James Fenton (gunsmith). By December 1835, Henry Reed (merchant) was added to the list. The local preachers assisting the Rev. J.A. Manton were Peter Jacobs, John Williams, George Gould, John Smith (carpenter), John Tongs (blacksmith), Henry Reed and Isaac Sherwin. The Mission was taken out to Perth, Longford (Norfolk Plains), Westbury, Wesley Dale, White Hills, The Forest, Magpie Hills, The Springs and Allen Vale. As detailed in the background chapter of this thesis, class meetings were small groups of ten to twelve people who met together weekly and who prayed together and supported each other. The class leader’s position required that he or she ‘had already experienced divine favour and he or she lived in the comfort of the Holy Spirit’. Class leaders were men or women of sterling piety and solid judgement, who could advise their co-brethren. Family and private prayer were essentials for the class and people were scrutinised for those who had been justified, those who were still penitents and those who were still unsure. All this was duly recorded by the class leader. Reproof and admonishment were delivered to those who had not conformed to the Rules of the Society and the Class Book advised that ‘reproof be administered with tenderness or sharpness according to the magnitude of the sin’.

---

69 Minutes of the Leaders of Wesleyan Methodist Society of Launceston, NS 499/948, AOT.
70 Methodist History, Spectator, Launceston Circuit, p. 7.
72 Ibid.
Band Meetings

Band Meetings were introduced in Launceston by Manton on 12 January 1836 and so enthusiastic were these six groups that they ‘decided to leave off the use of snuff and to fast’.\(^73\) The people in the Band Meetings were some of the most pious and active members of the Society, and, they met ‘together every morning at 5 o’clock to pray, to exhort and to encourage each other and then with their minds thus fortified, they go to their respective employments happy in God’.\(^74\) Manton was an enthusiast always on the look out for revival and was sensing it in early 1836, when the Society had one hundred full members. Joseph Orton who was visiting Launceston at this time, did not share his enthusiasm: ‘In the evenings the bands did not discover the spiritual life I had anticipated. They are more in the character of what is termed fellowship meetings – this is a spurious Methodism which ought to be avoided’.\(^75\) Orton witnessed the beginning of a Wesleyan Methodist Society in its initial formation and the dichotomy within the Launceston Society. On the one hand there was this extraordinary financial generosity, and on the other hand there was this Society which did not completely conform to the ideal British model.

Love Feasts

One of the strong features of a Wesleyan Methodist Society was the love feast, and Oakden lost no time in 1834 holding one at his home on 30 November. love feasts had their roots in fellowship meals possibly originating in Christian Agape meals which had a chequered history and the Moravians resurrected the practice. Love feasts became a feature of the Evangelical Revival in England in the Anglican religious societies.\(^76\) Initially, Love feasts were separated into sexes but eventually they became united. They contained hymns, singing, prayers, a distribution of bread by the stewards, collections for the poor, circulation of the loving cup, address by the minister, testimonies, spontaneous prayers and a closing

\(^73\) Rev. J.A. Manton Diary, 12 January 1836, NS 1258/1/1, AOT.
\(^74\) Manton Diary, 25 February 1836, cited in Dugan, \textit{Paterson Street Church}, pp. 9, 10.
\(^75\) Orton Journal, 2 April 1836, A 1714/5, ML.
exhortation and benediction. William Parkes emphasises that ‘testimonies were expected to be lively and current, and that men and women who could barely speak reasonable English often found a fluent prayer language’. The drink at the Love feast was usually water though occasionally tea, and this was shared from a large two handled mug which was passed around. The food from trays or baskets varied from biscuits to a type of seed bread or cake. Baker also emphasises ‘that the focal point was testimony’ at the love feast. It was ‘the spiritual sharing to which the taking of food and drink together was the symbolic prelude’. There was considerable pent up emotion with the testimonies of spiritual awakening and often they could spark a type of revival and were often used to that end. Oakden’s early implementation of the love feast can be seen in that light. However, a certain amount of order and decorum had to prevail at these events. Baker reminds us that ‘Wesley made strict regulations for safe guarding the good name of the Methodist love feast’. They had to be under the supervision of a level headed minister and a current class member’s ticket had to be produced. To understand the tone of these events, Frank Baker quotes The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine for 1836 which spoke of love feasts as ‘the most popular and exciting of our social meetings’.

In the Launceston situation, it is of interest to note that Oakden used the love feast as a courting tool as well as a spiritual one in his romance with Georgiana Cowie. He wrote ‘the Love feast will be held this evening, I propose being there, would you like to go with me. Should you not accede to the love feast, must I wait till tomorrow evening to see you’.

77 Ibid, p. 15.
79 In the Hobart Wesleyan Methodist Museum in Melville Street, there is an excellent example of their early love feast Cup. By 1900, the idea of a common cup was regarded as unhygienic and disreputable, and Methodism viewed love feasts as quaint survivals of a not very amusing kind. (Robert Currie, Methodism Divided: a Study in the Sociology of Ecumenicalism (London, 1968), p. 130).
80 Baker, Love Feast, p. 25.
81 Ibid, p. 33.
82 Ibid, p. 37.
83 Letter Philip Oakden to Georgiana Cowie, prior to October 1839, Letter in possession of family descendant, as cited in Anne and Robin Bailey, An Early Tasmanian Story, p. 70.
Joseph Orton had a patronising comment to make about the Launceston love feast as late as April 1839 in the Society. He wrote that ‘I attended a love feast at Launceston in the evening but in general, it bore character of an infant cause’.  

**Sunday School**

By 26 July 1835, a Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School was commenced in the house of Mr. Williams. Sunday Schools were an important part of the Wesleyan Methodist strategising structure and there was the overriding determination born of long experience to attach Sunday Schools to the Methodist Connexion, in case another sect should take them over. The committee contained Isaac Sherwin, James Fenton, Henry Jennings, John Williams and George Lilly. George Lilly was the first Superintendent and then in December 1835, Henry Reed became the Superintendent and the Sunday School moved to Paterson Street. This was an example of where active work in the Society was run alongside the consecration of wealth. Lilly, who was to be a significant figure in Port Phillip Wesleyan Methodism, was a carpenter born in Roscommon in 1803. He had gone to New South Wales with his father, a soldier, and when nineteen, accompanied the Rev. Walter Lawry to Tonga to found the mission there. The fathers of Mrs. Lilly, Mrs. John Hutchinson and John Batman were all members of the Parramatta Bible Society. There is a fuller discussion of Sunday Schools in Chapter 7.

**Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society**

The Launceston Branch of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society had been founded in October 1834 with the intention, common to all Wesleyan Missionary Societies, of accessing the wealth of the wider community and raising community awareness of the needs of the overseas
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84 Orton Journal, 2 April 1839.
85 Tasmanian Methodist histories make much of the fact that William Hart MLC was No. 70 on the Sunday School List. His parents William and Ann Hart were recorded on the Wesleyan Methodist Paterson Street Baptismal Roll and his father was variously cited as a tin man or brazier. Hart first advertised in the *Launceston Advertiser* of 11 April 1833 under these occupations and as working in the shop of Joseph Heazelwood, blacksmith, St. John Street.
86 Minns Papers, Box 1/6, Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania.
missions. Important local personages usually chaired the meetings and heads of other denominations were invited and welcomed to participate. For example, a Committee Meeting at Isaac Sherwin’s on 27 November 1837 decided to ask Sir John Franklin to preside if he was in town.\textsuperscript{87} Collectors were sent across the town in pairs. These were often women who were members or wives of members. The town was divided into small districts. The drawing in of the important members of the community shows up with the noting of Lewis Gilles and Henry Dowling as members of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society for September 1835.\textsuperscript{88} The first anniversary of this branch of the Society was held on 12 October 1835 and ‘Joseph Tice Gellibrand chaired the meeting.\textsuperscript{89} Gellibrand was being courted by his cousin Henry Jennings as a prospective member of the Wesleyan Methodists and this is apparent in Jennings’ Spiritual Diary.\textsuperscript{90}

When Gellibrand and Hesse had been missing for about a month in Port Phillip in early 1837, Jennings commented:

\begin{quote}
We are all now under great pressure for Gellibrand/Hesse have been nearly a month missing in the bush at Port Phillip and there can be no doubt that they have perished. I am afraid that Mr. G. was too eagerly pursuing the world and perhaps in mercy he may be cut off. The Lord has been striving very much with him of late, his convictions were deep and an entire change had been made by him. His family, from scarcely having any religious observance, had family prayer introduced and the Sabbath was strictly observed.\textsuperscript{91}
\end{quote}

Gellibrand had also been made one of the trustees of the Paterson Street Chapel, alongside Oakden, Reed, J.W. Gleadow, Isaac Sherwin, John Smith, Geo. Gould, Captain Samuel Horton, Thomas Parramore, John Dunn, Henry Jennings, Matthew Curling Friend\textsuperscript{92} and the Rev. J.A.

\textsuperscript{87} Minutes of Launceston Wesleyan Missionary Society (LWMMS), 27 November 1837, NS 499:934, AOT.

\textsuperscript{88} LWMMS, September 1835.

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{90} J.T. Gellibrand, cousin of Henry Jennings, was a noteworthy figure, ex-Attorney General and solicitor to the Port Phillip Association, he was lost in Port Phillip, believed killed by aborigines in early 1837.

\textsuperscript{91} Jennings’ Spiritual Diary, 2 April 1837.

\textsuperscript{92} Matthew Curling Friend took an action for libel to the Supreme Court against William Lushington Goodwin (Decisions of the Nineteenth Century Tasmanian Superior Courts, Friend v Goodwin, Published by Division of Law, Macquarie University and the School of History and Classics, University of Tasmania, 9 January 1837), in April 1838 after months of defamation regarding his lack of competence, neglect of his Port Officer duties and his usage of Government employees and boats on the Tamar for his own purposes. As well, he was defamed for his conduct as a
Manton.¹⁹ Thirty wealthy men stood alongside two ministers, and two ex-
convicts Thomas Knowles and John Smith; this was indeed egalitarianism
as chapel trusteeship was a highly desirable position.

The formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society
produced an early show of independence from the Launceston group.
When the Missionary Society was formed at the conclusion of 1834, the
group told Manton that they wanted to be known as the Launceston
Auxiliary Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. They felt they could do
more if they managed their own affairs rather than being a branch of
Hobart. Manton explained that ‘the feeling between the two towns was by
no means good and many would refuse to give, if committed to Hobart.
Additionally, they cannot forget the circumstances of the first failed
mission and the former chapel and feel that the people of Hobart were
partly the cause of it’.²⁰

---

¹⁹ Quarterly Class Schedules, Chapels and other property, NS 499/1006, AOT.
²⁰ Letter the Rev. J.A. Manton to WMMC, 30 December 1836, AJCP, M133.
Watch Nights

Watch Nights were also an important feature for Wesleyan Methodists and the Launceston Society. Watch Nights originated in the early 1740s and consisted of ‘singing, praying and praising God. It was Wesley’s adaption of how he understood early Christian vigils’. In essence, Watch Nights were similar to preaching services as they both had the same format with prayers, sermons and exhortations. However, the Watch Night usually lasted for three or four hours and the prescribed formula was repeated over and over again. For Methodists, Watch Nights were seen as a type of counter culture to other forms of night entertainment and revelling. Also, the darkness at night was seen as a backdrop to the struggle with Satan. William Parkes stresses that ‘watch nights were for a particular reason and planned at a particular season. The first London Watch Nights in Methodism took place on Friday evenings near the full moon and the watching was a watching for the Lord’s outpourings, a type of eschatological expectancy’. The Rev. W. Simpson recalled one of the Launceston Watch Nights where he felt ‘a powerful feeling prevailed and we were addressed by two of our members who were magistrates. It is a new thing in this part of the world for such individuals to be Methodists and local preachers. The circumstance exerted considerable interest’. Through this comment of Simpson’s it is possible to understand the position that Launceston Wesleyan Methodists maintained in Launceston at this time. Similarly in Longford, a Watch Night held in July 1837 was described thus: ‘After preaching the Lord’s Supper at 7 o’clock in the evening, a watch night began. At 10 o’clock I concluded and went to a friendly house to rest, but fifty to sixty friends followed me and I was unable to stop them; they continued to sing all night until daylight and their song was ‘we will not close our watchful eyes’. This is an exact replica of an occasion Parkes quotes from the works of John Wesley where Wesley said ‘A handful of us walked home together singing and rejoicing and praising God’.

---

95 Ruth, A Little Heaven, p. 20.  
96 Parkes, ‘Watch Nights’.  
97 Rev. W. Simpson, Launceston to WMMC, 1 August 1838, AJCP, M133.  
98 Rev. W. Simpson to WMMC, 12 July 1837, AJCP M133.  
It is hard to decide whether this excess of zeal and intensity was normal for the times, but the Launceston Society certainly transferred it to other occasions. For example, when Simpson arrived in Launceston to replace Manton as the Wesleyan Methodist Minister, he was met on the wharf on a Saturday morning by a crowd of Wesleyans. A prayer meeting was held and those who had to work in business arrived at 10 pm at night to express their gratitude, and the meeting continued through the night till Sunday morning.\(^\text{100}\)

**Circuit Itinerant Estate Preaching**

It is worthwhile to discuss the Wesleyan Methodist missionary endeavour to the farming estates surrounding Launceston and in the Midlands. These belonged to wealthy settlers such as John Leake, Benjamin Horne, Captain Samuel Horton, Major William Gray and others. They contained some fifteen free people and forty convicts as assigned servants. This was a major missionary source to be tapped by the Wesleyan Methodist ministers and local preachers. The ministers certainly met with a warm reception when they called at these estates and felt that it was a type of itinerancy familiar to John Wesley, who had put forth the edict ‘Go not to those who want you but to those who want you most’.\(^\text{101}\)

Butters made the point to the WMMC that the distances were so great from any place of residence that the family and prisoner servants were not able to travel them and, because the establishments were small, there was no hope of a country Society. Additionally, the prisoners were normally shut out of receiving religious instruction.

Henry Reed’s 1840 preaching plan, made before he left for England in February 1840 and therefore possibly not fulfilled, shows him planning to preach at Captain Horton’s property Somercotes, Robert Legge’s property at Break O’Day and the Archer properties at Panshanger and Woolmers as well as his own property at Wesley Dale. His text for all these venues was to be taken from Acts 8,5 ‘Then Philip went down to Samaria and preached unto them Christ’.\(^\text{102}\) Reed preached also at The Forest,

\(^{100}\) Rev. W. Simpson to WMMC, 31 October 1837, AJCP, M133.
\(^{101}\) Rev. W. Butters to WMMC, 10 April 1839, AJCP, M133.
\(^{102}\) Henry Reed Preaching Diary, Hudson Fysh Papers, Launceston Branch, State Library of Tasmania, LMSS 0049 Box 1/2 Items 0049/1/-. 
which was the heart of sawyers and splitters, living in bush huts. Local preachers like Henry Reed penetrated these areas often with some success.

Extraordinary stories hedged around with Methodist symbolism emerged from such areas. In one such incident a splitter appeared from the forest at a Launceston 5 a.m. prayer meeting, reporting that he had found a piece of paper wrapped around a pepper packet in his food supply. The paper had a portion of St. Mark’s Gospel printed on it telling him that, besides the way to salvation, if he was bitten by a snake it would not harm him if he believed. He experienced a change of heart and set off for Launceston to take advice. He had received a bite from a snake when travelling, and showed it to the assembly. He gave testimony and said what the Lord had done for him.\textsuperscript{105} The Wesleyan John Lees of Castlereagh, Sydney, who had a dramatic conversion experience connected with drunkenness, had also been bitten by a snake who appeared to be Satan in disguise.\textsuperscript{104} In both cases, a superstitious, symbolic myth had been combined with a conversion experience and had been carried to the colonies. These religious superstitions were common in the early nineteenth century before people gained more scientific understanding of the world around them.

Preaching at large farming estates was a fairly dispiriting process, as the audiences were in a sense captive. In 1836 Manton wrote ‘I reached the house of my friend Captain Horton at five this evening. At seven, he called his servants in and I preached to them. Captain H. found that some of his men were absent and engaged at playing cards; the cards and money were confiscated and they had to appear before the magistrate next morning.’\textsuperscript{105} There is the other side to consider that in these religious gatherings at the wealthy estates, a basis for a sense of community in the society was being engendered. The Wesleyan missionaries and preachers were filling a religious and social vacuum. There is no easy way to gauge

\textsuperscript{103} Henry Reed Papers, MS 7649, SLV.
\textsuperscript{104} James Colwell, \textit{The Illustrated History of Methodism: Australia, 1812 to 1855, New South Wales and Polynesia, 1856 to 1902: with special chapters on the discovery and settlement of Australia... leading up to Methodist Union / compiled from official records sources} (Sydney, 1904), p. 65; see also Chapter 2 of this thesis for further information on John Lees.
\textsuperscript{105} Manton Diary, 4 July 1836.
the success rate of these gatherings, but the Rev. W. Butters wrote that he felt Methodism was suited to the circumstances of the colony and the ‘wants of the scattered population’. \(106\) The assigned servants may well have received the message of community and inclusiveness of Wesleyan Methodism. Richard Ely sees ‘the free settlers and their well conducted convicts as coadjutors in the effective working of the redemptive machine’. \(107\) The Rev. Joseph Orton certainly utilised the system of preaching at wealthy settlers’ estates. Matthew Curling Friend rallied all his servants when Orton was passing through George Town to Port Phillip in 1836 and marched them down the street to hear Orton’s service. \(108\)

**Revival**

Wesleyan Methodists in particular had a strong desire for revival and Piggin explains it as ‘a work of God which consists of an outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon large numbers of people at the same time’. \(109\) In listing seventy various revivals in nineteenth century Australia, Piggin lists Launceston as having a revival in 1839; this is accurate but Piggin has not noted the first revival in Launceston in the 1835-36 period with the coming of Philip Oakden, Henry Reed and others. What Piggin does state accurately is that Australian revivals were often imported from overseas via people who had taken part in such occasions. Whether the revivals in Launceston were sparked from ministerial or lay influence is not completely clear. The ministers the Rev. J.A. Manton and the Rev. W. Simpson certainly looked for revivals, as did Henry Reed.

In October 1838, the Rev. Simpson refers to ‘the spirit being poured out in richer and more copious showers than ever before witnessed in this town. Such a sensation has been created and many who are in love with sin dare not venture into the precincts of the Methodist Chapel where they
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106 Rev. W. Butters to WMMC, 23 July 1838, AJCP, M133.
108 Orton Journal, 7 April 1836.
should be converted’.\textsuperscript{110} Just two months before in August, Simpson bemoaned his lack of progress: ‘I suppose after most revivals some of the new converts relapse’.\textsuperscript{111} In effect, Simpson was longing for a continuation of the 1836 revival in Launceston and he did indeed receive it. Certainly for the Wesleyan ministers, revivals were a tangible sign of success, something they could produce for their on-going credibility. Revivals satisfied the whole mission. Manton had testified to revival in February 1836 when he wrote ‘I have reason to believe the greater part of the Society is feeling the influence of revival’.\textsuperscript{112} William Parkes suggests that ‘revivals frequently began and continued through love feasts’.\textsuperscript{113} Manton sees the link when he recorded in August 1836:

Some weeks since, we held our quarterly Love Feast when a gracious influence visited us. The work was greatly received and deepened without any noise or confusion. During Bro. Butters’ stay with us a copious effusion of the Spirit took place. It was impossible to conclude the prayer meetings before 10 or 11 o’clock at night. Some of the most notorious sinners have been converted and conversions have gone through whole families. Our chapel is filled to excess and we have enjoyed a heaven on earth begun.\textsuperscript{114}

### Consecration of Wealth

The consecration of wealth of the Launceston wealthy elite took the form of donating money for chapel building and donations of land for the chapel, and the following discussion is very important for this thesis. The *Spectator* Methodist History of the Launceston Circuit proudly quotes that ‘the sum of £10,000 was raised during the first ten years of the Launceston Mission’.\textsuperscript{115} By 1839, chapels at Launceston, Longford, Perth, Cressy, Ross and Campbell Town were all free from debt. Isaac Sherwin in remembering the history of the Launceston Mission wrote thirty years after it had been established ‘we had a wholesome horror of debt or discord. Our chapel property was free from encumbrance. Providence smiled upon us’.\textsuperscript{116} Allen B. Robertson talks in the same vein about the Halifax

\textsuperscript{110} Rev. W. Simpson to WMMC, 10 October 1838, AJCP, M133.

\textsuperscript{111} Simpson to WMMC, 1 August 1838, M133, AJCP.

\textsuperscript{112} Letter Manton to WMMC, 25 February 1836, AJCP, M133.

\textsuperscript{113} Parkes, ‘Watch Nights’, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{114} Letter Manton to WMMC, 20 August 1836, AJCP, M133.

\textsuperscript{115} Methodist History, *Spectator, Launceston Circuit*, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, p. 8.
Methodists merchants and says ‘it was the merchant initiative which led to the purchase of land and creation of chapels, moreover their sound business knowledge must have been an asset in handling Church funds’.\(^{117}\)

Both Oakden and Reed were early elected as Society Stewards. \(^{118}\) These were positions of responsibility and Robertson likens Stewards in status to Anglican vestrymen. The wealthy elite monitored the mission’s business affairs. Geoffrey Milburn considers that Methodism was moved to regard wealth as a trust and sought to consecrate it to a higher purpose, but it was not easy for those who took it seriously, because it involved the ‘crucifixion of one’s selfishness’.\(^{119}\) Milburn further sees the consecration of money as ‘part of a wider and deeper consecration expressed through an active commitment to Methodism’.\(^{120}\) However, this thesis views the consecration of wealth in Launceston as a direct response to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, as well as Wesley’s directives on the Stewardship of Wealth. In Launceston consecration of wealth was inexorably tied to the mission establishment, and Milburn does not emphasise this particular aspect, instead referring only to the wider commitments of Methodism. The gospel had been resolutely linked to commerce by Richard Watson. The wealthy elite of Launceston probably saw the founding of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society as an actual missionary project, that of founding an infant society. Whatever were the true origins and nature of this consecration of wealth, Launceston set a standard of generosity in Australia and may well have influenced other denominations and set a pattern for them to follow.

In 1836, Isaac Sherwin gave a corner of his land to the Wesleyan Methodists in Margaret Street, Launceston, in order to build a second chapel. He owned ten acres of land bordered by Margaret Street and lived

\(^{118}\) On 25 March 1835 Philip Oakden was asked to be Society Steward. (Minutes of Meeting, Leaders of Wesleyan Methodist Society, Launceston, NS 499/948, AOT.)
\(^{120}\) Milburn, *Piety*, p. 20.
in a house called Alice Place. A note in Joseph Orton’s Journal 19 February 1837 shows his egocentric viewpoint regarding the energy and dynamism of the spiritual elite. Taking all credit to himself about the Margaret Street Chapel, he wrote ‘I preached at the Margaret Street Chapel opening due to the liberality of a few friends in the Town and coming out of the circumstance of my having preached on the spot a year ago and mentioned how a friend had given the piece of land. I hoped they would have the joy of a little temple and it has been fully realised’. His assessment is questionable as all the chapel building in Launceston and neighbouring towns was the initiative of the wealthy elite.

Land was also given by Joseph Heazelwood, blacksmith at Longford (Norfolk Plains), in 1834 for a chapel to be built. As stated previously, Heazelwood worked in Launceston in conjunction with William Hart, tin man and brazier. Heazelwood was not one of the spiritual elite, but he was an artisan taking the lead from the wealthy elite and consecrating his wealth. Neither Heazelwood or Hart had convict origins. The first service had been held in the barn on William Effingham Lawrence’s estate. The Rev. J.A. Manton told the WMMC that ‘three of our wealthy friends propose to take charge of the Chapel and hand it to the Connexion free of debt’. The three wealthy friends were Henry Reed, Isaac Sherwin and John Gleadow and later John Crookes. Lieutenant Matthew Curling Friend also donated land at Newnham for a chapel and this was noted at the Annual District Meeting on 21 October 1836. The faithful old Methodist at Green Ponds, Joseph Johnson gave two acres of land from a corner of his property which the Rev. Joseph Orton ‘deemed desirable’.

At Perth, Lieutenant George Palmer Ball was the chief agent in chapel building and consecrated wealth and an interesting acknowledgment of this is made in a letter by the Rev. W. Simpson to the WMMC. According to

---

121 Ann Fysh, Bothwell and Alice Place: Early Days of the Sherwin Family of Sherwood (Launceston, 1964), pp. 29-34.
122 Orton Journal, 19 February 1837.
124 Letter, Manton to WMMC, 20 August 1836, NS 1258/1/1, AOT.
125 Ralph G. Hubt,(comp.), Methodism in Longford: One Hundred Years of Witness, 1834-1934 (Longford, 1934).
126 Orton, Journal, 3 November 1836.
Simpson, ‘At Perth, twelve miles from Launceston, second attempts have been made to introduce the gospel but without success, not being able to obtain a congregation. It pleased the Lord to make our way plain by other means. A gentleman J.P., Ball has been brought to our knowledge of the truth and begun to show considerable zeal. Now we have a small flourishing Society and chapel, all the liberality of the above-mentioned gentleman’. 127 Here is a splendid example of one of Launceston’s elite Wesleyan Methodists not only paying for the chapel, but actually raising a Society where the Methodist minister had previously failed. These were in the light of spiritual contributions by the men of wealth. Palmer Ball also paid for the chapel at Salem. He was a class leader at Longford in 1838 and held a class at his own estate Mountford. Mountford was an estate of 1,616 acres, 12 miles from Launceston. Palmer Ball had previously sounded out the Rev. Joseph Orton telling him to obtain a piece of land at Perth, and adding that he would contribute £50 and guarantee £100; all the impetus came from Palmer Ball.128

127 Rev. W. Simpson to WMMC, 1 August 1838, AJCP, M133.
128 Letter, J.A. Manton from J.Orton, Orton Letterbook, 12 September 1837, Vol. 3, 1832-41, A1718, ML.
# PLAN OF THE LAUNCESTON CIRCUIT.

## 1839.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACES</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAUNCESTON</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITTO, MARGARET STREET</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGFORD</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTBURY</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTLAND ESTATE</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERTH</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALEM</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESTLY</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFFET</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEY HALL</td>
<td>11  0</td>
<td>11  10</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>11  12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK EVENINGS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAUNCESTON, WED</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGFORD, TUES</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTBURY, WED.</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTLAND, TUES</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERTH, THURSDAY</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>1  10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRAYER MEETINGS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY MORNING</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET-STREET, TUES</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
<td>7  10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PREACHERS.**


**WEEKLY MEETINGS.**


---

**Sundays' Meetings.**

Midland Methodism was similarly supported by the wealthy elite, Captain Samuel Horton at his property Somercotes had always provided a staging and meeting post of comfort, rest, relaxation and reflection for the Wesleyan Methodist ministers and preachers passing through from Hobart since early 1825. Orton expressed the feeling of all the ministers when he wrote in 1839 ‘arrived at Captain Horton’s about 6 PM where I found Mr. Oakden, this place is always like home to me’.\(^{129}\) In order to build a chapel at Ross, Captain Horton put himself down for one hundred guineas for the chapel and a relative in England of Mrs. Horton’s gave a sacramental service. Inevitably, the wealthy elite in Launceston were involved, as is illustrated in a letter from Captain Samuel Horton to the Rev. J.A. Manton saying ‘You may tell the Launceston brethren Bros. Reed, Sherwin, Gleadow etc. that I shall pay them all a visit to solicit subscriptions for a chapel at Ross’.\(^{130}\)

Turning aside, it is relevant to realise that the self-help ethos was not confined to the Wesleyan Methodists in Launceston. As John West wrote, ‘voluntary efforts of the different sects supplemented the legal provisions from the Government and many private persons expended large sums of money for raising buildings of worship’.\(^{131}\) The Launceston Evangelical community, with the shared faith of the Bible, were noteworthy in the 1830s and 1840s for having this spirit. It was also normal to appeal for help from other denominations and known benefactors. Mark Hutchinson ascribes this situation ‘to the confined nature of the Launceston society which forced particular accommodation between denominations and churchmen. The non-conformist groups established themselves without the massive infrastructure that followed the Established Church’.\(^{132}\)

\(^{129}\) Orton Journal, 7 June 1839.
\(^{130}\) Captain Samuel Horton, Ross to the Rev. J.A. Manton, 13 January 1837, NS 1258/1/1, AOT.
\(^{131}\) John West, *History of Tasmania: with Copious Information Respecting the Colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia & (Launceston, Tasmania, 1852)*, p. 209.
\(^{132}\) Mark Hutchinson, ‘Yet We Wish to be All One’, *Lucas, An Evangelical History Review*, No. 8, March 1990, p. 7.
Hutchinson argues that ‘social and denominational peace were identical’. Those new colonial liberal settlers, who had left behind an illiberal British Society, wanted religion to be a unifying source, not a divisive one. Richard Ely describes these colonial settlers as ‘civic Protestants free settlers who sought a Godly community and a Godly nation’. L.S. Bethell concurs: ‘men of high standing in the community agreed with the Government in believing that the church would better the lot of the prisoners, reclaim the godless and guide the footsteps of the coming generation’. However Petrow also reminds us that ‘Launceston had always felt a sense of isolation and neglect by the Government centred in Hobart, and this had fostered community consciousness and self help’. This community consciousness and self-help was later to develop into what Petrow refers to ‘as a strong civic patriotism in Launceston’.

Launceston Presbyterians raised £2000 by voluntary contributions for St. Andrews Presbyterian Church which was established on 16 October 1849. Hutchison reiterates that ‘John Crookes and Henry Reed spread their largesse through the wider Evangelical community, and in particular Henry Reed was an enthusiastic supporter of Congregationalism (Independents). He gave £100 to the establishing of the church of the Rev. Charles Price, the Tamar Street Chapel in September 1837. Similarly, John Gleadow gave £21 to the Anglican Holy Trinity Church established in 1841. It is significant to realise that not only the Evangelical community practised the self-help ethos. The Catholic community which was quite poor was congratulated by Bishop Willson in

---

133 Ibid, p. 9.
139 Hutchinson, ‘Yet We Wish’, p. 7.
September 1846 who said ‘By your admirable zeal and liberality, the Church is entirely free from debt’. The debt of £2934 on the Church of St. Joseph was entirely liquidated by its parishioners. 142

**The Rev. Joseph Orton – Crookes Case**

The Rev. Joseph Orton was a significant if controversial figure in the lives of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. Two significant incidents had an impact on Orton and the Society, which showed Orton’s inability to be flexible and the Launceston’s Society’s powerful independence of mind which overrode Orton.

An Act of the last Wesleyan Methodist Conference of 1835 had constituted that the Van Diemen’s Land District be divided and separated from the District of New South Wales. 143 Orton was made Chairman of the Van Diemen’s Land District. Born in 1795, Orton had the background of Hull, which Ward refers to as ‘an Evangelical dynamo par excellence’. 144 Additionally, Orton had business experience in London as an apprentice in a ship’s chandler’s business. He spent time in Jamaica in the West Indies as a missionary, with a period of imprisonment. 145 Posted to the New South Wales Mission, he arrived in Sydney in January 1832. With his business acumen, he certainly reduced the debt of the Sydney mission and acted as the WMMC shipping agent in the Pacific for the South Seas Mission. Orton wrote ‘In the four years at Sydney I attended to the whole of the business myself as well as preaching five times a week and travelling considerably’. 146 He visited the New Zealand Mission and Alex Tyrrell refers to Orton’s condemnation and hostile reports of his colleagues back to the WMMC and the austerity of his judgement. 147

This was the style of the man who visited Van Diemen’s Land in February 1835. He was hard working, authoritarian and highly sensitive to
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143 Minute Book of Preachers of Van Diemen’s Land District, February 1836-October 1844, Special meeting of Preachers, 11 February 1836, NS 499/15, AOT.
145 Tyrrell says Orton was caught up in an outbreak of persecution and gaol. (Tyrrell, *Sphere of Benevolence*, p. 45).
146 Rev. J.A. Orton to WMMC, 11 April 1837, AJCP, M133.
147 Tyrrell, *Sphere of Benevolence*, p. 112.
challenges to his authority. Tyrrell considers that Orton’s papers are ‘free of the petty backbiting that so many of his fellow preachers indulged in’. I cannot agree with this and my discussion of the Crookes case and the Liturgy Struggle reveal Orton’s mean-spirited behaviour and total inability to accept the opinions of others.

John Crookes was to become one of the Wesleyan Methodist spiritual and commercial elite in Launceston alongside Philip Oakden, Henry Reed, Isaac Sherwin, John Gleadow and others. He became involved in partnership and business arrangements with Reed and was later committed to considerable political and civic involvement. His treatment at the hands of Orton and the Rev. J. McKenny of New South Wales and his subsequent rescue by Reed demonstrated the solidarity and power of the group.

In 1835, Crookes offered himself for the Wesleyan ministry, but, owing to commercial interests, he changed his application to that of local preacher. The preachers of Van Diemen’s Land district noted his ‘promising character and confidently recommended him as a candidate for regular work’. Orton’s official arrival in Hobart as Chairman of the District coincided with the approval of Crookes and it was decided by the Van Diemen’s Land District that it was best for Crookes to labour in New South Wales with the Rev. Nathaniel Turner. The case, however, had undercurrents. The Rev. J. McKenny was coming to Sydney as Chairman of that District and Tyrrell rightly observed that ‘Orton’s status diminished from being Chairman for the whole of Eastern Australia’, with Pacific responsibilities, to being confined to Van Diemen’s Land. Soon McKenny declared to Orton that Crookes was an incompetent preacher, not suited to Sydney or acceptable to the congregation, and he was to return to Van
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Diemen’s Land. This was in direct contrast to Orton’s declaration at his meeting in Sydney in December 1835 that Crookes was ‘a man of sterling piety who has laboured with great acceptance’.  

McKenny felt that Orton had sent ‘an untried missionary in the shape of Mr. Crookes and removed a competent missionary in the shape of the Rev. W. Simpson’. Complaints flowed back and forth to the WMMC from Orton and McKenny each vindicating his position, with Crookes falling into the role of persecuted victim. For Orton, his objection and resentment was centred on the perceived insult to himself. He complained to the WMMC ‘that there was no serious consultation with me and it was expected by the Conference when the District was divided, we would mutually consult on any question of the moment’.

Crookes seems to have been without fault, and was in effect a whipping boy for both McKenny and Orton and their two egos. The ingrained bitterness of both men is very transparent in all the correspondence back to the WMMC. Crookes asked McKenny ‘What unaccountable reason could you give the District Committee and why should you cast me off and conceal everything from me’. Crookes arrived back in Hobart after his banishment and his sorrow was compounded by Orton’s refusal to see him. Crookes explained to the WMMC that in New South Wales ‘I had such a multiplicity of business to attend to, that I was constantly having to preach to the same people without having any time for preparation’. This has a ring of truth about it. Orton had always coped with the business of the shipping to the South Sea Mission when he was in Sydney, alongside his pastoral duties. However, McKenny was unable to cope with the business associated with the South Seas Mission and Crookes had been co-opted to the job. Crookes was in a no-win situation and Orton was not supportive. Orton complained to the WMMC that ‘Mr. Crookes stands aloof without any just

152 Minutes of New South Wales Sixteenth Annual Meeting to Secretaries of WMMC, AJCP, M121, 28 December 1835.
153 Rev. J. McKenny to Secretaries of WMMC, AJCP, M121, 11 April 1837.
154 Orton, Hobart Town to WMMC, AJCP, M133, 11 April 1837.
155 Orton to WMMC, June 1837, AJCP, M121.
156 Crookes to WMMC, 23 July 1837, AJCP, M121.
157 Crookes to WMMC, 23 July 1837.
course after repeated expressions of kindness’.\textsuperscript{158} This was the case even with the previous admission two months previously that ‘Crookes had been the butt of feeling’.\textsuperscript{159} Concurrently, Orton advised the Rev. J.A. Manton not to employ Crookes because he had not attended a Class Meeting in Hobart since he had arrived back: ‘You will have to be cautious firmly adhering to rule, Mr. Crookes is far from pleasing me. In his appeal to the WMMC and in his duplicate copy to me, he added four more pages that I never saw’.\textsuperscript{160}

Crookes remained polite to the end, fobbing off Orton with a letter refusing employment and moving out of his orbit. Crookes was rescued by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists and swept into their embrace both in a commercial sense and spiritual sense. Reed took him into his employ as chief clerk in his firm of Reed and Donald. Crookes succeeded to the ownership of the firm when Henry Reed returned to England, Donald accepting £20,000 for his share of the firm. The Wesleyan Connexion knew what they had lost in Crookes as a preacher. The Rev. John Waterhouse, who came out two years later in February 1839 as General Superintendent of the Wesleyan Missions in Australasia and Polynesia, wrote ‘From what I have seen of Mr. Crookes I greatly regret that we have lost such a man. My wonder is not that he should have declined after what he met with, but that he should have settled down in such a prominent manner’.\textsuperscript{161}

The story of John Crookes and his eventual rescue by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists throws up an understanding of Joseph Orton’s difficult character, particularly apparent at times when his own authority was challenged. It has been illustrated here in order to demonstrate the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists’ awareness of his character and how in this case, ministerial power could be circumvented. This leads into the incident which was running in tandem with the Crookes case and which is recorded in Van Diemen’s Land histories as the Liturgy Struggle.

\textsuperscript{158} Orton to WMMC, 20 June 1837, AJCP, M133.
\textsuperscript{159} Orton to WMMC, 11 April 1837, AJCP, M133.
\textsuperscript{160} Rev Joseph Orton, Hobart Town to the Rev. J.A. Manton, 18 July 1837. Letterbook Vol. 3, 1836–41, A1718, ML.
\textsuperscript{161} Rev. John Waterhouse to WMMC, 23 May 1839, AJCP, M133.
The Rev. Joseph Orton - The Liturgy Struggle

The early independent, go it alone spirit of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists reached its culmination in what was termed the Liturgy Struggle in Launceston. Australian Wesleyan Methodist histories view this incident as a surprising challenge by a normally agreeable Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. The Rev. C.C. Dugan came close to the truth when he describes it as ‘a situation full of peril which might have been the cause of a disastrous division in the Launceston Church’. 162 R.D. Pretyman gives the incident minimal exposure whilst admitting that ‘Orton’s rigid interpretation of Conference Regulations in other matters produced reactions’. 163 Dugan does give a slightly wider coverage to the topic in The Story of the Paterson Street Methodist Church, without exploring its significance in colonial religious history. The Rev. C.T. Hayward and M. Tyson do not mention the Liturgy Struggle in the Spectator History issue of the Launceston Circuit, and none of these writers recognise it in the terms of a natural growth pattern of global Wesleyan Methodism in the missionary sense. Hempton feels that ‘In order to survive and thrive, Methodism needed to break free from Anglicanism’. 164

Here was a religious society in Launceston half composed of ex convicts who had a lingering distaste for the establishment and the Anglican Church represented the establishment. In the final count the story of the Launceston Liturgy Struggle resulted in what Hempton describes as a situation ‘where power lay with those who gave the most’. 165 This was the Launceston situation where a strong part of the protest came from the wealthy elite.

It was Orton who provoked the struggle. In a letter to Manton in 1836, he reveals his obsession with rules and regulations. The argument lay with the introduction of the Established Church liturgy into the morning service at the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Chapel. Easy going, John Manton had omitted to do this at the opening of the chapel, excusing himself on the grounds of physical incapacity for a long service

163 Pretyman, Chronicle, p. 108.
164 Hempton, Empire, p. 204.
165 Hempton, Empire, p. 208.
and the lack of interest in the congregation. Orton replied that ‘I cannot entertain the opinion that you have ventured to assert that had the liturgy been introduced at the time of the opening of the chapel, it would now be half empty’. He was ‘not prepared to admit that the friends would have carried out their opposition to the conference recommendations of the Conference…our duty as Methodist missionaries is to promote Christianity according to the instructions from the ruling Body’.

Orton felt that the congregation’s objections to the Anglican liturgy stemmed from an attachment to other Dissenting bodies, which should not be allowed to influence Methodism. In his devotion to the letter of the law and the Rules and Regulations of the Wesleyan Conference, he was blinded to the possibilities of a changing order in a colonial situation. He had an inability to comprehend the changing circumstances and was troubled by this challenge to his authority. In November 1836 he had told the English Conference that he ‘wished to act carefully according to rule in this rising colony’. When he asked for advice, Orton explained that, whilst the Launceston group were rejecting the Liturgy, he had pressed it on the Hobart congregation. He blamed ‘two or three influential people’ and queried whether ‘they have the jurisdiction on the matter’.

Whereas Manton had been content to sway with the wind, Orton was challenged. Of particular concern to Orton was the possibility of this rebellion spreading to other infant Societies. Three of the influential friends who challenged him included John Gleadow, Henry Reed and Isaac Sherwin. Philip Oakden was not included in the rebel group because he had already left for England in March 1836 in pursuit of banking business. The challenge from these three men had even more significance when it is realised that Reed and Gleadow were Yorkshire men and John Gleadow was an old school friend of Joseph Orton’s from Hull. Orton states this in 1838 when he wrote ‘I rode into Launceston and took up a temporary abode with my old friend and school fellow Mr. Gleadow’. Also Henry Reed was the chief financial source of the Society. In
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continuing to push his point about the introduction of the Liturgy, Orton was confronting some of his greatest allies.

A lengthy letter from Launceston from a representative committee of nine protestors to the Preachers of the Van Diemen’s Land District needs to be spelt out in its entirety because it covers the whole history of the situation completely, and reveals the strength of feeling amongst the Launceston group:

Launceston 1 June 1837

Reverend Sirs

Having been informed by our Minister that at the last District Meeting held in Hobart Town you came to the determination of introducing the liturgy of the Church of England into our chapel on the removal of our present minister notwithstanding the very strong and unanimous feeling of the Society thereto, and of which you could not be ignorant. This subject was first mentioned by the Rev. J. Orton at a meeting of some of the Trustees in the month of March 1836. One night after a prayer meeting Mr. O requested each of the Trustees, Stewards and Leaders as were present to remain in the Chapel. Also the congregation had disappeared and Mr. O proposed that Mr. Wesley’s Abridgment of the Liturgy of the Church of England should be introduced into a morning service. The meeting was completely taken by surprise, no notice having been given of the object of the Meeting. The majority of the persons present were averse to any alterations but anxious to abide by the Rules of Methodism and Mr. O expressed the desire of the Conference as being decided in the point, that it appeared to the majority that there was no alternative but to submit.

At the quarterly meeting held in the month of June, Mr. O again introduced the subject, which was decidedly opposed on account of the strong feeling which existed in the Society against any alteration and it was considered as finally settled that no alteration should be made. On 8th February last, the Trustees, Stewards and Leaders were again called together to take into consideration a message from the District Meeting, the result will be found in the Minute sent herewith.

A copy of the Minute referred to was offered to Mr. O when in Launceston but he, without stating any reason, refused to receive it. Although no District communication was ever made by us to the last District Meeting, we have no doubt but the circumstances now stated were mentioned in the Meeting by Messrs. Orton and Manton. We cannot therefore understand how you will come to such a decision or what reason you would have for utterly disregarding our feelings and opinions. By our Trust Deed, we find that alteration as to times or additions of Public Worship in our Chapel are to be regulated by
the Rules of Pacification in the Minutes of the Conference held in the year 1795 which takes the matter entirely out of your hands.\footnote{171}{The Plan of Pacification was adopted in 1795 and gave power to the Chapel Trustees, Stewards and Class Leaders in a Wesleyan Methodist Society to decide when and if the Sacrament should be administered.}

The fourth clause in the minute states that the administration of Baptism, the Burial of the Dead and Service in Church hours shall be determined according to regulations above mentioned referring to the first clause, which states that the matter therein shall be decided by the Chapel on the one hand and the majority of Stewards and Leaders belonging to the Chapel. (The best qualified to give the sense of the people.) On the other hand, subject only to the 11th clause which directs that the officiating Preachers shall read either the service of the Established Church, our venerable father’s abridgement or at least the lines appointed by the calendar and in the concluding part of the Minute as if to put an end to all doubt it is stated as follows. Thus beloved brethren have we done our utmost to satisfy every point and unite the whole – you by your Trustees on the one hand and your proper representatives the Leaders and the Stewards on the other are to determine concerning the introduction of sacraments or service in church hours.

In strict compliance with, although ignorance of, the Minutes of the Conference, the Trustees, Leaders and Stewards of the Launceston Chapel have determined that the lesson appointed by the calendar only shall be read and with them our Minister has complied. We now beg that there may be no further discussion on the subject and that our present form of conducting the Services which has proved so acceptable and beneficial to the Society may be continued.

We are Rev. Sirs
Your Brethren the Lord

Peter Jacob
Henry Reed
Isaac Sherwin
Henry Jennings
Henry Gurr
James Fenton
John Williams
John Smith
J.W. Gleadow.\footnote{172}{Minutes of Special Meeting of Preachers of the Van Diemen’s Land District, 5 June 1837. NS 499-15, AOT. Letters to WMMC, Notes of Special Meeting from the Rev. J. Orton, 23 June 1837, AJCP, M121.}

The two solicitor attorneys who had signed the document, John Gleadow and Henry Jennings, had obviously framed it with reference to the Plan of Pacification. Eight days later, a patronising letter from Orton and Simpson was sent to the brethren at Launceston stating that 'the
document had not emanated from a Meeting recognised by the Superintendent, but owing to the youthful state of the Society and their lack of experience with the ways of Methodism, the informality would be passed over’.

In this lengthy letter Orton refuted the Launceston group’s interpretation of the Rules of Pacification and bridled at what he called ‘this right of direction and litigation implied in the Launceston document’. He promised to wait for the decision of the Conference and hoped to avoid ‘a wound in the breast of any of our esteemed brethren in Launceston renowned for their kindness, liberality and piety’. Orton was in a dilemma. He suspected that he was beginning to lose ground and was aware that the financial prospects of the Launceston Mission could be jeopardised by his intransigence. In a face saving measure he finally admonished ‘to beware of the spirit of litigation calculated to injure the tone and operation of the great law of Christian love’.

Even two years later in January 1839 Orton admitted to the WMMC, that he had not succeeded in introducing the liturgy to the Launceston Chapel, and if it could be done without endangering the prospects of that interesting Society, he would follow the Committee’s instructions. The WMMC had been surprisingly mild in their approach to the problem. Their view, born now of long missionary experience, had taught them a certain amount of compromise, and they advised the soft pedal approach to Orton. John Manton outlined the feeling in his diary entry for 19 April 1838: ‘This has been a long and painful business and the people resent it. Whilst I was at Launceston it disturbed our quiet. I think however the matter is settled’. Manton knew the Launceston group and had affirmed, back in 1835 ‘their liberality is unparalleled in the history of Methodism’.

The extent of the bitterness towards Orton is revealed in a frank correspondence, in 1839, from the Rev. John Waterhouse who had come
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to Hobart as General Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions in Australia and Polynesia. Like others, he clashed with Orton and he received violent protests about Orton from the Hobart Society, who said ‘that they had only kept together by the hope of my arrival’. Ministerial correspondence back to the WMMC often provided a vehicle for venting ministerial spleen against all and sundry.

Waterhouse revealed something of Orton’s mental state at the time by his comment ‘Mr. Orton’s so short in the temper department and so zealous of his honour that I fear he will try to thwart me’. John Dunn, leading Wesleyan Methodist in Hobart, warned Orton to keep ‘a watch over the door of his lips’. It is interesting to see the Launceston Society’s magnanimity towards Orton in the following correspondence. It was magnanimity overlaid with control. The Launceston Group had wished to transfer the Rev. W. Simpson, because his wife’s alcoholism brought shame to the Society. Reed offered to have Orton in the Society’s plan, stating ‘We have all been grieved with Mr. Orton about the prayer question and especially the way he treated us, but we have heard that our Hobart friends want to exclude him from the Chapel. Mr. Orton apologised to us for his conduct and said we should never hear again from him on the subject of the Liturgy. I would write to him and say he might come to us if the Hobart Town friends would not let him stay’.

Waterhouse was pragmatic and saw the Liturgy Question for what it was. But he was fully cognisant of the fact that ‘there are several wealthy, intelligent and deeply pious men in the Society with a resolution to keep all the chapels out of debt, it is truly astonishing. The manner in which the prayer question was conducted nearly upset the whole concern. Being young, they require affectionate and firm management’. Here was the difficulty of enforcing policy decisions for the ministers when there was such a long turn around in correspondence with the WMMC in London. In a sense, if challenged, they had no immediate support and were
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isolated. The Launceston group took the challenge to ministerial authority a step further when they protested to Waterhouse about the use of Class Book Regulations. They said ‘These laws are for England. We are responsible to the Conference alone and none of you have the right to say “What doest thou”. Also our Quarterly Meetings are a farce, you had better do away with them altogether’. Waterhouse had found the Launceston Society a strong confident one, albeit an infant one. Liberal and generous in their actions, far beyond any other in colonial society, they retained power to challenge ministerial authority over the subject of the Anglican liturgy. Waterhouse complained that they were ‘a people little used to home plans and he asked for some copies of Laws and Bye Laws of Wesleyan Methodism’.

The Launceston Society possibly viewed liturgy differently, and in *A Little Heaven Below*, Lester Ruth asks us to see the people themselves as the primary liturgical document. Launceston’s dynamic lay liturgy was in the shape of class meetings, band meetings, watch nights and love feasts, all topped up occasionally with the revival. Their remark that their Quarterly Meetings were a farce was in direct contrast to the American experience, described by Ruth, where early Methodist Quarterly Meetings attached themselves to camp meetings and turned into very large, noisy, two day worship and fellowship meetings. Ruth considers that ‘they were a crucial liturgical setting for the American Methodists and serve today as an appropriate lens to focus on their worship’.

The birth pangs of colonial Methodism can be seen in the liturgical dispute in the Launceston Society. They were following their own inclinations and adapting to the society in which they were placed. The social mix of the Society was diverse and in the main the members seemed comfortable with the warmth, exuberance, spontaneity and excitement of love feasts, watch nights and revival. The members, particularly emancipists, were all able to express themselves, and the Society appeared
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to steer a path between this element and the more sober functions and
discipline of the Society.

The wealthy elite were pious and humble but when challenged they
struck back, supremely confident of their position and power. They were
in a sense flag bearers for colonial Wesleyan Methodism and they oversaw
a Wesleyan Methodism that was devoted to its British Methodist roots but
which shed its Anglican overlap.

**Speculation**

There were two considerations for the elite of the Launceston
Wesleyan Methodists in the founding of Port Phillip. They viewed it as a
missionary outreach to be supported, and they specifically disassociated
themselves from any form of speculation regarding the new colony. Philip
Oakden is an example of the last consideration. Both these concepts will
be examined in the last portion of this chapter, and only the support and
initial push which the Society gave will be examined. 187

The purchase of land at legitimate land sales was not regarded as
speculation by the Wesleyan Methodists, but the joining of uncertain
sheep ventures and seizing of new territories in Port Phillip was regarded
as speculation by Oakden. A typical legitimate and adventurous land
search occurred in March 1835, when Oakden embarked on an eight day
trip to the north east of Van Diemen’s Land with Henry Reed, searching
for suitable land to be purchased from the Government at $5 per acre.
John Batman, friend of Reed, had lent the two men five of his Sydney
blacks for the excursion, but three of them vanished leaving only two in
the party. Reed and Oakden were eight days without seeing habitation,
and, as Oakden told Osmond Gilles, ‘You would be surprised how little
food I could do without, being altogether in the open air and continuing
so healthy’. 188 It is of interest also to note that George Palmer Ball and
Theodore Bartley, amongst others, wrote to the Secretary for the Colonies
in August 1834 asking to be allowed to purchase a number of acres on the
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Southern Coast of New Holland, between the longitudes 135° and 153°, at five shillings per acre. Though these two had not yet been converted to Wesleyan Methodism, they were not speculating, but offering to buy land.\(^{189}\)

In the wider business community the word speculation was regarded with suspicion particularly for Wesleyan Methodists. Once Philip Oakden referred to John Eddie, a Launceston auctioneer, as ‘speculative, don’t go in too deep with him’.\(^{190}\) Wesleyans of the period were very mindful of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference’s advice ‘that they were to run contrary to the spirit of the times by eschewing all schemes and speculations’.\(^{191}\) This is the tightrope that the wealthy Wesleyan Methodist had to tread. Money making was approved of, but risky speculative schemes were not, and speculation led to bankruptcy. Oakden was certainly conscious of the movement to Port Phillip as he noted in May 1835: ‘Mr. Batman of Ben Lomond is about having a vessel and purposes going to Port Phillip directly to sheep farm on an extensive scale, joined by several others with money, but to be the sole manager. He is arranging for sailing next week accompanied by the Sydney blacks and a few others’.\(^{192}\) By September 1835, Oakden’s attitude to speculation is revealed in his correspondence. After noting that the opposite coast of New Holland was exciting considerable interest, he wrote:

> Several influential and monied men are connected with it. Mr. Batman has sold his property and land in the colony for upwards of ten thousand pounds. He has chartered the *Norval* to take his stock. She makes her trip in about a fortnight and I propose to avail myself of Mr. Batman’s offer to accompany him. I am informed the land is very fine. I have taken no interest in the undertaking but consider the tenor of which the land is held to be too speculative.\(^{193}\)

\(^{189}\) F.P. Labilliere, *Early History of the Colony of Victoria from its Discovery to its Establishment as a self governing Province of the British Empire* (London, 1876), Vol. 2, p. 36.

\(^{190}\) Oakden to Osmond Gilles, 13 June 1835, Oakden Letter Book.

\(^{191}\) *Minutes of the Methodist Conferences from the First, held in London by the Late Rev. J. Wesley in 1744* (Thomas Cordeux, London), 1812-1932 Conference Minutes, IX, 1836.

\(^{192}\) Oakden to John Gardiner, 2 May 1835, Oakden Letter Book.

\(^{193}\) Batman’s Deeds of Conveyance where he purchased 600,000 acres from the Port Phillip aborigines on 6 June were what Philip Oakden considered to be too tenuous and speculative.
They may be remunerated in a few years if they are free from the ravages of the natives, molestation from the Government and quarrelling amongst themselves.\footnote{Oakden to Gardiner, 20 September 1835, Oakden Letter Book.}

In correspondence with Osmond Gilles in the same week, Oakden reiterated ‘that the undertaking of Port Phillip is way too speculative’.\footnote{Oakden to Osmond Gilles, 20 September 1835, Oakden Letter Book.} The undertaking belonged to the Port Phillip Association who hoped to acquire large tracts of land in Port Phillip by purchase from the Aborigines.\footnote{A.G.L. Shaw, \textit{A History of the Port Phillip District: Victoria Before Separation} (Melbourne, 1996), pp. 44-66.} John Batman was supported in the Port Phillip Association by J.T. Gellibrand, the Association’s solicitor, who had the responsibility of drawing up the Deeds of the Association.\footnote{Other members of the Association were Charles Swanston, banker Hobart Town, Henry Arthur, nephew of Lieutenant Governor Arthur and Collector of Customs Launceston; Thomas Bannister, Sheriff Hobart Town; James Simpson, Commissioner Caveat Board Hobart Town; John and William Robertson drapers Hobart Town; William Gardner Sams, Deputy Sheriff Launceston; John Sinclair, Overseer of Convicts Launceston; Anthony Cotterill, Chief District Constable, Launceston; Michael Connolly, merchant Launceston and agent of John Gore, London; John Thomas Collicott, Postmaster General, Hobart Town and George Duncan Mercer, retired Major, Edinburgh, Robert Douglas Boys, \textit{First Years of Port Phillip} (Melbourne 1935), pp., 40 – 41.}

John Gardiner, ex-store keeper at Ross, past employee of the Bank of Van Diemen’s Land and prospective overlander to Port Phillip\footnote{At the end of December 1837, Joseph Hawdon, John Gardiner and John Hepburn were the first overlanders to arrive at the settlement of Port Phillip with 300 head of cattle they had driven from the Murrumbidgee.} approached Oakden to join in a sheep speculation to Port Phillip, but Oakden declined. As well as his Wesleyan Methodist fears of speculation, Oakden was terrified of it because of his past experience with bankruptcy. Additionally, he was handling for the greater part, someone else’s money, namely that of Robert Gardner of Manchester. John Gardiner was a cousin of William Fletcher, Oakden’s great friend, who had travelled out to Van Diemen’s Land with him on the \textit{Forth} in 1833\footnote{Fletcher lived with Oakden at Stydd House in High Street Launceston prior to marriage. Gardiner was probably very aware of Oakden’s reserves of money because of his cousin William Fletcher. William Fletcher was later Colonial Inspector for the Union Bank of Australia.}. Reed was involved with Batman as a friend and to the extent of lending him some £6,000 in April 1836 for his Port Phillip activities. This was certainly lent as a business contract with £3,000 to be paid within two years and the remaining £3,000
to be paid at ten per cent interest.\textsuperscript{200} Oakden’s Letter Books show no sign of missionary concern for Port Phillip, possibly because he was concerned about his return trip to London when he left on 12 March 1836 on the \textit{Alexander Johnson}.

\textbf{Port Phillip Mission}

The missionary push to Port Phillip and support came from other members of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist wealthy elite and it is important to remember that, the Society was on the cusp of its first revival. The Rev. J.A. Manton captured the group’s energy and enthusiasm when he wrote: ‘We have many hearts, who while they are thankful for what they have done, regard it almost as nothing and anxiously look for greater things and appear determined not to rest until it is done’.\textsuperscript{201} In 1835, when Joseph Orton had visited Launceston, he encouraged missionary enthusiasm by reading ‘extracts of letters from Tonga relating circumstances of revival in the islands’.\textsuperscript{202} With their own impending revival, the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were bristling with enthusiasm to support a new Aboriginal mission and Port Phillip provided the opportunity.

According to Rex Harcourt, John Helder Wedge was the first member of the Port Phillip Association to refer to the possibility of leading the Aborigines to embrace the advantages of religion, but offers no documentary evidence.\textsuperscript{203} Alex Tyrrell in his work about Joseph Orton cites Governor Arthur as suggesting a fund for an Aboriginal mission to Port Phillip on 3 January 1836, but also neglects a reference.\textsuperscript{204} The original manuscript correspondence of the Port Phillip Association reveals the cynicism of the group towards the Aborigines. The Association’s concerns centred only about their claims for grazing land and Aboriginal cooperation. There was certainly a report to Arthur called ‘The Scheme for civilizing and bringing aid and industrious habits to the Aborigines of New
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Holland’ and this mentioned ‘a knowledge and blessing of religion’. This report would appear to have been one of the necessary tools for convincing the Lieutenant Governor of their cause. John Wedge referred to it ‘as strengthening our claims for confirmation of the land’. Gellibrand had also taken up the idea of religious zeal and professed ‘brotherly love for the Aborigines’, after previously advocating hostile measures to the blacks to ‘eat them out or drive them out’.

James Simpson was suspicious of Gellibrand’s and Batman’s motives with regard to religious zeal. He wrote to Wedge ‘little George may like to hear this, but he is not to be gulled by it either’. Tyrrell is correct about Lieutenant Governor Arthur suggesting a missionary fund in early January 1836 to Wedge (possibly because Wedge appeared to be the most sincere member of the Port Phillip Association). Arthur pointed out ‘the advantages likely to result to the Aborigines of Port Phillip by offering them religious instructions and the propriety of despatching a mission which could be furthered by private pecuniary contributions’. Wedge asked the Committee to think about the proposal and communicate with Arthur, promising at the same time his own assistance.

This was Arthur at his Evangelical best, and his partners in the project were not to be the Port Phillip Association but the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist wealthy elite. Bonding with Arthur in the penal redemptive process, they were now to bond in a real missionary venture. Some formal communication must have passed between Lieutenant Governor Arthur and the Launceston Wesleyans or the Port Phillip

---

205 Report to Lieutenant Governor Arthur from Port Phillip Association, 3 November 1835, Port Phillip Papers, MS 9142, Book 113/11. SLV.
206 J. Wedge to Jas. Simpson, 11 August 1835, MS 1438 – MS 1447, Port Phillip Papers, SLV.
207 Jas. Simpson to J. Batman, Port Phillip, 17 September 1835, MS 9142, Book 113/11, Port Phillip Papers, SLV.
208 James Simpson, 1792-1857, arrived in Van Diemen's Land in 1825. He was made the magistrate at Norfolk Plains and later at Campbell Town. In 1832 he was made Commissioner of the Land Board in Hobart. He joined the Port Phillip Association and went to Melbourne in 1837, and in 1840 became the Police Magistrate of Melbourne. (C.A. McCallum, ‘James Simpson (1792-1857)’, Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol. 2 (Melbourne, 1967), p. 447.)
209 James Simpson to J.H. Wedge, 19 June 1835, MS 9142, Box 113/10, Port Phillip Papers, SLV. (Little George referred to Lieutenant Governor George Arthur).
210 J. Wedge to the Committee of Management of the Port Phillip Association, 3 January 1836, M1443, Port Phillip Papers, SLV.
Association and the Launceston Wesleyans to produce Orton’s reaction by the end of January in Sydney.

Orton told the Colonial Office that he had received information of a favourable opening of a new settlement at Bass Strait named Port Phillip, opposite Launceston.\(^\text{211}\) Some days later he told the WMMC of the favourable opening at Port Phillip and the number of Aborigines. He referred to ‘the opulent friends of Launceston who take an interest in the undertaking. If it is desirable to establish there the several friends will pledge themselves £200 - £400 per annum towards the support of two missionaries’.\(^\text{212}\) This concrete offer from the wealthy Wesleyan Methodist elite was a promise of consecrated wealth allied to a very real missionary endeavour, and it was an answer to Arthur’s plea for private pecuniary contributions.

The question has to be asked, where did the impetus come from for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists to solidly embrace the missionary concept by the end of January 1836? It would seem that some other spark had ignited the wealthy elite by the end of January 1836 other than Lieutenant Governor Arthur’s fund, and this leads into the well known controversy of when did Henry Reed visit Port Phillip. Reed asserted that he had done so in the spring of 1835 and reiterated this fact strongly throughout his life.\(^\text{213}\) The correspondence surrounding the topic is large, without any final direct evidence besides Reed’s own statement.\(^\text{214}\)


\(^{212}\) Orton to General Secretaries WMMC, 30 January 1836, District Despatch Book, 1826 – 35, A1716,1-2 ML.

\(^{213}\) In a letter in 1877 to Thomas Umphelby, a former whaling employee, Reed states categorically ‘I preached the first sermon in Melbourne in the spring of 1835, there were only two huts, Batman’s and Fawkner’s, and I think a shepherd’s. My congregation was Henry Batman, Batman’s brother, Buckley and three Sydney blacks’; (Henry Reed, Launceston to Thomas Umphelby c/- Chas. Umphelby, 60 Collins Street, Melbourne, 1 October 1877, Hudson Fysh Papers, State Library of Tasmania, Launceston Branch, LMSS 0049, Box 1/2, 0049/2/-; the Rev. Irving Benson was a strong supporter of the concept that Henry Reed did indeed visit Port Phillip in the spring of 1835 as it dovetailed with Benson’s wish that the Centenary of Methodism in Victoria be celebrated in 1935 when his book was published. See C. Irving Benson, *A Century of Victorian Methodism* (Melbourne, 1935), pp. 28-30.

\(^{214}\) Without going into the details of the controversy, it is indeed possible that Henry Reed went to Port Phillip and gained knowledge of the Port Phillip aborigines in the time frame laid out by Ida Leeson, Librarian of the Mitchell Library, Sydney, who stated that ‘there is a possible time frame between 16 October and 18 November 1835 when Reed could have gone to Port Phillip’; (Ida Leeson, Mitchell Library to
Orton did not arrive in Hobart until February 1836 and it took the next few months before he did anything practical about the Port Phillip mission. What is not highlighted was his extreme reluctance to embark on the project. Tyrrell certainly refers to the opulent friends willing to donate money to the mission, but also confusingly says that these friends were involved in setting up the colony. Tyrrell confuses the word ‘friends’ as being the Port Phillip Association rather than the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. As has been already pointed out, the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were interested only in distancing themselves from speculation, and desiring to support a mission to the Aborigines. Harcourt certainly avers that ‘Orton had no prior intention of going to Port Phillip, but Reed’s enthusiasm and offer of a free passage changed his mind’.

Orton visited Reed’s farm at Norfolk Plains in early April and found ‘that his mind was greatly exercised about proceeding to Port Phillip’. The next day more pressure was brought to bear by the Rev. J.A. Manton, Reed and John Gleadow, who agreed that Orton had to go. Reluctantly Orton confessed ‘I feel some doubt as to the advantages to be derived from my visit, but I believe I am in the way of Providence and that my proceeding will be attended by initial benefits’. After staying with Gleadow overnight, Orton was bundled off to Georgetown with John Batman and his wife to board the Caledonian to Port Phillip and he wrote: ‘Considering the situation I am placed as public Chairman, the instructions from the Committee and the opinion and advice of my friends, I cannot see my way clear to relinquish the undertaking’.

---

G.B. Minns, Historian Methodist Church, Melbourne, 7 July 1937, G.B. Minns Box 2/5.1, Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania). What was largely unknown in 1937 was that Henry Reed could have taken Philip Oakden’s berth on the Norval. The ship was meant to leave on 22 October 1835 and set sail on 24 October 1835 but due to unfavourable winds, the boat could not clear from George Town until 5 November, arriving in Hobsons Bay, Port Phillip, on 9 November. There is every indication from Philip Oakden’s Letter Books that he had to relinquish his own important passage, owing to the delay of twelve days, and the fact that his nephew Frederick Wigan suddenly became dangerously ill. (Anne and Robin Bailey, Early Tasmanian Story, pp. 40-42.)

215 Tyrrell, Sphere of Benevolence, p. 132.
216 Harcourt, Southern Invasion, p. 83.
217 Orton Journal, 5 April 1836, A1714.5, ML.
218 Orton Journal, 6 April 1836, A1714.5, ML.
219 Orton Journal, 7 April 1836, A1714.5, ML.
Orton's voyage and time in Port Phillip has been widely detailed by others, but the purpose of this portion of this thesis has been to show that it was the wealthy elite of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists headed by Henry Reed plus Lieutenant Governor Arthur, who initiated the mission to Port Phillip and who forced Orton to comply with the project.

In this chapter the egalitarian fabric of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society has been demonstrated, backed by a small demographic sampling, and the strategising of the new Society with all its components has been discussed. The important feature of consecration of wealth has been shown to be largely based on land donations and money for chapel building, and this discussion has been broadened to show how the self-help spirit was a factor common to many Launceston denominations. The power of the Launceston wealthy elite has been examined through a discussion of the Liturgy Struggle with the Rev. Joseph Orton, and their support for the Wesleyan Methodist, John Crookes. Finally it has been shown how the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite helped to extend their consecrated wealth to missionary outreach to the aborigines of Port Phillip, thus fulfilling all the basic missionary injunctions.
Chapter 5

Status, Commercial Interests, Banking

Introduction

This chapter initially aims to establish the status and commercial and civic standing of the elite Wesleyan Methodist group in Launceston in the 1830s. It is necessary to establish this status to make sense of the phenomenon that ran in parallel with this status, the Wesleyan Methodist involvement in banking. This involvement was a unique occurrence both in a global colonial setting and in England. In the early nineteenth century, Wesleyan Methodists lacked the status to achieve such involvement. This statement will be backed up and clarified in the section on banking.

The first criterion to establish the status of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite is a section on land and property ownership and transactions. The concept of what land and property ownership meant in colonial Launceston will be discussed and a table drawn up to detail the land transactions of the elite group with some others. The data has been derived from the Registry of Deeds, Lands Department, Hobart, and the period covered is 1830—50. Various individual transactions are discussed whilst indicating the general nature of the survey.

The concept and understanding of status is confirmed and widened in the next segment which discusses membership of Jury Lists in the period. The social and civic cachet applied to Special Jurors in Launceston is described and shown to be a reinforcing element. Philanthropic and civic involvement of the Wesleyan Methodist elite is then discussed in an attempt to demonstrate how such involvement was another stepping stone to a position of note in society. The benefits of philanthropy and divine obligation are shown to be a two-edged sword resulting in prestige and status. This
section stresses the credibility that came from the membership of such societies, a credibility that fitted such men to hold the position of bank director.

The individual commercial interests of some specific elite Wesleyan Methodists will then be examined and will be counterbalanced by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists on the next rung down. This lower rung has been added to show how the patronage and influence of the elite was a necessary element in Wesleyan Methodist Society. The individual examination of such figures as Henry Jennings and John Gleadow relies heavily on contemporary newspaper extracts from the *Cornwall Chronicle* and the *Launceston Advertiser* and reveals another view of these status figures. These two men were accused of rapacity and financial exploitation and, though their standing in the community was not really affected, the section shows Henry Jennings' conscience was disturbed by the accusations.

Having established the concept of the elite's status in Launceston, the chapter moves into the general development of banking from 1828 to 1840. The reader is given an explanation of the existing economic and financial structure in Van Diemen's Land, alongside the currency and developmental capital difficulties. A banking chart has been drawn up showing Wesleyan Methodist involvement from 1823. Each bank's date of formation is shown with each of its directors. Wesleyan Methodist directors are emphasised in bold. The other directors are shown in order to illustrate how the Wesleyan Methodist elite stood alongside the perceived quality of the town on the upper rung of society. This quality had a heavy merchant emphasis.

The apotheosis of Wesleyan Methodist banking involvement is demonstrated by Henry Reed's directorship of the Anglo Imperial bank, The Bank of Australasia, and the part that Philip Oakden played in establishing the imperial joint stock bank, The Union Bank of Australia, as well as being a director. The establishment of The Union Bank of Australia is important for this thesis as it reveals the
possibilities that presented themselves for one Wesleyan Methodist merchant to be involved and to seize his opportunity, using the Wesleyan Methodist qualities of persistence, networking and piety. The establishment of the bank demands a lengthy explanation. This is done with an emphasis on pious evangelical networks, joint stock banking history, the Manchester cotton masters, Anglo imperial banks and merchant influences. One of the benefits of this chapter is to show how the hawk-like watchful, merchant influence described in Chapter 3 came back full circle with the establishment of the Union Bank of Australia.

Status

Land Dealings

Evidence of Wesleyan Methodist status and community standing needs to be illustrated in a number of different ways. This examination of Wesleyan Methodist land purchases is a new tool for viewing Wesleyans in their setting. No sense of this has been previously employed by Methodist historians. The prevailing attitude to land ownership in Van Diemen’s Land at the time was summed up by the *Launceston Advertiser* in 1834 thus:

There is nothing like land, this is the vernacular cry. It is the feeling which sends men from old established parts of the earth to the wild parts of new countries, the desire to be independent – land and property which man can transmit with increased value. The settler in Van Diemen’s Land risked his all in the remotest corner of the globe.¹

Allen B. Robertson suggests that it was property ‘that defined the Wesleyan Methodists in Nova Scotia and placed them in the upper rungs of society’.²

Land and property ownership meant prestige within a country, and particularly in Van Diemen’s Land. Individual economic prosperity was often defined in an emerging society such as

¹ *Launceston Advertiser*, 7 August 1834.
Launceston by ownership of land and property, and this section will explore some eight to twelve Wesleyan Methodist figures and their land holdings to place them commercially in the town setting. The opportunity was there for these men in a new society to obtain parcels of land, which would not have been available to them in the old world of Britain. Land and property purchases were completely permissible within the Wesleyan Methodist framework of investment, although, like other financial investments, it was not to become an overweening entity, as in Henry Jennings’ case.

Sellars describes the American Methodists in Ohio in 1807 ‘who bought and improved land, embracing the opportunities for commercial agriculture’. The Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite were in effect reacting to the local economic reality and embracing the existing economic situation. Land and property purchases were a form of investment and particularly in Van Diemen’s Land, where property ownership had been lionised from first settlement. The system of free land grants had been the lure that had tempted free settlers to emigrate. Some of these settlers were possibly either the people the Land Commissioners referred to as ‘that class of people … hard working tenants at home, who found that their labours went to the landlord’, or what Sharon Morgan refers to as ‘the ambitious, avaricious men of Van Diemen’s Land casting their eyes around for more land’. Morgan details the history of free land grants in Van Diemen’s Land which first commenced in 1804, and she demonstrates in a table that the years of greatest activity for land grants were 1813, 1817 and 1823. Official records show between 1824 and 1831 1,457,461 acres had been granted and sold.

---

7 Lands of Tasmania, compiled from Official records of the Survey Department by order of the Honorable the Colonial Treasurer, Survey Department (Hobart, n.d.), p.35.
Under the 1825 regulations, land sales as an alternative to free grants were introduced, but seldom was Crown land sold when it was still available freely. Land sales and the abolition of free grants were introduced in 1831, where sales were to be by public auction at not less than five shillings an acre.\(^8\) After examining biographical and other index files in the Archives Office of Tasmania, it can be shown that eleven out of nineteen Launceston Wesleyan Methodists in the following list received free land grants before 1831. They were George Palmer Ball, Theodore Bartley,\(^9\) Charles Chilcott, Patrick Dalrymple, John Ward Gleadow, George Gould, William Gray, Benjamin Horne, Samuel Horton, Henry Jennings and Henry Reed. Reed had received 640 acres at the Nile Rivulet and Ball, who had arrived in December 1831, as the free land grants were closing, had finally obtained 2,560 acres in 1833. The largest grant to the Wesleyans was to Gray who received 2,560 acres in 1827 and an additional 2,560 acres in October 1828. Similarly, Benjamin Horne received 2,000 acres and Samuel Horton received 1,000 acres in 1823 and 800 acres in 1828. Henry Jennings received 500 acres in April 1824 and another 500 acres in November 1827. Gleadow applied for and received 2,000 acres in 1825 and was refused another grant in 1831.

With these facts in mind, Table 1 can be examined. Some four or five lesser Wesleyan Methodist figures such as Peter Jacob, Charles Chilcott, Samuel Dowsett, John Drysdale and George Gould have been included, though their land involvement was not large; they have been included as a contrast to the wealthier Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite. Figures in the Table are a general indication of the individual person’s involvement in land. Figures have been derived from the Index to Memorials held in the Registry of Deeds, Hobart. Without a close examination of the individual

---

\(^8\) Letter B.W. Wray, State Librarian to Hudson Fysh, Query no. 1963/10, 9 Jan. 1963, LMSS 0049, Box 1/2, 0049/2/-, Hudson Fysh Papers, State Library of Tasmania, Launceston Branch.

\(^9\) Theodore Bartley was not admitted as a Wesleyan Methodist until October 1838, Minute Book of Quarterly Meetings, NS499/928, AOT.
Memorials, the figures provided in the table are not necessarily precise. For example, a name on a memorial is often teamed with two others, whose names are not spelt out in the index, so this detracts from 100% accuracy.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Purchase /Sold</th>
<th>1830 -- 1840</th>
<th>1841--1850</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town/Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Allotments</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball, George Palmer</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartley, Theodore</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcott, Charles</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookes, John</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalrymple, Patrick</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowsett, Samuel</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drysdale, John</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladow, John</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, George</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, William</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heazlewood, Joseph</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location Town/ Country</td>
<td>Purchase /Sold</td>
<td>1830 -- --1840 No. Allotments</td>
<td>1841-- --1850 No. Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne, Benjamin</td>
<td>Town S 5 P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton, Samuel</td>
<td>Town S 4 P 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, Peter</td>
<td>Town S 6 P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, Henry</td>
<td>Town P 32 S 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakden, Philip</td>
<td>Town P 19 S 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, Henry</td>
<td>Town P 13 S 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwin, Isaac</td>
<td>Town P 16 S 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyson, William</td>
<td>Town P 5 S 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures Derived from Index to Memorials, Registry of Deeds, Hobart.

The other reason why the table is only a general indication is because an individual may have received a free land grant before 1831 and a purchased grant after 1831. It is not possible in this table to determine which sales of land would have been actually portions of the owner's original land grant and not necessarily part of the
argument about Wesleyan Methodists buying and selling for investment. It is important therefore to understand that, in the table, the land being sold could have been free land grant, purchased land grant or land acquired from another by Memorial under the General Law of Land. Many of the Wesleyan Methodists who received large land grants were pastoralists like Samuel Horton, Benjamin Horne, George Palmer Ball and William Gray. Others like John Ward Gleadow and Henry Jennings were a combination of lawyer, merchant and pastoralist.

The appearance of John Crookes in the table is deceptive as he had only five land transaction in his formative period before 1850. When he was at the height of his powers after 1850 and until his death in 1870, he had one hundred and forty land transactions. Similarly, William Tyson, a lesser rung Wesleyan, had only seven land transactions up until 1850, but after that, when he had improved his position, he had thirty land transactions.

The air of Wesleyan anxiety is raised by Henry Jennings about too much land and property ownership, when he wrote in January 1836 that ‘I am far too engrossed by the world. I have entered too largely into the purchase of property and am encumbered with too many things’.¹⁰ This was the anxiety ever present in the Wesleyan Methodist business mind on how to achieve Wesleyan moderation in business and investment. Despite the agonised avowals of Henry Jennings, he emerges as the Wesleyan Methodist most occupied in land transactions and purchases. In the matter of land purchases and sales by Philip Oakden, one should not lose sight of the fact that he was at all times investing two or more streams of money, his own and Robert Gardner’s. Which source of money was being used is inevitably blurred in the records. As is stated in a Memorandum of Agreement in 1852, after Oakden’s death, between William Atkinson Gardner (Robert Gardner’s son) and Georgiana Oakden, ‘Philip

¹⁰ Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary, 3 January 1836, Jennings Family Papers, MS9432, SLV.
Oakden was possessed of several pieces of land in which Robert Gardner was beneficially interested'.

The two highlight purchases for Philip Oakden and Henry Reed were their country properties, the defining status of gentlemen. In Henry Reed’s case, he purchased Wesley Dale (Native Hut Corner) on 30 September 1836, a property of some 2,560 acres (four square miles) from Lieutenant Travers Hartley Vaughan, a retired military man. Philip Oakden purchased Bentley, which was at Chudleigh near the Mole Creek caves. Oakden purchased this from Henry Reed on 31 July 1828, some 1,500 acres. This was obviously purchased with Gardner’s money, and he told Gardner that ‘the land was considerably higher, colder and wetter like the English climate. It will take a considerable sum to stock it, fence and drain. I propose occupying it myself and ultimately letting off parts of it for small dairy and grazing farms’. Oakden explained to Gardner that originally Henry Reed had purchased the property for his father-in-law at the Bank Coffee House in London, but the option was not taken up, so Reed sold it to Oakden at a profit of £200.

One aspect to notice in the table is that in the period 1841-4, the period of gross economic depression in Van Diemen’s Land, land transactions did not falter for Oakden, Jennings and Gleadow. Henry Reed’s transactions for the period were small, twenty nine in all, but this was the result of being abroad at the time. Oakden had seventy-five transactions, Jennings had fifty-six and Gleadow ninety-nine. Particularly in the case of Gleadow and Oakden, their transactions took on an urgency, no doubt fuelled by the availability of properties in the depression. The comparatively low figures for Henry Jennings in the economically depressed period probably reflect his guilt as

---

11 Memorial of Agreement between Georgiana Oakden and others, 22 February 1852, Philip Oakden correspondence file, AOT.
12 Different versions appear as to why Oakden’s property was called Bentley, but it was more than likely named after Bentley Hall where Oakden lived at Longford, Derbyshire. (See Anne and Robin Bailey, An Early Tasmanian Story with the Oakden’s, Cowies, Parramores, Tullocks and Hogs (Melbourne, 2004), p. 1.)
13 Assignment of Deeds, Registry Index, Philip Oakden.
14 Philip Oakden to Robert Gardner, 15 May 1838, Letter Book Philip Oakden, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
much as anything else, as evinced in his spiritual diary. Between 1830 and 1840, he had 200 transactions, an extraordinary amount.

It is also essential to understand that Jennings and Gleadow were in the perfect and powerful position to be aware of the property market. As mentioned in the individual commercial profiles in this chapter, they often acted almost as real estate agents themselves, constantly advertising in the 1830s properties for lease or sale through their offices. One such was in 1837 when Jennings was agent for sale of 600 acres at St. George’s River and 298 acres at Georges’s Bay. Similarly, Jennings advertised the Talisker Estate of 500 acres in 1839. Additionally, both Gleadow and Jennings were in the perfect position to have first pickings so to speak; a situation of both opportunity and, in Jennings’ case, temptation. These opportunities could also have been shared with fellow Wesleyan Methodists such as Oakden and Reed.

George Palmer Ball had been involved with John Leake’s son Robert in offering to open up the coast of South Australia in the mid-1830s from Portland to Port Lincoln on the proviso that they could purchase 8,500 acres from the Crown at five shillings per acre. Ball, who had been ‘held up as an example of magnificent Christian piety in Van Diemen’s Land, better than in any part of the British Empire’, also had an insatiable thirst for land.

---

15 *Launceston Advertiser*, 12 October 1837.
16 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 30 March 1839.
17 It is noteworthy that Philip Oakden had already been offered the Talisker estate as early as August 1835 by Major McLeod but had declined the offer. (P. Oakden to Major McLeod, 20 Aug. 1835, Letter Book Philip Oakden, NS474, NS1290, AOT).
19 W. Mann, ‘Vindication of Van Diemen’s Land in a Cursory Glance at her Colonists as they are, NOT as they are represented to be, London 1840’, in *Six Years Residence in the Australian Provinces, Old England* (London, 21 December 1839), p. 63.
Jury Lists

Confirmation of status in Launceston also stemmed from membership of Jury Lists. Castles notes that ‘the reordering of the jury system for both criminal and civil proceedings took place in several stages. In 1830, there was the Jury Act for the trial for issues of fact at common law, by civilian juries of twelve’.20 Twelve members were often difficult to enlist, and ‘a Jury Act was passed in 1834 enabling juries of four persons on a special list, to be empanelled in civil cases, and it permitted juries of twelve to be called on the application of one of the parties’.21 These special jurors were to be taken from the esquire, merchant and bank director classes. Levy confirms that ‘special jurors were selected from amongst respectable citizens of good standing in the community’.22 Low believes that the middle class, who demanded trial by jury, ‘were not motivated by ideological considerations, rather they felt these reforms would guarantee their social and economic position in the colony’.23

The Launceston Advertiser of 15 December 1836 felt that the terms demanded from the Jury Act excluded a whole body of other respectable people from jury service. Arguments about the terms esquire and merchant grumbled on through the Launceston newspapers in the 1830s as to the interpretation of the terms. The Launceston Advertiser in 1837 raised the point that ‘this was a law that seemed to vary from locality to locality’.24 In Launceston particularly, esquires were those ‘whom Judge Blackstone thought entitled to the term’.25 But these could vary in another locality like Campbell Town or Norfolk Plains; there was a wide latitude to the terms. On 7 January 1838, there was a list of protesting jurors who had been kept waiting for two days by Judge Montagu’s non

21 Ibid, pp. 274-5.
24 Launceston Advertiser, 5 January 1837.
25 Launceston Advertiser, 22 November 1838.
appearance. The list included the Wesleyan Methodists Theodore Bartley, Henry Reed, John W. Gleadow and Henry Jennings.\textsuperscript{26} The inescapable fact was that being named a juror was an acknowledgment of respectability and status.

Examination of the Tasmanian Colonial Index,\textsuperscript{27} reveals that the following Wesleyan Methodists certainly appeared in the 1835 Jury Lists (presumably as Special Jurors not Common Jurors). They were Patrick Dalrymple, John Ward Gleadow, William Gray, Benjamin Horne, Samuel Horton, Henry Jennings, Philip Oakden, Thomas Parramore, Henry Reed and Isaac Sherwin. Oddly, John Stoneham is listed on the 1835 Jury Lists and this is difficult to equate with the status of the other group. A Wesleyan Methodist cabinet maker who became insolvent in 1836, he did not fit the profile of the criteria i.e. esquire, merchant and bank director. Wesleyan Methodist Joseph Heazlewood, a Longford blacksmith with considerable property, was certainly in the 1835 Jury Lists, as was George Gould, a Wesleyan Methodist farmer from Longford. Whether Longford was considered to be part of the demanding Launceston criteria is not certain. Wesleyan Methodists who were not part of the elite group often found themselves on Jury Lists at a later date, where the criteria were not as demanding: for example Henry Gurr, 1839 Jury List, Samuel Dowsett, 1840 Jury List, Matthew Lassetter and Peter Jacob, 1842 Jury List. A Wesleyan Methodist like Charles Chilcott who had arrived in the Launceston area in 1830, after having been an early settler in the Swan River Colony with a grant of 2,800 acres, appeared on the Jury List for 1839.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{26} Launceston Advertiser, 11 January 1838.
\textsuperscript{27} This is a microfiche and compact disk index drawn from reels held both in the Mitchell Library, Sydney, and the Kiama History Group. It contains over 80,000 records of musters, jury lists, pardons, tickets of leave, colonial court records etc.
\textsuperscript{28} Chilcott biography file, State Library of Tasmania, Launceston Branch.
Philanthropic and Civic Involvement

A crop of societies was produced in the 1830s in Launceston, some philanthropic, some community oriented and some with civic involvement. All of these societies included members who were Wesleyan Methodists, some in greater numbers than others. In 1834 we can note the commencement of the Benevolent Society, the Launceston Bank for Savings, the Sunday School and the Mutual Insurance Society; 1835 produced the Infant School Society, Cornwall Auxiliary Bible Society and the Navigation of the River Tamar Committee; 1836 and 1838 saw the Association for the Suppression of Felony, the Temperance Society and the Horticultural Society; while 1839 produced the Strangers’ Friend Society.

There were various reasons for involvement in philanthropic and civic improvement societies. Participation in philanthropic, civic improvement and some religious societies was a way to gain a position of note in Launceston society, particularly in its early development. Membership was reported in the local papers and, in general, there was a social and business cachet attached to men whose names constantly appeared on the relevant societies’ committees. According to Dyster ‘Men of capital in Launceston left clear footprints. Newspapers reported their doings and they themselves lodged advertisements to draw attention to their affairs; they kept letterbooks and ledgers’. 29 Peter Shapely discusses ‘entering into the charity field as a means of status, making the leaders appear as altruistic and morally upstanding members of the community’. 30 He agrees that ‘newspapers and magazines eulogised those who were actively associated, it was all part of the discourse of charity, and was a vital means of reinforcing their symbolic capital and social position’. 31 Finally, Shapely makes the telling statement

31 Ibid.
that ‘the construction of a charitable profile was a vital means of acquiring status’.  

A cautionary note was sounded in the Cornwall Chronicle in January 1838 regarding membership of so many societies. With reference to the Infant School Committee, the Cornwall Chronicle wrote that ‘The men on the committee of this institution are on the committee of almost every other similar institution. They are excellent men engaged in business but it is impossible that they can sufficiently attend to so many societies, unless they are supernatural beings’. The committee formed in January 1835 for the Infant School were Lewis Gilles, Henry Reed, Henry Jennings, J.W. Gleadow, Philip Oakden, Thomas Scott and Henry Dowling. The four Wesleyan Methodists on this committee were Reed, Jennings, Gleadow and Oakden, and there was indeed a note of veracity in the Cornwall Chronicle article. These four men, along with Isaac Sherwin, George Palmer Ball and Theodore Bartley, were continually appearing on the committees of local societies. The intention of the Infant School Committee was ‘to train the children from an early age to diligence, order and attention’ as well as ‘the moral and intellectual advancement of the lower orders’. This was the Wesleyan Methodist evangelical message.

Philanthropy was an important feature of the Wesleyan Methodist membership and activity. Eric McCoy North considers that ‘early Methodist philanthropy may be regarded as one of the most important features of the Wesleyan Revival’. Wellman J. Warner agrees, writing that ‘from the very inception of Wesleyan Societies, existence of social distress imposed a special obligation on Methodists’. It was a type of divine obligation, and Warner further considers that ‘there was for wealthy Methodists a sense of

32 Ibid, p. 158.
34 Launceston Advertiser, 8 January 1835.
35 Launceston Advertiser, 1 January 1835.
accountability for human need in the community, that went hand in hand with the feeling that their prosperity was a result of Providential Favour. Additionally, it should be considered that added to the prestige, credibility, status and divine obligation aspects, there was a sense with the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists that they were aware of their position and as first generation Wesleyan Methodists felt they had to leave a legacy. Isaac Sherwin confirms this at the Wesleyan Centenary Meeting in May 1839 when he refers to their collections and charity ‘as not necessarily ostentatious, but that succeeding generations should know what has been done’.

It is the credibility and status attained from membership of the philanthropic and civic societies that is of interest in this section. This thesis argues that these elements gave the Wesleyans the wherewithal and position to be involved in the banking institutions of the town.

There was some little commercial distress in Launceston in 1834, and this is confirmed by Hartwell, who says that ‘the years 1833 and 1834 were relatively better, even though there was general dissatisfaction amongst the colonists’.

Four of the Wesleyan Methodists felt that there were enough cases of real distress in the town to think of forming some type of relief society. The Wesleyans Philip Oakden, John Leach, Henry Jennings and Isaac Sherwin came together with other supporters of benevolence including Henry Dowling, the Rev. Dr. W.H. Browne and Lewis Gilles, who brought in the like-minded Evangelical Anglican and Baptist element. The rule laid down at the Benevolent Society Meeting was ‘that relief was not to be given in money, but in food, clothing, lodging etc.’. The social consciousness of this group flowed through to the suggestion of the

---

38 Warner, Wesleyan Movement, p. 192.
39 Colonial Record, 20 May 1839. The Colonial Record was a paper for religious news, published for only three months between 11 March 1839 and 24 June 1839. It covered all the Protestant sects in Launceston and gave a broader and lengthier emphasis to religion, including many reports from the South Seas Missions.
41 Launceston Advertiser, 2 October 1834.
Launceston Bank for Savings which was to foster thrifty habits and family responsibility.

Given the commercial climate at the time, an instructional article on Savings was reprinted in the Launceston Advertiser ‘on the vital importance of saving a little from weekly incomes’.\(^{42}\) Frugality and industry were part of the true essence of Wesleyan Methodism. The initial Launceston Bank for Savings committee included the Wesleyan Methodists Philip Oakden, Isaac Sherwin, George Palmer Ball, Theodore Bartley and later Henry Reed and Henry Jennings, showing a strong dominant Wesleyan Methodist presence.\(^{43}\)

The Benevolent Society’s funds waxed and waned according to the economic state of the town, and this is evidenced by a note from Henry Dowling, the secretary, at the end of November 1836 ‘appealing for more subscriptions to defray debt’.\(^{44}\) Another Benevolent Society, the Strangers Friend Society,\(^{45}\) had a completely Wesleyan Methodist committee, Philip Oakden, Henry Reed, John Gleadow, Patrick Dalrymple, Isaac Sherwin and Henry Jennings, who were the six visitors. Founded in Launceston at the end of August 1839, this kind of society was what John Wesley referred to as ‘one of the fruits of Methodism’.\(^{46}\) As The Methodist Magazine for 1798 wrote, ‘Protestants, Roman Catholics, Strangers and Foreigners have an equal right to be relieved by it’.\(^{47}\) Historian Robert Wearmouth states that ‘pious, zealous, sensible persons of blameless character were appointed as visitors by the Society’.\(^{48}\) This was certainly the case in the Launceston Society. The six Wesleyans also noted that the

\(^{42}\) Launceston Advertiser, 3 April 1834.
\(^{43}\) E.A. Beever, Launceston Bank for Savings 1835-70 (Melbourne, 1972), pp. 5-14.
\(^{44}\) Cornwall Chronicle, 3 December 1836.
\(^{45}\) The first Strangers’ Friend Society had appeared in England in 1787, and it comprised men who visited such poor strangers who had no helpers or friends. Money was not given, but medicine, food and clothing were.
\(^{46}\) William Myles, A Chronological History of the People called Methodists of the Connexion of the late John Wesley’s from their rise in the year 1779 to their last conference in 1812 (London, 1813), p. 180.
\(^{47}\) The Methodist Magazine, 1798, p. 418.
Wesleyan poor were not relieved from the Strangers’ Friend Society because there was a separate fund for them.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{49} Cornwall Chronicle, 31 August 1839, 5 September 1839.
Philip Oakden  circa 1840
Commercial Interests

*Philip Oakden*

Philip Oakden’s Letter Books for December 1833 to May 1842 provide an excellent insight into a Launceston Wesleyan Methodist merchant’s daily business dealings in Van Diemen’s Land and England. The Letter Books reveal Oakden’s viewpoint on the contemporary economic state of Van Diemen’s Land. It is interesting to note that Oakden’s assessment of the year 1835 outlines a favourable market with an abundant harvest anticipated. This is strangely at odds with Hartwell’s interpretation of the years 1834 – 1835 in Van Diemen’s Land as being very depressed.\(^{50}\)

Oakden’s commercial expertise centred around three areas. He was a commodities merchant, commission agent and wool merchant. As detailed in Chapter 3, he had a financial arrangement with Robert Gardner of Manchester, taking 50% of the profits from any investments he made with Gardner’s capital of £20,000. At the same time, he arranged with a friend, John Jackson of Hamburg, to invest a sum in Van Diemen’s Land at 2½% commission. He also had a separate joint venture with Osmond Gilles and Robert Gardner regarding wool sales.\(^{51}\) The wool that Oakden shipped to England was handled by Osmond Gilles through Gardner, Outram and Bootle of Watling Street, London, and by Horsfall and Co. As previously detailed, Oakden’s entry into the wool trade was initially difficult. Many of the leading wool growers such as the Archer Brothers sent their wool home on their own account without a middleman. Other wool growers had an advance from storekeepers to the amount of value without interest. All this contributed to the unreality of wool prices. Oakden complained to his agent in Liverpool that ‘exaggerated statements constantly appeared in the newspapers regarding wool prices, and that encouraged the growers to ask for

---

\(^{50}\) Hartwell, *Economic Development of Van Diemen’s Land*, p. 206.

\(^{51}\) Philip Oakden to Robert Gardner, 11 February 1836, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, NS 474, NS 1290, AOT.
higher prices'. Philip also cites an old Hamburg friend, Wesleyan Methodist, Benjamin Horne, as ‘sending his wool home on his own account in 1834; this was worth £1,500, and as well, he was selling large lots of sheep every year to the butcher’.53

As well as sourcing Wesleyan Methodist contacts for wool, he had a purchasing joint venture with John Eddie, merchant and auctioneer of Launceston. The wool was purchased in thirds with Eddie, Oakden and Gardner, all of which was consigned to Osmond Gilles.54 By June 1835 however, Oakden is referring to Eddie as too ‘speculative’. This is borne out by John Eddie’s insolvency in 1843.55

Oakden utilised John Jackson’s account by lending it on mortgage to Major McLeod at 15%. His commission in this case was 2½%. The flow of the commodity trade imports was facilitated by the fact that Oakden retained an office in Liverpool of Oakden & Co. This was run by two men Mr. William Tarbot and Mr. Pix, the former being a Wesleyan Methodist. Imports ranged from a continual stream of clothing (including jackets, blankets, trousers and shirts) from Robert Gardner in Manchester, to salt, lead, shop papers, gunpowder and window panes. On a visit to Sydney in September 1834, Oakden spent £2,000 in green tea chests, sugar, lead, brandy, Indian brown maize, oranges, lemons, dates and candles. All of this was sold for a good profit in Van Diemen’s Land, 50% of the profit going to Oakden.

A private venture involved cheese packed in lead and sent from his brother at Bentley Hall near Stydd in Derbyshire, and selling at fifteen shillings per pound; shipped from Liverpool, it proved very popular in Hobart Town. The continuity of this cheese import shows up in the Cornwall Chronicle shipping news imports lists right through the 1830s, and is certainly shown in 1840 in the Launceston

52 Philip Oakden to W. Tarbot Liverpool, 14 Jan. 1834, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, NS474, NS1290, AOT
53 Philip Oakden to John Jackson Hamburg, 25 March 1834, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
54 Philip Oakden to Robert Gardner Manchester, 14 January 1834, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
55 Launceston Advertiser, 16 Feb. 1843.
Advertiser. Coming in on the Arab from London on 16 March were thirteen hampers of cheese. Without much success, Philip Oakden importuned Robert Gardner to facilitate much of this importing by chartering a vessel from Liverpool which would be packed with a proportion of their freight, particularly salt, lead, soap and gunpowder. It would then be backloaded with wool from Launceston. Another side venture in his account with Osmond Gilles was the importation of shoes and boots from Hamburg. After gauging local tastes, which were shopkeeper’s boots, Philip explained ‘that he sold the boots himself, having no counter of a house establishment, I paid 2½ % to parties whose premises they were sold from’.

These imports were countered by Philip exporting wool, salted hide, kangaroo skins and wattle bark. The whale oil trade was already tied up by companies who collected it and sent it home on their own account. It is clear from his general correspondence that he certainly left an impact on the wool trade in Van Diemen’s Land. He had very firm standards as to the state and condition of the wool he purchased, buying only wool that met his criteria for colour, weight and washing, particularly washed wool. This small commercial case study reveals a man alive to all financial opportunities that presented themselves in a buoyant market, and a man prepared to fight for his share of the market profits in Launceston.

56 Launceston Advertiser, 19 March 1840.
57 Philip Oakden to Osmond Gilles, 22 Aug. 1835, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, NS 474, NS 1290, AOT.
58 The main parties engaged in the black whale fishery in 1839 were Henty & Connolly, 400 tons oil, 10 tons bone; Griffiths & Connolly 183 tons oil and 7 tons bone. (Launceston Advertiser, 31 Oct. 1839, p. 3.)
Henry Reed - January 1870
Henry Reed

Henry Reed’s papers are generally patchy for the earlier portion of his life in Launceston, but there are more primary source documents held in the Hudson Fysh papers at the Launceston Branch of the State Library of Tasmania. These documents were collected by Fysh when writing the book about his grandfather: *Henry Reed, Van Diemen’s Land Pioneer*. There is also an inventory of Reed papers held by a descendant in Queensland but the papers are not available for study. The impression gained from the fairly extensive inventory is that the 1830’s papers are mainly concerned with charter agreements, mortgages and in particular the failed charter of Reed’s *Norval* in January 1836. This was the occasion when over one thousand sheep were lost belonging to Captain Swanston. Much of the remaining Reed information comes from the newspapers of the day, *Launceston Advertiser*, *Cornwall Chronicle* and *Launceston Examiner*, combined with a microfilm of original documents held in the State Library of Victoria. There is also a story of Reed’s life, mainly in the later period, written by his second wife Margaret.

Philip Oakden refers in his Letter Book of February 1836 to Reed as being a rich man. Reed was well established with his fortune at this time and his interests in the 1830s centred around whaling, merchandising, agriculture, Durham cattle, blood stock horses, ship owning, chartering and acting as a shipping agent. His centre of activity was a store and brick warehouse at 94 Cameron Street, Launceston, commenced by John Sprunt in 1830, being three storeys and a basement. Reed lived next door in Charles Street, his residence being erected in 1835 by Samuel Jackson. His warehouse was to be the repository for imported merchandise supplies for Launceston as well as the new colony of Port Phillip. His ship the *Norval* brought from London such merchandise as carriages, gigs,}

59 Letter P. Oakden to Robert Gardner, Letter Book, Philip Oakden, 11 February 1836, NS474, NS 1290, AOT
60 *Launceston Advertiser*, 7 June 1830.
elegant mahogany furniture and billiard tables. Reed was also dealing with liquor into his warehouse as is shown by a letter in 1836 requesting to sell wholesale wines and spirits from his warehouse.\(^{62}\)

Given that Reed had joined the Wesleyan Methodists by 1836, Hudson Fysh explains the liquor anomaly by citing references to show that Reed was very liberal in his views on drinking and never joined a temperance movement, believing that ‘my teetotal friends go too far’.\(^{63}\) As previously detailed, he had been whaling in the Portland Bay area since 1830 using the _Socrates_ as well as charting vessels from Sydney to Portland Bay for oil and whalebone.\(^{64}\) His partners were Michael Connolly and J. Sinclair, and the 1836 agreement severing the whaling connection is found in the Fysh Papers. It read:

> Whereby Reed and Sinclair were to receive £2,131 from the concern whose gross value included the _Socrates_ and gear which amounted to £6,600, Reed and Sinclair were not to continue whaling without the consent of Michael Connolly, and the firm was to be named Henty, Connolly and Griffiths who had one third each for three years.\(^{65}\)

The whaler _Socrates_ had been one of a number of ships Reed had owned, chartered or acted as shipping agent for. The 1836 _Launcesto Advertiser_ noted Reed acting as agent for the ships _John Denniston_ and _Isabella_ for London,\(^{66}\) his own ship _Norval_ to London,\(^{67}\) and agent for the schooner _Eagle_ to Port Phillip.\(^{68}\) It also noted him as agent for the _Boadicea_ for London, being chartered by Henty & Co. and Hewitt and Gore. In effect, this was the strength of his business as ship owner, shipping agent, charterer and colonial agent of J.W. Buckle. The _Cornwall Chronicle_ advertisements for
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\(^{61}\) _Cornwall Chronicle_ 27 June 1835.

\(^{62}\) Letter, 8 August 1836, Hudson Fysh Papers, LMS 0049, Box 1/2 0049/2/-, Launceston Branch, State Library of Tasmania. (Hereafter referred to as Fysh Papers).

\(^{63}\) Hudson Fysh, _Henry Reed, Van Diemen’s Land Pioneer: by his Grandson Hudson Fysh_ (Hobart, 1973), p. 70.

\(^{64}\) 1835, Fysh Papers, LMS 0049, Box 1/2, 0049/1/-.

\(^{65}\) 23 January 1836, Fysh Papers, LMS 0049, Box 1/2, 0049/2/-.

\(^{66}\) _Launceston Advertiser_, 7, 14 January 1836.

\(^{67}\) _Launceston Advertiser_, 31 March 1836.

\(^{68}\) _Launceston Advertiser_, 15 December 1836.
1837 show Reed acting strongly as shipping agent to Port Phillip carrying stores and live stock.\textsuperscript{69}

His old love of horse racing prior to Wesleyan Methodist conversion had been subsumed into the purchase of blood stock. The blood horse \textit{Carwell} bred by Lord Mountcharles and descendant of St. Leger winners had been purchased by Reed in October 1833 in London at the cost of £1,000. He also owned \textit{Czar} the celebrated Clydesdale, and these two horses were constantly advertised in 1835 as standing at Reed’s residence at Norfolk Plains.\textsuperscript{70} In 1836 he was joined by John Gleadow in the ownership of two Cleveland horses \textit{Major} and \textit{Malton}, who had been foaled at Circular Head by The Van Diemen’s Land Company’s famous horse \textit{Cleveland}. In this way, Reed and Gleadow retained their love of horses in a fashion acceptable to Wesleyan Methodism. This involvement in horse breeding was a serious commercial business for Gleadow\textsuperscript{71} and Reed, Dyster reinforces this with his comment that ‘farmers and those on the southern mainland valued Tasmanian Breeding… and in the 1840s hundreds left Launceston for various destinations’.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Cornwall Chronicle}, 10 June 1837.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Launceston Advertiser}, 31 December 1835.
\textsuperscript{71} John Gleadow was heavily involved in the horse trade to the Indian Army, and this is noted in the \textit{Launceston Examiner} for January 1845 through to 1849, when a company was formed for the exportation of horses to Calcutta and Madras. The company was called The Launceston Horse Exportation Company, and the committee comprised Richard Dry, Alex Rose, J.A. DuCroz, Major Wentworth and John Gleadow. \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 10 February 1849.
\textsuperscript{72} Dyster, ‘Port of Launceston’, p. 109.
John Gleadow  circa 1850
John W. Gleadow, Henry Jennings and Others

John Ward Gleadow and Henry Jennings were both acting as solicitors and attorneys in Launceston in the 1830s. As detailed in Chapter 3, Gleadow commenced in 1827 and Jennings in 1833, and, in a sense, these two Wesleyan Methodist solicitors had a clear field for their legal activity from the early days. F.D. Wickham was another solicitor from the early thirties, and a notice in the Launceston Advertiser in 1838 reveals that the members of the bar practising in Launceston were Gleadow, Jennings, Henty, Wickham, George Howe and E. Stilwell.\footnote{Launceston Advertiser, 25 January 1838.} William Henty had joined John Gleadow as a partner in 1837.

The Launceston Advertiser and The Cornwall Chronicle of the 1830s show that Gleadow and Jennings appeared to be the most prominent and consequently open to most criticism, particularly from The Cornwall Chronicle. Much of the two men’s work appeared to revolve around facilitating money lending, acting for insolvents, being agents for the sale of properties and making claims upon unpaid due bills. Sums such as £1,000, £700 and £400 were being offered as mortgage loans at 15%.\footnote{Cornwall Chronicle, 7 November 1835.} The involvement with insolvencies heaped fire and criticism on Gleadow’s and Jennings’ heads, and it is relevant to discuss the Insolvency Act in the light of the two men’s day to day involvement. The Launceston Advertiser of 5 March 1835 noted that the new Insolvency Act provided a greater facility for creditors to reach debtor’s property. The Cornwall Chronicle commented that it was ‘to protect the insolvent against the severity of his creditor and to protect the creditor from deliberate fraud – no easy task’.\footnote{Cornwall Chronicle, 4 April 1835.}

The editor, proprietor and publisher of the Cornwall Chronicle was William Lushington Goodwin, an ex-sea captain noted for the recklessness of his writing, leaving him open to litigation. Clifford Craig describes him as ‘a fairly typical sea captain of the time, and
also a fairly typical editor, fearless, independently minded and scurrilous to a degree’. But one senses a whiff of veracity in his diatribes. He certainly announced in December 1835 when he took over editorship of the *Cornwall Chronicle* that ‘he intended to run it on republican lines’. Goodwin kept up unremitting attacks on Lieutenant Governor Arthur, Lieutenant Governor Sir John Franklin, and other targets were Lieutenant Matthew Curling Friend, John Gleadow and Henry Jennings. The latter two were referred to as the religious lawyers.

The Insolvency Act was meant to make trade more stable and the abolition of imprisonment for debt, except in cases of fraud, was a bonus for debtors. Assignees were appointed first in an insolvency and their power ceased after the first meeting of creditors, and then the permanent assignee was created with full power over the insolvent’s property; Gleadow and Jennings were often appointed assignees for insolvents. Both men were closely involved in the directive from Justice Montagu ‘that when a promissory note or bill of exchange was dishonoured, followed by neglect of payment for a specified period, it should be made presumptive evidence of insolvency’.

A letter published in the *Cornwall Chronicle* by a person styling himself as ‘Inhabitant’ laid out the causes of complaint against the lawyers. ‘Inhabitant’ blamed ‘lawyers as being rapacious towards their clients who were unable to meet their obligations’. In Launceston when a bill failed to be met, the bill was immediately handed to the lawyers for recovery and, as ‘Inhabitant’ wrote, ‘in a few days, the lawyer saddles the owner of the bill with costs greater than the amount of the bill he is trying to recover. Because of law costs, the creditors take advantage of the Insolvent Act and gets rid of all his debts, by making out he is unable to pay them’. ‘Inhabitant’
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76 Clifford Craig, *The Engravers of Van Diemen’s Land* (Launceston 1961), p. 117.  
78 *Launceston Advertiser*, 23 April 1835.  
79 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 4 February 1837.
stressed that he had been in the same situation; he was a day late paying his bill and he was faced with a summons for £15, half the amount of his bill. The tenor of the letter is strongly against the religious lawyers Gleadow and Jennings. ‘Inhabitant’ called them ‘hard men in their temples, devoted to religion, professing the grace of God. These disciples of Christ who live righteously in junction with all mankind, compare their professions with their preacher’s and decide their work.’

Gleadow was again slated in the same month by a Mr. H.G. Arrowsmith protesting against Gleadow’s bill for £22.14.1 being costs against recovering a debt from a Mr. Heaney for £27.3.1. Gleadow’s bill to Arrowsmith was reproduced in the Cornwall Chronicle showing fifty different services by the solicitor in recovering the debt from Heaney. These services involved attending the various bodies involved, sheriff’s fees, copies of declarations, engrossing affidavits etc., all serving to back Arrowsmith’s protests against the Insolvency Act as impracticable and mischievous. Jennings was similarly attacked in the Cornwall Chronicle by J.W. Bell the auctioneer. Bell’s wife was a Wesleyan Methodist and the means by which Walter Powell, then employed as a clerk, was brought to the Wesleyan Methodist Church. However, Mrs. Bell’s application to be a full member of the Wesleyan Methodists was refused ‘because she had not manifested sorrow for being married to an unbeliever, namely J.W. Bell’.

J.W. Bell wrote to Jennings that ‘I understand that you are blessed with a high degree of piety, charity and every other virtue. I pray that you have nothing further to do with the insolvencies of such men for the sake of a few pounds, a good man is more precious than gold’. In this case, Jennings’ costs were published in the Chronicle as were Gleadow’s previously. The case involved
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80 Cornwall Chronicle, 4 February 1837.
81 Cornwall Chronicle, 4 February 1837.
82 Cornwall Chronicle, 25 February 1837.
83 Minutes of Meeting of Leaders of The Wesleyan Methodist Society, Launceston, 19 June 1839, NS499/948, 949, AOT.
84 Cornwall Chronicle 16 December 1837.
recovering a debt of £36.15.6 from an insolvent John Jordan for J.W. Bell. The case had many ramifications as detailed in the newspaper, but the basic fact remained that Jennings charged Bell £55.15.6 to recover an amount of £36.15.6, detailing the separate services on his bill. Bell bitterly wrote an open letter to Jennings: ‘I received your account to £55.15.6 for your professional services and in showing Jordan a new way to pay old debts must refer you to that gentleman, as he has all the property and we all the justice. I have no doubt he will settle with you as your charges are so moderate’.  

Bell also published in the same edition of the newspaper Jennings’ costs in 1834 for suing a poor man (a customer of J.W. Bell) for a debt of £20 and the bill came to £33.0.2.

Making allowance for the Cornwall Chronicle’s partiality for scandal and invective, there comes through a sense of Gleadow and Jennings being in the right place at the right time for making money out of insolvencies and unpaid bills. Jennings commented on the particular incident in his spiritual diary by writing:

I was a good deal cast down on account of an attack on me by Mr. J.W. Bell in the newspaper, which I thought in the main wholly untrue. I was fearful I might have given too much occasion by my carelessness in taking up the causes of people. May God grant that this also be blessed by my spiritual improvement. I particularly need the guidance of God in my profession. I mention this more particularly, as I am sometimes doubtful whether as a Christian, I am consistently following my profession at all. I am truly beset by snares and temptations, but out of all this, the Lord is willing and able to deliver me.

Jennings certainly showed signs of being caught between two worlds, commerce and religion. The world of commerce and provided him with unrivalled opportunities in the handling of insolvencies, unpaid bills, and all the attendant costs. Yet after Bell’s attack, he showed signs of a certain self-doubt as to his practice and its charges. William Lushington Goodwin’s penchant for malice has been attested to, but occasionally his perspicacity struck home. In this case, when he was certainly referring to Gleadow and Jennings,
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85 Cornwall Chronicle, 2 December 1837.
86 Jennings’ Spiritual Diary, 24 December 1837.
he wrote ‘we learn that the professors of religion are in the habit of paying their debts, it is a considerable practice and justifies those exacting the same from others, but we do not approve of unkindness to debtors, it does not accord with the spirit of religion’.\textsuperscript{87} Gleadow and Jennings were conducting their businesses within the confines of best business practice, but failing in humanity. Goodwin’s hatred of what he termed religious lawyers was still in full swing when he asked ‘If there be a dirty case to be taken in hand, who is the lawyer, the finger will be directed at the Saint. Does a scoundrel want any legal assistance to escape, he must go to a religious lawyer’.\textsuperscript{88}

As regards general insolvency figures, the \textit{Cornwall Chronicle} of 12 May 1838 quoted the figures that in the last two years and four months, there had been 299 cases of insolvency.\textsuperscript{89} The general feeling was that since the prison sentence had been removed from insolvency, many persons declared themselves insolvent after cashing up their assets and then immediately shipping across to Port Phillip. No barrier was put in their path by the Customs House and police clearances, so once a man had been declared insolvent he was free to move where he liked. According to one estimate, ‘£293,000 had been taken out of the colony in hard specie, by insolvents who had sworn that they had given up every thing of theirs’.\textsuperscript{90} It is significant that a Wesleyan Methodist, Isaac Sherwin, was in the chair at a public meeting held at the Commercial and Agriculture Exchange to consider the best means of protecting against losses from the \textit{Creditor and Debtor Act}.\textsuperscript{91} This was a case of Wesleyan Methodist interest in best business procedures.

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Cornwall Chronicle}, 29 December 1838.  
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Cornwall Chronicle}, 1 August 1840.  
\textsuperscript{89} There was a new \textit{Insolvency Act} in 1839 to provide for the more efficient distribution of insolvent estate. Sir Alfred Stephen was the driving force behind both the 1835 and 1839 \textit{Insolvency Acts}, and had based them on laws existing in other parts of the British Empire, the Cape Colony, Indian Law and Scotch Law as well as English Law. (Alex Low, ‘The Adventures of Bentham in Van Diemen’s Land: Sir Alfred Stephen and the Insolvency Act’, \textit{University of Tasmania Law Review}, v. 22, no. 2, 2003, pp. 184-5, 196-7.)  
\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Cornwall Chronicle}, 18 November 1840.  
\textsuperscript{91} \textit{Cornwall Chronicle}, 4 July 1840.
The Middle Rung Wesleyan Methodists

Though not regarded as the Wesleyan Methodist elite, it is appropriate at this stage of the thesis to discuss some of the persons of the middle rung of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society in their working commercial life. They sometimes enjoyed backing and a certain amount of protection from the Wesleyan Methodist elite and were often independently versatile in slipping from one profession to another. These men were not going to rise to the giddy heights of the Wesleyan Methodist elite in banking, but were examples of the middle level of Wesleyan Methodism in Launceston.

An insolvency case of a Wesleyan Methodist with a satisfactory ending was one concerning John Stoneham. He was a member of the Launceston Society and a cabinet maker. His insolvency was noted in the Launceston Advertiser for 13 October 1836, stating that John Gleadow was solicitor to the insolvency. Three years later in December 1839, he was in a position to open a Temperance House at his own house at St. John Street, Launceston. One can perhaps surmise that Stoneham received backing from brother Wesleyan Methodists, who were following a Methodist law which said ‘By doing good, especially to them that are of the household of the faith, employing them preferably to others… helping each other in business, and so much the more, because the world will love its own or them only’. 92

Stoneham was on the cusp of the Temperance Movement in Launceston (this will be discussed in a later chapter). The Temperance Home was conducted on total abstinence lines, with beds for travellers and refreshments that Stoneham listed as ‘tea, coffee, raspberry vinegar, beef steak, mutton chops, toast and Welsh rabbit’. 93 The surprising note at the bottom of the Stoneham
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92 Edmund Grindrod, A Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of the Wesleyan Methodism with Notes and an Appendix (London, 1842), Section 1.
93 Cornwall Chronicle, 7 March 1840.
advertisement announced that ‘N.B. Funerals were performed’. He was obviously exercising his dual roles as mine host and cabinet maker.

This versatility in moving from one occupation to another was possibly more of a reaction to the state of the economy rather than a specifically Wesleyan Methodist attribute. Having suffered once financially, Stoneham was covering all possibilities. Another Wesleyan Methodist with much the same financial history was Matthew Lassetter. Lassetter is mentioned by the Rev. Joseph Orton in Sydney in September 1833, when he wrote after a visit by Henry Reed in the *Norval* that ‘Mr. Reed kindly offered to assist Mr. Lassetter’s business, but when he entered his affairs, he was astonished at his embarrassed circumstances, but in the most friendly manner heard the proposition, gave that amount prompt assistance... I would think it would be better for Mr. Lassetter to retire from public work for some time. Mr. Reed has views on it’. In the same month, when Lassetter arrived in Launceston, he was received as a member of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. Working as a baker, he was also given the position of Headmaster at the Infant School at a salary of £100, with house, rent, coals and candles free. A correspondent named ‘A Subscriber’ protested against Lassetter in the *Cornwall Chronicle* as ‘not satisfied with his income, he still carries on the business of a baker and shopkeeper, how can you give attention to both?’ Lassetter countered this with saying ‘I get up at four or five in the morning and it does not interfere with my school duties’. Here Lassetter was following the path of the true Wesleyan Methodist. This is typical testimony of a Wesleyan Methodist and it ties in with a testimony in *The Arminian Magazine*. A certain Jas. Hall wrote an account of his
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94 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 19 March 1840.
95 Rev. Joseph Orton Sydney to the Rev. John and Mrs. Manton, 3 September 1835, WMMS District Letterbook, 1828-35, A17165-1, ML.
96 Minutes of Quarterly Meeting, 29 September 1835, 25 November 1834 – 20 September 1841, NS499/928, AOT.
97 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 16 April 1837.
98 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 29 April 1837.
experiences in *The Arminian Magazine*: ‘I determined that the business of my station should be done as well within my power and with all possible despatch. I found that by this method, I could do far more work in the day than I had done before’.  

Another accusation hurled against Lassetter referred to him as Rev. Mr. Lightweight, who gave 5 ounces short on his loaves. Lassetter marshalled his supporters with a long column article in the *Cornwall Chronicle* in June 1838.  

Four men who had worked for Lassetter made legal depositions that Lassetter was quite honest in his bakery business with weights. One of his supporters, Daniel Saunders, was definitely a Wesleyan Methodist as he appeared in the Wesleyan Methodist Rolls. Another, Robert Veitch, was a servant to Henry Reed. In the late 1840s Lassetter changed occupations yet again by becoming an auctioneer.  

The vigour, energy and versatility of the Wesleyan Methodists is illustrated by another Launceston Wesleyan Methodist, Samuel Bailey Dowsett. He had been in the Hobart Society and had been joint superintendent of the Sunday School with J. Hiddlestone, showing his ability and versatility in moving from one profession to another. Initially a transportee, Dowsett covered three roles at different times as newspaper proprietor, schoolmaster and accountant. In 1826 in Hobart, he opened a commercial boarding school for boys in Brisbane Street called Woodland House, whilst Mrs. Dowsett had a Ladies’ Seminary. After removal to Launceston, he established a newspaper *The Cornwall Press* in 1829 in opposition to John Pascoe Fawkner’s *Advertiser*. The *Cornwall Press* only reached nineteen numbers, and Dowsett called Fawkner, ‘an addle-pated upstart, a superannuated zany’. He then established the *Independent Newspaper* which was first published on 28 March 1834. By 1834, he was advertising himself as a general agency accountant, house and  
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100 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 23 June 1838.
101 *Launceston Examiner*, 20 March 1847.
102 Convict List, AOT.
estate agent, and agent of the Court of Requests with rents and debts collected. In January 1835, he was conducting the Launceston Academy, a school for boys in St. John Street. He advertised himself as ‘having many years experience in the instruction of youth and would educate them in Classical and Commercial Studies’. In 1835 he applied to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists to be readmitted to the Society.

William Tyson was yet another Wesleyan Methodist to have felt the favour of Henry Reed and to have been raised by him in business and spirituality. Tyson was a carpenter, joiner and seller of pumps and appeared to have been employed at country properties. He worked at Reed’s property Wesley Dale, which Reed had purchased in 1835. Dan Pickett, the overseer, reminisced that ‘Tyson, now of Launceston, was Henry Reed’s carpenter and when under the influence of drink, had twice attempted to commit suicide by cutting his throat. Under Mr. Reed’s influence, he has not tasted drink since’. Tyson advertised in 1837 that he would work with any country gentleman and had moved to the location at the corner of Charles and Elizabeth Streets, Launceston, where he intended to carry on a joiners and pump making business. By April 1840, he was advertising for an apprentice.

The case of William Dawson raised doubts about the double standards exercised by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists when it came to a member involved in business and land dealings. The Cornwall Chronicle referred to Dawson as ‘a substantial prop of that religious meeting house of the Methodists’. Dawson had been a Superintendent of Road Gangs at the end of 1835, and then became

104 Launceston Advertiser, 20 September 1834.
105 Launceston Advertiser, 1 January 1835.
106 Minutes of Quarterly Meeting, 21 January 1835, 25 November 1834–20 September 1841, SN499/928, AOT.
107 Fragment of letter from Dan Pickett, n.d, Reed Papers, MM45, AOT, also Hudson Fysh Papers, LMS 0049, State Library of Tasmania, Launceston Branch.
108 Cornwall Chronicle, 10 July 1837.
109 The Tyson family became notable leaders in Launceston Wesleyan Methodism and one of William Tyson’s sons, Matthews Tyson, was one of the official historians of Launceston Wesleyan Methodism in the Spectator Magazine.
110 Cornwall Chronicle, 15 February 1840.
the Launceston Town Surveyor. His case of forgery in January 1840 was given considerable exposure by both the Cornwall Chronicle and Launceston Advertiser. Inevitably, the Chronicle teased out the scandal of the case and their accusations fell upon ‘certain members of that religion attempting to get their brother out of trouble… Methodists do themselves and the cause much harm by attempting to throw a bad man a cover to hide his errors from public knowledge’.  

A week later, the paper claimed that Dawson’s spiritual brothers were trying to hush it up. By 16 May, Dawson, who was placed in the debtors’ portion of the Launceston gaol, had attempted to scale the wall of the prison and escape with the aid of a rope ladder dropped over the wall by two ex-prisoners. The Launceston Advertiser noted disapprovingly that ‘the gentlemen who had undertook to help his family with support had abandoned it after this episode’.

A certain amount of undue favour was shown to Dawson throughout the saga, and it was this fact that the Cornwall Chronicle seized upon. There was the support from fellow Wesleyan Methodists and character references from leading citizens such as Matthew Curling Friend, P.A. Mulgrave, Major D’Arcy Wentworth and Mr. Sams, the Sheriff, and the fact that Dawson was placed in the debtor’s side of the prison, not the felon’s side. There seemed to be another agenda on the part of his peers. Dawson was declared bankrupt, paying ten shillings and sixpence in the pound to creditors
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111 Cornwall Chronicle, 15 February 1840.
112 Dawson’s case which came up before the Supreme Court on 18 April 1840 was that he had uttered a forged bill of exchange for £37 with intent to defraud John Archer. It had been drawn on Alexander Cheyne, Director General of Public Works, Dawson’s superior. Dawson had purchased a remaining two year lease for £1,200 from John Archer and farm at Allan Vale belonging to Mr. Allan. The £37 forged bill was only a portion of the £1,200 payment. He was found guilty and remanded for sentence to ten years’ transportation to Port Arthur; Launceston Advertiser, 23 April 1840.
113 Launceston Advertiser, 21 May 1840.
who had proved their debt,\textsuperscript{114} and it would seem that he only served one year of his sentence by order of the Colonial Secretary.\textsuperscript{115}

A search through Wesleyan Methodist records, particularly the Minutes of the Leaders of the Wesleyan Methodist Society, does not reveal any sign in 1840 of Dawson being expelled from the Society. This was normal procedure for a member who had offended and there are countless examples in the records of people being expelled for trivial misdemeanours such as non-attendance. Dawson’s actions of forgery merited expulsion, but instead on 12 August 1840, by which time he was at Port Arthur, he is shown with his wife Ann as being admitted on trial as a permanent member to the Wesleyan Methodist Society.\textsuperscript{116}

The question to be raised is why did Dawson merit such protection from the Wesleyan Methodists to the point of admittance to the Society? We can conjecture that Dawson as Town Surveyor had been a valuable friend to many townspeople, including the Wesleyan Methodists. As Town Surveyor, he had early access to the notice of information of sale of town blocks; information which could be passed on to other interested parties who wished to purchase blocks of land. He was a useful link in the chain of business and this needed protection. Although it does not show in the records, Dawson, probably in early 1840, repented of his deeds to the Wesleyan Methodist Society, and was readmitted to the Society with his wife Ann on trial, in August 1840.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{114} Launceston Advertiser, 9 July 1840.

\textsuperscript{115} SC 41/5, p. 51, AOT, Note quoted in ‘Decisions of the Nineteenth Century Tasmania Superior Courts, R. V. Dawson’, Published Decisions of Law, Macquarie University and the School of History and Classics, University of Tasmania.

\textsuperscript{116} There is no doubt that this is William Dawson the forger, his wife was Ann and they are shown on the Launceston Circuit Baptismal Register of Paterson Street, December 1834-67, as having a child Letitia Henriette baptised in 1839 and giving the father’s occupation as Town Surveyor. Dawson was married in 1839 and had already had four children prior to marriage. (Minutes of Meeting of Leaders of the Wesleyan Methodist Society, Launceston, 12 August 1840, NS499/948, NS499/949, AOT).

\textsuperscript{117} In 1855 William Dawson was resident at the Mersey, and he rented a public house built by Mr. Johnson of Sherwood. He was also assessor, surveyor and collector for the Devon Road Trust. James Fenton was critical of Dawson and wrote ‘a most wasteful expenditure had been going on in Dawson’s time of
Banking

The introduction to this thesis argued that any connection to banking was a very unusual feature for Wesleyan Methodists in the 1830s, and it has been reiterated in the preamble to this chapter. It cannot be stressed too strongly that it was a significant social shift globally for a group of Wesleyan Methodists to be involved in banking. In England, a few individual Wesleyan Methodists were connected to banking, such as the Skinner family of Stockton-on-Tees, the Carne family of Penzance and Thomas Thompson of Hull, but for the greater part it was the Quaker families who took up the challenge. J.A. Hobson judges that the Quakers ‘were trusted by all, and their connections to farming and weaving, which needed temporary advances, started them lending their cash and becoming bankers’. 

Dr. Gareth Lloyd of Rylands Library, University of Manchester, agrees with the premise of this thesis that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were very unusual in their connection to banking. He considers that ‘though the Wesleyan Church did move up socially during the nineteenth century it was mainly to the middle class, rather than the exceptionally wealthy quarters of society that involved banking. Banking involvement relied on social connections with a social cachet still being attached to the national established church’. Dr. Peter Nockles of Rylands Library, University of Manchester, also supports the contention that there were no other Wesleyan Methodist communities at this period globally who became involved in banking. In addition to these two opinions, there is the fact to consider that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite were management, and he was receiving £250 per year from the road trustees, whilst having all the advantages of a public house for the men he had employed on the works, James Fenton, *Bush Life in Tasmania, Fifty Years Ago* (London, 1891 and Launceston 1970), p. 145.

120 Dr. Gareth Lloyd, personal communication, 27 July 2006.
121 Dr. Peter Nockles, personal communication, 21 September 2006.
first generation Wesleyan Methodists, not second or third generation Wesleyan Methodists who had moved up in the world.

It has so far been demonstrated in this chapter that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite by their property and land ownership, participation in jury service, commercial involvement and membership of philanthropic and civic societies had forged for themselves a position of status in society that fitted them for the role of bank directors. Their involvement in the aforementioned ran in parallel with banking involvement as can be seen by Table 2. The Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite’s position was unassailable, not just that of the worthy industrious Wesleyan Methodist taking part in the new capitalism. The group stood shoulder to shoulder with the elite of the business community. Launceston Society did not have a vice regal element to it as did Hobart. Its upper ranks were men of commerce, and the Wesleyan Methodist elite had become one with that rank, and had seized the opportunity for banking involvement.

---

_Croyden House, 59 George Street,
Launceston
Union Bank opened here, 1 May 1838_122

---

### Table 2

**Wesleyan Methodist Involvement with the Van Diemen’s Land Banks to 1840**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Date of Formation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Van Diemen’s Land</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>(Hobart Town Courier, 29 Dec. 1827)</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>John Dunn&lt;br&gt;shareholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Bank</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>(Hobart Town Courier, 29 Dec. 1827)</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Joseph Hone&lt;br&gt;(Chairman)&lt;br&gt;William Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Dunn&lt;br&gt;John Kerr&lt;br&gt;Peter Mulgrave&lt;br&gt;James Reibey&lt;br&gt;Patrick Wood&lt;br&gt;Stephen Adey&lt;br&gt;(Manager, Cashier, Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Bank</td>
<td>1 May 1828, closed temp. Dec. 1833, reopened 1834</td>
<td>(Hobart Town Courier, 8, 15 Mar. 1828 Butlin, ANZ Bank, p. 15.)</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>W.E. Lawrence&lt;br&gt;(Chairman)&lt;br&gt;James Cox&lt;br&gt;P.A. Mulgrave&lt;br&gt;T. Williams&lt;br&gt;W. Barnes&lt;br&gt;J.H. Reibey&lt;br&gt;A. Thomson&lt;br&gt;R. Day&lt;br&gt;T. Landale&lt;br&gt;J.W. Gleadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Bank</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>(Hobart Town Courier, 28 June, 11 July 1829)</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>John Dunn&lt;br&gt;(Managing Director)&lt;br&gt;T.M. Fenton&lt;br&gt;(Director, 1832)&lt;br&gt;W. Gellibrand&lt;br&gt;(Director, 1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial General Savings Bank</td>
<td>Jan. 1831</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>John Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Date of Formation</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tamar Bank                  | Jan. 1835 (Took over from Bank of Van Diemen’s Land) | Tamar Independent, 15 Nov. 1834                    | Launceston | L. Gilles (Managing Director)    
T. Williams   
M. Connolly   
F.D. Wickham   
P. Oakden   
George P. Ball (10 October 1836) |
| Launceston Bank For Savings | Mar. 1835                         | Launceston Advertiser, 26 Mar. 1835 and 6 Apr. 1835 | Launceston | 1835 The Rev. Dr. Browne   
H. Dowling   
Henry Reed   
Henry Jennings   
W.E. Lawrence   
Philip Oakden   
C.S. Henty   
1836 Theodore Bartley   
Isaac Sherwin, (first paid manager)   
J.W. Gleadow |
| Bank of Australasia         | 1 Jan. 1836 (take over Cornwall Bank) | Launceston Advertiser, 7 Jan. 1836                 | Launceston | Henry Reed   
Geo. Kinnear   
C.S. Henty (Manager)   
W.E. Lawrence   
W. Barnes   
T. Landale   
J. Henty |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Date of Formation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Union Bank**                | 1 May 1838        | *Launceston Advertiser,* 26 April 1838, 3 May 1838 | Launceston     | London Board  
  George Fife Angas  
  Robert Brooks  
  James J. Cummins  
  John Gore  
  Robert Gardner  
  (Manchester)  
  Charles Hindley  
  M.P.  
  Chas. E. Mangles  
  **Philip Oakden**  
  James R. Todd  
  **Thomas Sands**  
  (Liverpool)  
  Christopher Rawson  
  (Halifax)  
  Launceston Board  
  **Philip Oakden**  
  Michael Connolly  
  William Fletcher  
  T. Williams  
  Lewis Gilles  
  (Manager) |
| **Commercial Bank**           | 23 July 1838      | *Cornwall Chronicle,* 14 July 1838 | Launceston     | **Isaac Sherwin**  
  (first paid manager) |
| Launceston Branch             |                   |                                 |                |                                               |
| **Tradesmens Joint Banking Co.** | 18 April 1840   | *Cornwall Chronicle,* 18 April 1840 | Port Phillip   | Committee  
  Cropper  
  Mortimer  
  Dodd  
  Fawkner  
  Brown  
  **Lilly**  
  Reeves  
  **Peers**  
  Miller |
|                               | (Did not eventuate owing to lack of support) |                                 |                |                                               |

*Names in Bold were Wesleyan Methodists*
It is necessary to understand the economic situation in Van Diemen’s Land and its related lack of hard currency before any discussion can be initiated about banking. Hartwell’s opinion of the economic situation in Van Diemen’s Land is that ‘it did not experience boom conditions as the decade was, except for short periods, one of continued stringency’. Hartwell’s trade cycle theory includes a complicated view that the years 1828 – 1833 and 1836-1837 had mixed prosperity, 1834 – 1835 were very depressed and 1838 had moderate depression. Ginswick challenges Hartwell’s definition of the word depression and finds Hartwell’s overview of the period difficult to accept.

Butlin is more measured in his analysis and believes that in the 1830s ‘the island experienced ups and down in economic activity’. This in part is reflected by Philip Oakden’s business Letter Book of the period. There was certainly a brittle quality to the economy and Frank Broeze gives a highly lucid explanation of all the factors involved. The difficulty that Oakden had in December 1833 with the acceptance of bills has been commented on previously. Bill discounting was difficult, Treasury bills had a premium of 3.7%, and private bills were unsaleable. Oakden was the example of Lieutenant Governor Arthur’s assertion ‘that the merchant bank directors exerted a very contracted monopoly by discounting each other’s bills and placing large funds at their disposal’. This was the monopoly Oakden had faced on arrival, but had overcome with friendly connections discounting his bills. He certainly bemoaned the fact that he had not brought more cash than credit. He considered that ‘sovereigns or Spanish dollars are the best transfer of capital from

There was indeed a great lack of British silver coin in the colony; currency ranged from Spanish dollars to Indian rupees at the period. From April 1826 in compliance with the Treasury, all accounts and receipts had to be reckoned in sterling. Spanish dollars were paid at four shillings and four pence and Calcutta rupees at two shillings and a penny.

Holmes and Green remind their readers that in England in the early nineteenth century in provincial banks, discounting of bills of exchange with its variants was the dominant form of credit. Bills had been used since the early fourteenth century. Holmes and Green explain it: ‘they were essentially promises by one trader to pay another merchant a specified sum at a given date; a payee could get immediate cash by selling the bill to a bank at a discount of the full value, leaving the bank to collect the full amount when due, or selling it to another bank’.129

Frank Broeze explains the merchant, agent structure in Launceston in the 1830s. Henry Reed was Buckle & Co.’s agent, Robert Brooks had Ranulph Dacre as his Sydney agent and Dacre had formed a connection with Thomas Williams in Launceston. In 1835, Thomas Williams formed in Launceston Williams, Campbell & Co. with Robert Campbell.130 Another connection with Launceston and Robert Brooks was James Reibey whose connection with Brooks waxed and waned but ‘he never stopped acting for Brooks’.131 Michael Connolly was John Gore & Co.’s agent; Gore was to be England’s largest wool importer. Connolly had pioneered the system of making advances to suitable people for whatever they asked for their wool. Consequently, other merchants had to follow and this revolutionised the wool trade. These advances required money from the English merchants, and the situation in Van Diemen’s Land stood as follows. There had to be greater facilities for facilitating

128 Philip Oakden to Robert Gardner, 14 Jan. 1834, Philip Oakden Letterbook, NS 474, NS 1290, AOT.
130 Broeze, Mr. Brooks, p. 52.
131 Broeze, Mr. Brooks, p. 56.
remittances from Australia to Britain and for receiving advances from Britain. There was also a desperate need for hard currency and developmental capital.

The system had to be speeded up and the English merchants who were now involved in the Launceston trade needed to turn over their capital quickly and maintain liquidity. In the colonial market everything turned on money and credit and funds had to be available in the colony. The high interest rates were attractive to developmental capital. Butlin suggests that 10% had for years been the minimum rate as a safe short term loan and at risk rose rapidly.\textsuperscript{132} The 1830 Act in Tasmania which declared English usury laws invalid, seemingly had no real effect on the interest rates. Philip Oakden cited the interest rates to encourage friends and business acquaintances to invest in Van Diemen’s Land. Writing to Osmond Gilles in 1834, he noted that ‘would it not be advisable for your sisters to invest a proportion of their capital in the colony. It might be done so as to have the interest regularly sent to them. It would increase their income and I think without risk’.\textsuperscript{133} What Butlin refers to as the ups and downs of the economy were certainly connected to the wool trade, which at times had an uncertain edge to it. Oakden’s Letter Book gives a picture of the difficulty of predicting wool prices abroad. The delay in communication with Britain about wool prices slowed the economy. As Oakden wrote, ‘there were lower prices in November 1834 but then favourable accounts reached the colony and prices advanced considerably, but growers did not like the prices offered and sent home on their own account’.\textsuperscript{134}

Banks were to be a stabilising influence in this type of economy. Butlin sees them as the business of deposit, discount and exchange. Trading banks would provide a localised facility for discounting bills. Petrow writes ‘that the main objective of the first

\textsuperscript{132} Butlin, \textit{Foundations of the Australian Monetary System}, p. 223.
\textsuperscript{133} Philip Oakden to Osmond Gilles, 15 Jan. 1834, Philip Oakden Letterbook, NS 474, NS 1290, AOT.
\textsuperscript{134} Philip Oakden to Robert Gardner, 12 June 1835, Philip Oakden Letter Book, NS 474, NS 1290, AOT.
Vandemonian banks was to issue notes which were underwritten by shareholder investment’. 135

Wesleyan Methodist involvement in Vandemonian banking had commenced early with Wesleyan Methodist John Dunn of Hobart laying some groundwork.136 He had had Hamburg business experience for six years prior to sailing for Van Diemen’s Land in 1821 and therefore could reasonably be judged to be part of the Hamburg group in Van Diemen’s Land.137 Dunn arrived in Hobart on the Heroine on 10 September 1822 with other Wesleyan Methodists such as Robert and Ann Mather, and Messrs. Shoobridge, Drabble, Hiddlestone, and Chapman etc., all of whom had been encouraged to emigrate by the Rev. William Horton (See Chapter 2). Dunn arrived with goods worth £2,296 and was granted land; he also opened a shop on the corner of Elizabeth and Bathurst Street, Hobart. His first entry into banking was as a shareholder in the Bank of Van Diemen’s Land, and he progressed to being a director of the Derwent Bank which opened in 1828.138

At the same period in Launceston, Wesleyan Methodist John Gleadow was a Director of the newly formed Cornwall Bank, alongside such merchants as Thomas Williams and James Reibey. The Cornwall and the Derwent Bank were in 1828 part of the early beginnings of the Van Diemen’s Land banking system, and in both cases there was a Wesleyan Methodist on the Board of Directors. The Cornwall Bank had opened in reaction to the refusal of the Derwent Bank to provide a branch in Launceston, and Butlin describes the Cornwall’s early business as ‘modest but profitable, consisting

136 John Dunn’s father had been a weaver, and in 1806 at sixteen, John was apprenticed to a cotton muslin manufacturer for five years. He learnt the warehouse trade with all its aspects and affairs; (John Dunn Indenture, 1806, NS1400, AOT).
138 It is also noteworthy that James Reibey, future partner for Robert Brooks, was amongst the Directors.
almost wholly of discount of local bills and receipts of deposits without interest’.  

In 1829, John Dunn branched out and commenced his own bank, The Commercial Bank. It was as Butlin writes ‘the venture of a single man, John Dunn, and it was not until 1832 that it was converted into a joint stock company.’  

This action in initiating such a project as a private bank speaks volumes for the level of confidence and influence of this leading Wesleyan Methodist figure in Hobart, though the initiation of a private bank was in harmony with the English provincial tradition; the concept and legalisation of joint stock companies only came in 1826. Commercial trading experience in England and Hamburg, combined with commercial success in Hobart had conjoined with the notion of consecrated wealth to take John Dunn to the next level. He was the foremost financial figure in the Hobart Wesleyan Methodists, and was perhaps a role model for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite.

The concept of a private savings bank had been introduced by John Dunn in January 1831. It was called a General Savings Bank and it was a special branch of his Commercial Bank. Butlin writes that ‘Dunn had already originated payment of interest on deposits in Tasmania in 1829 with the Commercial Bank’. Butlin considers that ‘the story of Australian Savings Banks began in New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land with measures to enforce convict discipline and encourage thrift amongst emancipists’. Tentative steps had been made in New South Wales since 1817 towards savings banking with forced convict deposits, but it was not on a firm footing until 1832 when it was regulated by an Act in Council. Lieutenant Governor Arthur also approved of the ‘principle of convicts’ money being put into some type of Savings Bank deposits’. Dunn paid 7½% interest on deposits in his Savings Bank and it was probably
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143 Ibid, p. 31.
aimed at assignees and expirees. The Derwent Bank in Hobart had already started a special arrangement whereby money could be deposited in a special savings account managed by the Derwent directors, and the scheme seemed to be aimed at reformed convicts and expirees.\textsuperscript{144}

Savings banks appealed to the more affluent and philanthropic members of society and, in Launceston, the Wesleyan Methodist involvement was obvious. The Launceston Bank for Savings was established just after the Tamar Bank was established there in 1835. Economic growth is naturally linked to banking, and, as Broeze writes, ‘With the recovery after 1829, the Tamar was part of a wave of the next generation of trading banks’.\textsuperscript{145} The Tamar Bank, which took over from the Bank of Van Diemen’s Land, had Lewis Gilles as Managing Director and two Wesleyans as directors, Philip Oakden and George Palmer Ball. Maurice Connolly, John Gore’s agent, and Thomas Williams, Robert Brooks’ agent, were also on the Board.

We should stress that here on the Tamar Bank Board were two Wesleyans on equal terms with the two agents of the London mercantile houses, Robert Brooks and John Gore & Co. The merchants who had eyed the Launceston trade in Chapter 3 of this thesis now had their agents in place to facilitate access to resources, bill discounting etc. The Bank of Van Diemen’s Land, which commenced a branch in Launceston in 1832, had already heralded this process with Wesleyan Methodist Henry Jennings as a director alongside Thomas Williams and Michael Connolly, Brooks’ and Gore’s men.

The Tamar Bank provided the new facilities cash credits up to £500 and interest offered on deposits at 5% interest for six months. E.A. Beever comments ‘this was ill suited to working class saving’,\textsuperscript{146} and the Launceston Bank for Savings was born with the idea of

\textsuperscript{144} In 1834 a separate Derwent Bank for Savings was formed, aimed at depositing from the wider community.

\textsuperscript{145} Broeze, \textit{Mr. Brooks}, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{146} Beever, \textit{Launceston Bank for Savings}, p. 12.
placing the proceeds in an account at the Tamar Bank. Beever comments that ‘it was then considered that three of the eight sponsors of the Launceston Bank for Savings, Oakden, Gilles and Ball were connected with the Tamar Bank’. The idea of a savings bank was very attractive to the Wesleyan Methodist element in the community, aligned as they were alongside the philanthropic elements of the town committed to worthy causes. Beever discusses ‘the impressive list of Trustees over the years, placed there to inspire confidence, their main purpose was to impress’.

The Cornwall Bank’s affairs were uncertain. Butlin comments that ‘there was great uncertainty as to what its assets and liabilities were’, and for a period in 1833 it was closed. The Tamar Bank presented a challenge to the Cornwall and Butlin compares their note issue for December 1833 where ‘the Tamar’s note issue was £11,722 and the Cornwall’s was £4,489’. From 1835–36 onwards, Port Phillip and South Australia were brought into Launceston’s orbit of commerce. Settlers and livestock flowed across the Bass Strait, but this was counter-balanced to some extent by the constant sale of goods. Beever points out that ‘despite the drain to the mainland, the population of Launceston increased from 5,000 in 1835 to 7,000 in 1840’. Banking in Launceston reached its next phase when merchants like Robert Brooks increased their investment in Van Diemen’s Land. British exports were more in demand and Broeze alerts his readers to the fact that ‘Launceston loomed so large in Robert Brooks’ shipping operations, that of all the fourteen ships he bought before 1840, no less that ten were destined for there’.

Local banking was beginning to think globally and Launceston was confident enough to reach out to England to become involved imperially in the next banking phase. The Anglo Banks were more needed than ever to facilitate the transfer of bills and to inject capital
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149 Butlin, *Australia and New Zealand Bank*, p. 16.
into the colony. A.S.J. Baster feels that 'between 1834 and 1840, the turn around for investment funds and foreign exchange facilities in the Australian trade gave rise to the creation of imperial banks' 153. At the same time, it is important to understand what had been happening in banking in England. In 1826, the Banking Copartnerships Act allowed the formation of joint stock banking companies with any number of shareholders and the right to issue their own notes. This was a large shift away from private banks. In the mid-1830s, Holmes and Green stress that 'there was a surge in investment and speculation in railways, banks and insurance companies, and the markets were hyperactive with hothouse conditions. Promoters of joint stock companies stressed the safety of their capital base versus private banks, whilst overall there was hostility from the Bank of England'. 154

The first Anglo Imperial joint stock bank to operate in Van Diemen’s Land was the Bank of Australasia. Butlin makes it quite clear that 'the Anglo Banks such as the Bank of Australasia were British ventures designed to make profits for British shareholders with close and detailed supervision of policy by London Directors, there was never a question of independent local control'. 155 There was always an Inspector appointed to ensure that the London desires and wishes were fulfilled. Broeze also alerts the reader to the fact that 'the composition of the Bank of Australasia, London promoters included businessmen interested in the Australian trade like Jacob Montefiore, J.S. Brownrigg of Cockerill & Co. and Richard Norman'. 156 The Bank of Australasia was a Chartered Bank and Baster explains that 'it commenced its undertaking in November 1832, though its charter was dated 31 May 1835, nearly three years later; the reason for delay was that matters of principle were being settled'. 157 Holmes and Green stress, however, that 'the advantages of

156 Broeze, *Mr. Brooks*, p. 93.
157 Baster, *Imperial Banks*, p. 49.
joint stock companies formed in the 1830s was that they relied on a kit of rules and Deeds of Settlement from the earliest joint stock banks formed in the late 1820s'. The British wished to gain rewards from the economic wool boom in Australia, and this is spelled out in the Bank of Australasia’s prospectus: ‘The Directors are satisfied, that in no part of the world can capital be employed more advantageously and securely than... the colonies of Australia’. In England, joint stock banks were bound closely to industry and in Australia they were to be tethered to the wool industry.

The Bank of Australasia’s Charter meant limited liability and limited responsibility for its shareholders and this aroused suspicion in Van Diemen’s Land. In the banks of Van Diemen’s Land, each proprietor was liable to the whole extent of his property and person, whereas with the Chartered Bank each proprietor was only liable to double the amount of his share. Governor Arthur concurred in the suspicion and refused the bank a share in public business. John Dunn, Wesleyan Methodist, Managing Director of the Commercial Bank, also objected to the Bank of Australasia as having the power to draw specie away from Van Diemen’s Land.

The Cornwall Bank in Launceston was absorbed into the Bank of Australasia on 1 January 1836. James Henty was in London in 1835 doing business on behalf of his family, and he suggested that the Bank of Australasia take over the Cornwall Bank. This transpired and Charles Henty became manager. There was some suggestion that it ‘was difficult to persuade local men to join the board’, but Henry Reed provided the Wesleyan Methodist quotient and became a Launceston local director. Philip Oakden had foreseen ‘that interest rates would come down when the new bank called ‘The Goliah’ commenced. Bank interest will be 8%. We have now thought of

158 Holmes and Green, *Midland Banking*, p. 17.
159 Baster, *Imperial Banks*, p. 51.
161 Ibid, p. 265.
162 Ibid, p. 265.
anticipating this in the Tamar Bank by lowering to that and still pay a handsome dividend for the last half of the year’.  

There was continuing hostility to the Bank of Australasia (The Goliah); the main accusation in the newspapers was that ‘of its monopoly and the drawing of specie from the colony’. The argument that the Bank of Australasia was a banking monopoly was strongly refuted by Geo. Kinnear, the Bank Inspector: ‘the only monopoly I know of, is that of the Derwent and Van Diemen’s Land Bank who hold a monopoly of the Government accounts’. Petrow corroborates the hostility to The Bank of Australasia, particularly issuing from the Cornwall Chronicle, and divided public opinion. He reminds us, however, that the Launceston Advertiser ‘did in fact support the entry of the Anglo Australian Banking Company, as the Australasia was sometimes called, and that it did not expect too much mischief’.

The heights of Wesleyan Methodist involvement are shown in the shared establishment of the Anglo Imperial Bank, The Union Bank of Australia by Philip Oakden. The establishment of the Union Bank is an excellent example of pious, evangelical networks. The involvement of Oakden was something not replicated by any other Wesleyan Methodist at the time in Britain or abroad. Kurt Samuelsson talks about ‘merchants developing a kind of international freemasonry of business with connections in all the commercial centres of Europe’. Tyson narrows the concept and posits that ‘the Methodist network of employers, buyers and sellers, was an attempt to support the Christian community in the highly competitive market place of industrial England’.

Both these comments contribute to the understanding of the connections that
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163 Philip Oakden to Osmond Gilles, 22 August 1835, Philip Oakden Letterbook, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
164 The term ‘The Goliah’ was a disparaging one.
165 Cornwall Chronicle, 6 August 1836.
166 Cornwall Chronicle, 13 August 1836.
167 Petrow, ‘Boom, Slump and Bust’.
168 Kurt Samuelsson, Religion and Economic Action, the Protestant Ethic, the Rise of Capitalism and the Abuses of Scholarship (Toronto, 1957), p. 130.
Oakden was to utilise in the part he played in the establishment of the Union Bank of Australia.

The part that Oakden did play in the establishment of the Union Bank of Australia has been a matter for discussion and argument amongst historians. A.G.L. Shaw writes that ‘The banking boom and the new banks being established get only passing reference from John West, even though the Launceston connections with the latter were being developed under his nose’.\footnote{A.G.L. Shaw, ‘John West’s Tasmania’, Bulletin of the Centre for Tasmanian Historical Studies, Centennial Issue, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1990-91, p. 89.} Butlin states that ‘the conception and birth of the Union Bank raises a problem in historical justice and by selecting various documents, one can either support either Oakden or George Fife Angas as the creator and there are elements of uncertainty about that’.\footnote{Butlin, Australian and New Zealand Bank, p. 51.} This thesis proposes to show that Oakden’s involvement was indeed equal to that of Angas and indeed his involvement from the point of view of Launceston commerce was without peer. It is essential to be in possession of the times and dates of the whole affair and that is why Oakden’s Letterbook is invaluable in the run down. Though the Angas-Oakden saga will appear to be protracted and over detailed, it is the opinion of the thesis that this is necessary to secure acknowledgment of Wesleyan Methodist Oakden’s legitimate place in the founding of the Union Bank of Australia.

Oakden left Launceston for England on 12 March 1836 on board the \textit{Alexander Johnson}, and arrived in Liverpool on 12 July 1836.\footnote{P. Oakden to Frederick Wigan, 18 August 1836, Philip Oakden Letterbook, NS474, NS1290, AOT.} It is clear from the Letterbook that Oakden had been planning on sailing for England as early as December 1834; he had initially only come to Van Diemen’s Land on a short stay, perhaps for two or more wool seasons. Owing to various circumstances, including successful business dealings, the opening of Port Phillip and the firm establishment of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, he put off his departure until March 1836. He had already
been in Launceston for two years and needed to confirm accounts and business with his patron and backer Robert Gardner of Manchester. J.T. Walker promulgated the misnomer that is oft repeated in banking histories that Oakden was sent to London ‘in order to strengthen the Tamar bank and from his negotiations, arrangements were made from which grew the Union Bank of Australia’.173 The statement by Walker was based on a memorandum handed to him by a friend. Three years previously in 1885, however, Henry Jennings had stated categorically in an article of reminiscences that ‘Mr. Oakden was then in England and we knew how great his influence was and we determined to suggest to raise another company with equal capital to the Bank of Australasia’.174

Jennings’ memory accorded with Oakden’s Letter Book about already being in London some three months before a request was sent by the Tamar Bank for help. There are some inaccuracies in the Jennings’ article but he is 100% accurate about Oakden being already in England before the Tamar Bank thought of approaching him. Butlin lacked knowledge of Oakden’s movements and personal and business correspondence, and he repeats Walker’s note of 1888 that Oakden was sent to London to negotiate a connection for the Tamar Bank. Butlin also misconstrues the Jennings’ article saying that ‘the Bank had been conceived by the Tamar Directors and Oakden commissioned to promote it’.175 D.T. Merrett in his banking history repeats the Walker and Butlin inaccuracies and compounds it by saying ‘that two of the Tamar fellow Directors journeyed to England with Oakden as Henty had done’.176 Butlin further discredits his research by stating that ‘it is not plausible to imagine that a visiting colonial [i.e. Oakden], whose previous business experience had not

175 Butlin, *Australian and New Zealand Bank*, p. 53.
been successful, would have been accepted by prosperous London capitalists as the initiator of what was intended, from its foundation, to be a major bank'.

To counter this, it will be demonstrated that Oakden did indeed have connections in England which were to bolster his position. Oakden’s chief connection in England was Robert Gardner, notable Manchester cotton-master and devout evangelical. Anthony Howe considers that ‘the cotton masters were therefore the leading entrepreneurial group produced by the Industrial Revolution, as well as the dominant group in Lancashire’. Jane Garnett and Anthony Howe see Gardner as one of those business men who aimed to integrate their working life more clearly with their religion, In their opinion, Gardner was ‘one of those Christians in control of industrial commercial operations, who felt keenly the moral dilemmas and conflicts of responsibility posed by their business life’. Two laudatory nineteenth century books take Robert Gardner as a model for the ideal business man. Firstly, Hugh Stowell’s A Model for Men of Business, Lectures on the Character of Nebemiah, 1854 and, secondly, W. Kirkham’s 1865 book, which was a memoir of T.C. Hincksman, fervent Wesleyan Methodist, who lived in Gardner’s home. Hincksman avowed that Robert Gardner had taught him the values of true religion such as self-denial, conscience, diligence and humbleness and that worldly success was only to be valued in relation to God.

This was the substance of Gardner, an evangelical employer who encouraged non-sectarian education and employment. He supported the ten hour movement by conducting an experiment with an eleven hour day and encouraged Anglican Church reform by suggesting that cathedral funds should be directed to the needy of
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177 Butlin, Australian and New Zealand Bank, p. 54.
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Manchester. He also built the Anglican Church at Salford for evangelical Hugh Stowell. In his paper *The Labour of Life*, Robert Gardner revealed his character by noting that it was principally by the working classes that we had our wealth, and it ought to be our object to promote the well being of the working classes. These were the social and moral objections felt by some Anglican evangelicals and they meshed in with the Wesleyan Methodist obligations of philanthropy and benevolence.

Philip Oakden’s connection with George Fife Angas was three fold, though he had not met him prior to his visit to England in March 1836. Firstly, Osmond Gilles, Philip’s business partner, had taken passage for South Australia on the *Buffalo* with Governor Hindmarsh and other officials, sailing for the new colony on 22 July 1836, a day before Oakden arrived in Liverpool on 23 July 1836. Involved with the South Australia Association from its inception in 1834, Gilles had lent it £1,000 at one stage to keep it afloat. He was one of the wealthiest South Australian settlers and was the Chairman of the Emigration Committee of Management. The South Australia Company was formed on 22 January 1836; ‘when the Commissioners were appointed Osmond Gilles advanced another £1,000 to meet expenses gaining the support of Torrens and the position of Colonial Treasurer’. Though reputedly prepared to invest £10,000 in the new colony, Gilles only spent part of it in land and stores. The South Australia Company was founded as a joint stock enterprise; the capital of £500,000 was raised by shares of £50 each with the right to raise the capital to the limit of £1,000,000.

George Fife Angas was the largest shareholder in the South Australian Company, and he was appointed Chairman. The original board of the South Australia Company included the following directors: Raikes Currie, M.P., Charles Hindley, M.P., John Rundle, M.P., John Pirie, James Hyde, Henry Kingscote, Christopher Rawson, Thomas Smith, James
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Fitzpatrick states that ‘it was Angas’ command of capital that instituted the South Australia Company and made the colonization scheme practicable’. 187 The South Australia Company connection to Launceston was through Lewis Gilles, who was their Launceston agent.

Oakden’s next connection to Angas came through George Arthur, ex-Governor of Van Diemen’s Land. Oakden would have been known to Arthur through the setting up of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society and the application for funding of £600. The Angas family were merchants, shipowners and coach and carriage manufacturers in Newcastle. The family firm Angas & Co. had a large trade, importing mahogany from British Honduras with its centre at Belize. Edwin Hodder asserts that ‘Angas was a Christian first, a merchant afterwards … any wealth gained, he would hold in trust from God to be used for the advancement of the Kingdom of God in the world’. 188 Concern for the slaves of Honduras prompted Angas to help send out missionaries ‘to bring the natives under the sound of the gospel’. 189 Arthur had been the Superintendent of the settlement and evangelically like-minded. Hodder writes that ‘Arthur was in full sympathy with the efforts of Mr. Angas’. 190 Assisted by his true friend Arthur, Angas strove to bring the rights of the natives of Honduras to a legal tribunal in Britain. Additionally, Angas gave unlimited time to the Sunday School movement and Hodder attributes to Angas ‘the foundation of Sunday Schools in the north of England’. 191

Oakden’s third connection to Angas was his brother William Henry Angas. William Henry had been a seafarer for the family firm with a deep concern for fellow seamen, and he expressed the view
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‘that no man seemed to care for their souls’.

Expert in European languages, William Henry preached fluently to sailors in Norway, Sweden, Holland, Russia, France and Germany in their own tongue. He also spent a year in a Moravian settlement in order to understand them. He became a missionary to seamen and formed the Bethel Seaman’s Union which joined with the Port of London Society in 1826 to become the British and Foreign Sailor’s Society for promoting the Moral and Religious Welfare of Seamen. William Henry Angas died suddenly of cholera in September 1832. It is Edwin Hodder who alerts his readers to the connection between William Henry Angas and Philip Oakden. Hodder describes Oakden as ‘a man not only of business but a man after a godly sort, and an old friend of William Henry Angas’. Thus three connections for Philip Oakden have been established through to George Fife Angas, namely Osmond Gilles, Lieutenant Governor Arthur and William Henry Angas.

George Fife Angas had gone on to found the National Provincial Bank of England, a scheme for bringing a number of provincial banks together under the one body. A Baptist by practice, George Fife Angas’ sentiments regarding the increase of wealth were aligned with those of the Wesleyan Methodists. He believed that ‘with respect to the increase in wealth, I think we should have a specific design of disposing of the same in the promotion of the Divine glory, by advancing the true interests of the human family’.

Like Robert Gardner and Philip Oakden, Angas’ piety was genuine.

The various banking histories allude to Oakden having an introduction to Angas, no doubt through one of these connections, but this does not seem to occur until some time early June 1837. In October 1836, Oakden wrote to Osmond Gilles stating ‘he had not seen Angas’. However, Angas noted 13 January 1837, that Oakden
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had made contact with him, saying that ‘when he arrived in Liverpool
no new bank existed or was likely to exist’.\textsuperscript{196} Presumably, this
contact was by note, not by a face to face meeting. The next mention
in the Oakden Letterbook has Oakden writing to Lewis Gilles saying
‘I left Liverpool on 6 June and arrived in London and the whole of
my time has been occupied in conjunction with Mr. Angas,
endeavouring to form a new joint banking company for the
Australian Colonies’.\textsuperscript{197}

This was virtually a year after Oakden’s arrival in England in
July 1836. It had been understood in the colonies in late 1836 that
plans were being made in Liverpool for a second Imperial bank, The
United Bank of Australia and Van Diemen’s Land. Butlin claims that
‘this project had received no publicity in the colonies and that the
Tamar Bank knowledge of it was presumably drawn from private
correspondence with Oakden himself.’\textsuperscript{198} This is not so, as is shown
by reading the Launceston newspapers for the period. Two columns
on the front page are given to publicising the United Banking
Company of Van Diemen’s Land in the \textit{Cornwall Chronicle} of 8
October 1836. This article was reprinted from the \textit{Liverpool Mercury}
and had obviously just arrived by ship from Liverpool. It was
probably sent early June, a journey of four months, too early for
Oakden to have sent it. He arrived in Liverpool on 23 July. Two days
after the article, the Tamar Bank reacted and wrote to Oakden and
two others:

\begin{quote}
We hereby legally empower you to act for us in negotiating an
agreement for a connection between the bank and the
individuals in Liverpool who have it in contemplation to
establish a bank for the for the use of the Australian colonies to
be styled the United Banking Company of Australia and Van
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{196} ‘Notes on the Foundation of the Union Bank of Australia’, Version 3, George
Fife Angas Papers, 13 January 1837, Collection of Mr. Rob. Linn, Adelaide. (Angas
Papers).
\textsuperscript{197} Philip Oakden to Lewis Gilles, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 6 July 1837, NS474,
NS1290, AOT.
\textsuperscript{198} Butlin, \textit{Australian and New Zealand Bank}, p. 53.
Diemen’s Land, and to whom this day, we have written on the subject.\textsuperscript{199}

The Tamar Bank had been having its own set of difficulties. The Bank of Australasia was able to give bills on London at par, thus giving it an advantage. The Tamar was being forced to the wall and realised that it had to enlarge its capital. Baster writes that ‘the Tamar Bank suspended payment on 26 September 1836 and the Bank of Australasia was unjustly accused of causing the suspension by denuding the island of specie’.\textsuperscript{200} Angas’ notes reveal that it was Oakden’s persistence that persuaded him to go ahead with the Union Bank, even though the formation was Angas’ own work.\textsuperscript{201}

Broeze feels that ‘it was because of George Fife Angas’ involvement with the National Provincial Bank, a leader in branch banking, as well as his connection to the South Australian Company, that Angas had no difficulty in drawing up a detailed prospectus’.\textsuperscript{202} Hodder’s opinion is that Angas had been looking for a bank ‘to transact in neighbouring colonies, the business of the South Australia Company’s bank, but with the Company’s Deed of Settlement confining their bank exclusively to South Australia, the idea was abandoned as far as the Company was concerned’.\textsuperscript{203} Hodder implies that, knowing this, Angas was easily persuaded by Oakden to form an independent company. Angas certainly reveals some of this in his diary: ‘We walked together for an hour or two on Southwark Bridge and considered how best it was proper for me to add to my present engagements. If without injury to other affairs I have on hand, I can lay the foundation of this projected Company on such principles and with such men as will glorify God and promote

\textsuperscript{199} Tamar Bank Directors to A. Brown, Philip Oakden, John Fletcher, 10 October 1836, Union Bank Letters, ANZ Group Archives. This letter was signed by the Tamar Bank directors, Lewis W. Gilles, Thomas Williams, George P. Ball, Michael Connolly and Thomas Reibey.
\textsuperscript{200} Baster, \textit{Imperial Banks}, p. 59.
\textsuperscript{201} ‘Notes on the Foundation of the Union Bank of Australia, Version 3’, George Fife Angas Papers, 20 June 1837, collection of Mr. Rob. Linn, Adelaide.
\textsuperscript{202} Broeze, \textit{Mr. Brooks}, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{203} Hodder, \textit{George Fife Angas}, p. 134.
the weal of men, and at the same benefit South Australia, then indeed it might be my duty to do so'.

Butlin describes the various impetuses that went into the foundation of the Union Bank of Australia and criticises Hodder for claiming that Angas had the whole credit for the establishment of the Union Bank of Australia, pointing out that Hodder was quoting from Angas’ diary which was, understandably, self-congratulatory. Butlin equally dismisses the claim that the project was due to Oakden and the Tamar Bank, and is equally doubtful about Walker's 1888 statement relating to a friend’s memo regarding Oakden. Butlin also notes that Baster is cautious about Walker’s story. Possibly the best way to analyse the influences that come to bear on the formation of the Union Bank of Australia is to look at the composition of the Directorate in the original prospectus dated September 1837. Oakden referred to the new directors as ‘all influential practical men and not great names, just for the sake of names’.

**Union Bank of Australia**

**English Directors September 1837**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George Fife Angas</th>
<th>Charles Edward Mangles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brooks</td>
<td>Philip Oakden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James John Cummins</td>
<td>Christopher Rawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gardner</td>
<td>Thomas Sands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gore</td>
<td>James Bogle Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hindley MP</td>
<td>James Ruddell Todd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

204 Hodder, *George Fife Angas*, p. 134; (This is an extract from George Fife Angas’ diary. The diary has since disappeared and all that is left are Angas Papers which are a collection of notes in some different versions held by Mr. Rob Linn, Adelaide).
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There was the Manchester and Liverpool connection with the inclusion of the evangelical cotton masters Robert Gardner and Charles Hindley MP and the merchant Thomas Sands. Charles Hindley, a member of Parliament, was variously known as a Wesleyan Methodist or a Moravian. He was originally a classics and mathematics tutor, who had entered the cotton trade and become one of the cotton masters. Devoutly religious, Hindley was a founder of the Protestant Dissenters and General Fire and Life Assurance Company for the benefit of families of Dissenting and Wesleyan Ministers. In 1847 he was deeply involved in the Ten Hours Act and in the 1840s joined the Anti Corn Law League and Peace movement, becoming President of the Peace Society. Anthony Howe sees Hindley’s support for the Peace movement as ‘having a strong religious motive’.207 As well, Hindley was a director of the South Australia Company with Angas.

Thomas Sands was a Wesleyan Methodist merchant of Liverpool, deeply involved in the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. He was present at the Anniversary Meeting of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society which included a farewell to the Rev. John Waterhouse who was embarking as Superintendent of the Mission to Australia and Polynesia.208 His name certainly appears as a signatory to a document alongside the Wesleyan Methodist greats decrying the ‘misguided organisation called the Grand Central Association who were attempting to subvert Methodism by withholding funds’.209 Being Liverpool-based and Wesleyan Methodist, he would certainly have been known to Oakden. The triumvirate of Gardner, Hindley and Sands can be seen as a cooperative measure of Oakden and Angas, with the balance weighted in Oakden’s favour. Butlin grudgingly acknowledges Oakden’s role in ‘negotiating the Liverpool interests of the new bank’.210 Added to this it is important, as Howe reminds us, to be

207 Howe, Cotton Masters, p. 230.  
210 Butlin, Australian and New Zealand Bank, p. 56.
aware of the ‘transformation of banking in the 1830s through the emergence of joint stock banks’. These were banking partnerships between cotton masters and by the 1850s, ‘it was common for a textile master to become a director of a local bank’. This is backed up in an article by Stuart Jones discussing the Manchester cotton magnates move into banking 1826-56. Jones discusses the timing and reasons for this particular growth and produces an explanatory framework against which Robert Gardner and Charles Hindley can be viewed.
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PROSPECTUS OF THE
Union Bank of Australia.

Capital £500,000, in Shares of £25 each.
One-half to be reserved for the Colonies.

Directors.
GEORGE FIFE ANGAS, Esq.
ROBERT BROOKS, Esq.
JAMES JOHN CUMMINS, Esq.
JOHN GORE, Esq.
ROBERT GARDNER, Esq., Manchester.
CHRISTOPHER RAWSON, Esq., Halifax.

CHARLES HINDLEY, Esq., M.P.
CHARLES EDWARD MANGLES, Esq.
PHILIP OAKDEN, Esq.
JAMES RUDDELL TUDY, Esq.
THOMAS SANDS, Esq., Liverpool.

Trustees.
GEORGE CARR GLYN, Esq.
JOHN GORE, Esq.
JAMES JOHN CUMMINS, Esq.


Messrs. Bartlett and Beddome.

MASHFIELD MASON, Esq.

In the establishment of a Bank of Issue and Deposit under the above Title, the Directors are chiefly impressed with a conviction of the importance of meeting the increased demand for Capital in the Australasian Colonies, and are desirous in the establishment of their Banks in New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, and other Australasian Settlements, to identify, to the utmost of their power, the interests of the Colonists with their own.

The Directors are fully persuaded that in no part of the world can Capital be more advantageously or securely employed than in Australasia, where the Bank Interest is 8 per Cent. and the current rate considerably higher; and where the Dividends of the Colonial Banks have hitherto averaged fully 15 per Cent. per Annum.

An important advantage in the present undertaking is the contemplated junction of one of the most profitable Banks in the Colonies with this establishment: which measure, it is expected, will be followed by the coalition of others at the principal stations.

A local currency, based upon a capital affording unquestionable security, is much wanted, and loudly called for; and the facilities which this establishment will afford for transmitting, in safety, the funds of emigrants and others to the Colonies, and of making remittances to Europe will be great and highly appreciated.

In order to facilitate the junction with some of the existing Banks, Ten Thousand Shares are reserved for appropriation in the Colonies, the Directors retaining the power of issuing in England, at such premium as they shall see fit, whatever part of these Shares may not be required for that purpose.

A deed of settlement will be duly prepared, which will contain a clause giving power to dissolve the Company, in the event of one-fourth of the subscribed capital being at any time lost; and it will be imperative on the Board of Directors to call a meeting of the Proprietors to consider such dissolution if any such loss shall arise.

Arrangements will be immediately entered into, enabling parties to effect remittances of money between Great Britain and the Colonies.

Application for shares to be made (if by letter, post-paid) to the Secretary, Mashfield Mason, Esq., at the temporary office of the Company, No. 76, Cornhill.

The Prospectus for the Union Bank of Australia
The strong expertise of merchants also went into the formation of the Union Bank of Australia. Naturally Broeze, whose work is merchant based, stresses that the merchants and shipowners of London played a pivotal role in the establishment of the imperial banks ‘with Robert Brooks and John Gore being actively involved in the creation of the Union Bank’.\(^ {213}\) Brooks is certainly mentioned by Oakden in July 1837 stating that ‘Mr. Gore will send a prospectus to Mr. Connolly and possibly one may be sent by Mr. Brooks’.\(^ {214}\) Broeze also reminds his readers that Brooks and Gore were the London principals of two directors of the Tamar Bank, Michael Connolly and Thomas Williams, and that they were also on the committee of the newly formed New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land Commercial Association, as well as directors of the London Dock Company. (J.W. Buckle of Buckle, Bagster and Buckle was also on the committee of management with others of the Commercial Association). Broeze notes ‘they had the power to attract investors to the new company’.\(^ {215}\)

George Fife Angas invited James John Cummins to accept a directorship. Cummins was a professional banker and had managed the Bank of British North America. His family firm N. & J. Cummins of Cork was a large supplier of pork and had dealt with Robert Brooks. The pious side of his personality was illustrated by his publication in 1839 of the book *Practical Meditation*, which included such hymns as ‘Jesus Lord of Light and Glory’.\(^ {216}\) Both Christopher Rawson and James Ruddell were already directors of the South Australia Company, and Charles Mangles was the brother-in-law of the Western Australian Governor Sir James Stirling. Mangles was the leader of trade in that colony. James Bogle Smith was the London representative of the merchant shipowners William Smith & Son of Liverpool.

\(^ {213}\) Broeze, *Mr. Brooks*, 94.

\(^ {214}\) Philip Oakden to Lewis Gilles, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 17 July 1837, NS474, NS1290, AOT.

\(^ {215}\) Broeze, *Mr. Brooks*, p. 95.

\(^ {216}\) Broeze, *Mr. Brooks*, p. 513, note 27.
Broeze highlights the two factions on the Union Bank board ‘the pious interest and the hard nosed mercantile interest’. Angas, Cummins, Gardner, Hindley, Todd, Sands and Oakden were the pious element and Brooks, Gore and Mangles were the mercantile bloc. However, Broeze does note that Mangles did have evangelical interests, and was treasurer of the Australasian Church Missionary Society. Angas had certainly wanted the pious element in the directorate and Oakden was the ideal collaborator in the project. Angas wrote:

By the manifest workings of the hand of a gracious Providence has this company been formed in a couple of weeks, and there were two grand objects I had in getting up this company. First, the protection of the South Australia Company from competition and the appointment of such a body of Directors as would select and appoint from pious men to places of trust.

Angas wanted to protect the South Australia Company banking facility and it was decided that the new Union Bank of Australia would not establish a branch there. There was provision for the Tamar Bank to be purchased and there was no Charter of Incorporation as the costs associated with that were high. Oakden explained to John Dunn that ‘we have no charter, the directors are liable for the whole of the property, the same as other colonial banks, many of the shareholders are men of great wealth and the shares principally held by persons connected with the colonies and their friends’. Angas decided to go ahead without a charter and he says in his diary ‘it was on the advice of my old friend Sir George Arthur’. Arthur’s was one of the unseen hands in the formation of the bank. The prospectus was drawn up by Angas on 19 July 1837

---

Broeze, Mr. Brooks, p. 100.
Sydney Herald, 10 September 1838.
George Fife Angas Diary 13 July 1837, diary no longer extant, quoted in Hodder, George Fife Angas, p. 135.
Philip Oakden to John Dunn Hobart, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 3 May 1838, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
George Fife Angas Diary 29 June 1837, diary no longer extant, quoted in Hodder, George Fife Angas, p. 135.
There is a letter published in the Launceston Advertiser, 11 January 1838 from a gentleman recently returned from England, and he refers to the Union Bank. He wrote ‘The Union Bank is going on very prosperously…Sir George Arthur seems to take a warm interest in it’. 
and the final prospectus for the Union Bank of Australia was dated 1 September 1837. The nominal capital was £500,000 in shares of £25 each, with power to increase to £1,000,000; 7,000 shares were reserved for colonial subscribers and the remaining 13,000 sold in England. The first choice for the new bank’s name had been the Austral-India Bank but this was abandoned in favour of Union Bank of Australasia and finally altered to Union Bank of Australia.225 Mashfield Mason was appointed secretary to the Union Bank of Australia.

The extent of Oakden’s persistence is highlighted in a later correspondence with Angas regarding the appointment of the bank inspector. He admitted to having ‘all along pressured upon you (and sometimes you may have thought intrusively so) the importance of having the most eligible person that would be obtained to fill the situation. I hope that Mr. McLaren will be all that can wish’.224 John Cunningham McLaren was appointed Colonial Inspector. He was the nephew of David McLaren, manager of the South Australia Company, and had experience in various institutions including the Provincial Bank of Ireland. Regarding him, Angas revealed to Oakden that ‘Although I do not consider him a pious man, he is a most worthy character of extensive experience’.225

Oakden left for Launceston on the Clifton, 15 November 1837, accompanied by two of his Wigan nephews Arthur and Philip, brothers of Frederick Wigan. When he safely arrived in Launceston, he relinquished his London directorship to Benjamin Lindo, a London city merchant, preferring to hold the Launceston directorship. Oakden had been the working director in London as the situation demanded. His persistence and contacts had convinced Angas to join the venture and lend his respectability, but it was

---

223 Philip Oakden to Lewis Gilles, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 6 July 1837, NS474, NS1290, AOT; Union Bank of Australia Minutes, London, 7 and 10 July 1837, UAL 401A, ANZ Group Archives.

224 Philip Oakden to George Fife Angas, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 15 May 1838, NS474, NS1290, AOT.

225 George Fife Angas to Philip Oakden, 9 December 1837, Oakden Papers, U/294/1, ANZ Group Archives.
The Launceston Wesleyan Methodist had triumphed in the global arena. The whole formation of the bank cannot have been easy and this is apparent from a complaint made by Mashfield Mason about the Liverpool directors: ‘I would remark respecting our proprietors in Liverpool, they certainly give greater trouble than the whole body elsewhere. I can only say, I wish they had never heard of the bank’. 

The all important specie for the bank came out at different times and in different amounts. As per his Letterbook, Philip Oakden brought £20,000 with himself on the Clifton, £20,000 was sent directly to Hobart Town and £5,000 per Rhoda. Mashfield Mason’s correspondence points to £20,000 per Clifton, £5,000 per Rhoda and £5,000 per Bolivia, total £30,000, bills per Munford all to Launceston and Hoptown Town, £10,000 per Young Queen and £20,000 per Fanny total £30,000, making in all £60,000 to Van Diemen’s Land as specie. S.J. Butlin’s calculations have £20,000 in coin accompanying Philip Oakden in the Clifton, £25,000 in Mexican dollars sent ahead to Launceston and further shipments of £20,000 to Hobart and £15,000 to Launceston, totalling £80,000. All these variations in amounts probably point to about £70,000 coming as specie.

The opening of the Union Bank of Australia took place on 1 May 1838. The Tamar Bank had been dissolved and formed a junction with the Union Bank. The Launceston board had a similar format to the old Tamar Bank with Lewis Gilles as Managing

---

226 George Fife Angas also involved Philip Oakden in pious missionary ventures. In early 1839, he wrote to Oakden saying that ‘he had just heard of the arrival of 600 Germans…poor persecuted people who deserve more sympathy manifested towards them in this country’ (Angas Letter Book, 4 February 1839, p. 214, South Australian Archives, as cited in L.A. Triebel. ‘The Early South Australian German Settlers’, *Tasmanian Historical Research Association Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 8, 1959, p. 61); Philip Oakden sent a donation to assist, and there was a discussion on how to assist these poor families possibly in Melbourne with other Moravian missionary families.

227 Mashfield Mason to Philip Oakden, 24 March 1838, Oakden Papers, U/294/1, ANZ Group Archives.

Director, Oakden, Thomas Williams, Michael Connolly and William Fletcher. Fletcher, staunch friend of Oakden, had arrived with him in Van Diemen's Land in 1833 and this position as a Union Bank director led, as Broeze writes, 'to a brilliant career. He eventually became manager at Launceston and Melbourne, then Colonial Inspector and finally a Brooks' nomination as Director of the London Board'.

John Gore and Robert Brooks had their men in place in the shape of Thomas Williams and Michael Connolly, men who could service their demands and who had privileged access to the bank's resources.

Launceston Union Bank of Australia
April 1838 Advertisement.

Philip Oakden had managed to involve another Wesleyan Methodist in the bank, as his nephew Frederick Wigan was employed

---

229 Broeze, Mr. Brooks, p. 98.
as collecting clerk at £75.\textsuperscript{230} Here was a prime example of the Wesleyan Methodist helping the fellow Wesleyan Methodist in business, albeit he was a nephew. In May 1838, two of the Wesleyan Methodist elite in Launceston were on the boards of the two Imperial banks. Henry Reed was on the Bank of Australasia’s Board and Oakden was on the board of the Union Bank of Australia – an extraordinary achievement for two Wesleyan Methodists at this period in colonial history. The only other Wesleyan Methodist involved in colonial banking at this time was Edward Stephens, who became the Adelaide manager of the South Australia Banking Company in 1839-40.\textsuperscript{231} Stephens exemplified the Wesleyan Methodist who might not have progressed any further in England from the position of assistant cashier, but who rose to the exalted position of bank manager through a combination of opportunity, pious connections and the Wesleyan Methodist quality of seizing the day. As an unnamed minister from England observed after a visit, ‘the social position of Wesleyan Methodists in South Australia was very much higher than at home’.\textsuperscript{232}

Isaac Sherwin was to be the first paid manager of a branch of the Commercial Bank in Launceston on 23 July 1838. The Sherwin family biography describes him as ‘having ridden on horseback from Hobart with the necessary money and papers, a daring adventure in those days of bushrangers’.\textsuperscript{233} John Dunn was maintaining his bank’s position in the branch situation. The next step was the opening of a branch of the Union Bank of Australia in Hobart on 6 September

\textsuperscript{230} Philip Oakden to Director of Union Bank of Australia, London, 15 May 1838, Philip Oakden Letterbook, NS474, NS1290, AOT.

\textsuperscript{231} One of the sons of John Stephens, who had sometime been President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, he had originally been a bank clerk and assistant cashier in the Hull Banking Company, when he was appointed cashier and accountant of the South Australia Company. ‘Edward Stephens (1811 - 1861)’, Australian Dictionary of Biography, Volume 2 (Melbourne, 1967), p. 480. When the company’s business was divided and a separate bank established, Stephens became manager.


\textsuperscript{233} Anne Fysh, The Early Days of the Sherwin Family of Sherwood, Bothwell, Tasmania and Alice Place, Launceston (Launceston, 1964), p. 32.
1838, and then John Dunn opened a Commercial Bank branch at Campbell Town on 15 October 1838.\textsuperscript{234} This was the healthy competition of banking when Wesleyan Methodist ties appear to have been forgotten. There certainly had been talk of being partners in the Union Bank of Australia in April 1838, when Oakden put it to John Dunn that ‘The Tamar joins us to commence business and become our first branch. Should we not be joined on the same principle in Hobart Town, we can so arrange as to become partners without merging entirely into one general bank.’\textsuperscript{235}

More conciliatory words came from Oakden in May: ‘You have been very successful, the time your respectable bank has been in operation, for which I am sure you are grateful to the Giver of all good … I would wish that you could join us, but should that not be the case, we can become partners, having a proportion of interest according to capital. I shall make no arrangements for Hobart Town until the arrival of Mr. McLaren the Inspector’.\textsuperscript{236} Conjecture would see Dunn as not having received any accommodation from McLaren when he arrived at the end of July 1838 to make a decision. Hence, the Commercial Bank branch opened in Launceston at the end of July 1838. Butlin believes that ‘Oakden did not initiate a Hobart branch of the Union Bank of Australia, the colonial banks not being tempted to absorption or partnership, he awaited McLaren’s arrival’.\textsuperscript{237} As can be seen, Oakden had certainly floated the idea with Dunn, but it did not come to fruition, despite the strong Wesleyan Methodist ties.

The final Wesleyan Methodist venture in the 1830s banking story is a non-event, but nevertheless of interest. The Tradesmen’s Joint Banking Company had been formed in Port Phillip on 18 April 1840 by John Pascoe Fawkner in answer to his being rejected by the shareholders of the Melbourne and Port Phillip Bank as a director in

\textsuperscript{234} \textit{Hobart Town Courier} 5 October 1838
\textsuperscript{235} Philip Oakden to John Dunn Hobart, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 23 April 1838, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
\textsuperscript{236} Philip Oakden to John Dunn Hobart, Philip Oakden Letterbook, 3 May 1838, NS474, NS1290, AOT.
\textsuperscript{237} Butlin, \textit{Australian and New Zealand Bank}, p. 59.
January 1840. According to Hopton, ‘somewhat chagrined by his rejection Fawkner endeavoured to form the Tradesmen’s Bank with a capital of £100,000 at £10 shares, but he did not meet with the necessary support’. The Tradesmen’s Bank of Melbourne and Geelong was advertised in the *Cornwall Chronicle* of 18 April 1840 and the interest for this thesis is that two Wesleyan Methodists were on the committee, George Lilly and James Peers. Both men had been staunch members of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society and had left for Port Phillip for more opportunity. Peers, a bricklayer and fine musician, had arrived in Launceston in 1835 and on May 1837 came to Melbourne via St. Vincents Gulf, South Australia. Originally heading for South Australia, he was shipwrecked at Cape Nelson, Portland, changed his mind and came to Melbourne, buying land at the first land sale and working as a building contractor.

George Lilly, carpenter and auctioneer, was a good friend of Fawkner who subscribed to the first Wesleyan Methodist Chapel in Melbourne. Lilly had been present at the special service held at the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Chapel vestry the night before Fawkner sailed on the *Enterprize* for Port Phillip, where the whole party was commended to the divine care. Though seemingly inconsequential, this proposed Tradesman’s Bank does suggests the possibilities for Wesleyan Methodists in new colonial societies. These men were the artisan community who had migrated to Port Phillip, not the Wesleyan Methodist elite. Inclusion in any form of banking in England would have been unthinkable for such men. Confidence learnt in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society and the right
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239 Geo. B. Minns to Jane Grice, Moondah, Frankston, 11 August 1933, Minns Box, 1/2. 3, Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania.
240 In 1837 George Lilly became one of the first private auctioneers licensed in Melbourne. He bought an allotment of land in Melbourne at the first land sale on 1 June 1837, and another allotment at the second sale on 1 November 1837. He was a trustee of the Wesleyan Chapel in Melbourne from its inception in 1839. Michael Cannon (ed.), *Historical Records of Victoria*, Vol. 3, *Early Development of Melbourne: 1836-1839* (Melbourne 1984), pp. 66, 82, 84, 570-1.
241 Geo. B. Minns, ‘Founder of Melbourne and Methodism’, Minns Box, 1/2. 3, Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania.
connection to John Pascoe Fawkner had shown these new possibilities.

The chapter has demonstrated the achievement of status by the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite through land and property ownership, jury list membership, professional and commercial interests and charitable and philanthropic involvement. With the concept of status established, Wesleyan Methodist banking involvement has been discussed, stressing at the same time the significance of this aspect. A detailed study of the establishment of the Union Bank of Australia has been laid out to ensure Philip Oakden’s rightful place in the historical record, and also to stress the esteem in which this networking Wesleyan Methodist was held globally.
Chapter 6

Background to Spiritual Diary Writing
The Spiritual Diary of One Launceston Wesleyan Methodist

Introduction

The forward movement of Launceston Wesleyan achievements is halted here for a discussion on the inner world of one Wesleyan Methodist. The chapter centres on a discussion of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Henry Jennings’ spiritual diary. Before this discussion, the background and evolution of spiritual diaries is examined, to show how the tradition and practice of spiritual diary writing evolved. This background commences from the early Church fathers’ practice of self-examination, through pre-Reformation times of personal confession to the active Puritan period in the sixteenth century, when spiritual diaries moved from the habit of self-examination to actual diary writing. Various Puritan diaries such as those of Samuel Ward and Michael Wigglesworth are discussed. The discussion is then taken through Jeremy Taylor’s influence on John Wesley and the resulting journals which issued from the Holy Club at Oxford. German pietistic and Moravian influences are considered and there is a lead into the nineteenth century where specific Wesleyan Methodist diaries, of ministers, business men etc. are discussed.

The chapter then moves to discussion of the particular diary of Henry Jennings.¹ This diary gives a rare and intimate picture of the

¹ There were no other spiritual diaries extant for any of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. Some of Walter Powell’s journal/diary is detailed in Benjamin Gregory’s A Thorough Business Man: Memoirs of Walter Powell (London, 1871), and some of Henry Reed’s meditations are available in Margaret Reed’s Henry Reed, an Eventful Life Devoted to God and Man, by his Widow with a Preface by General Booth (London, 1906). A good percentage of Philip Oakden’s personal papers were destroyed by a descendant circa 1970. (Anne and Robin Bailey, An Early Tasmanian Story (Melbourne, 2004), p. 13); some letters still extant between Philip Oakden and Henry Reed reveal the depth and sincerity of their inner life.
life of a Launceston Wesleyan Methodist within his Society, a picture that would not possibly be gained from many other sources. It was decided that the best method of extraction from the diary was to discuss it in relation to the various dialogues that threaded their way through the diary. Two main dialogues became apparent in the diary and these were Henry Jennings’ spiritual advancement by grace and his temporal / financial concerns. A third and lesser dialogue which is discussed is that of Jennings’ proselytising and its successes and failures. The dialogue of spiritual advancement is divided up into the various sub-headings of lukewarmness, indolence, sloth, early rising, watchfulness, Bible centred texts, backsliding and care of time, in order to gain some sort of discipline and control over the text. The random and sometimes incoherent entries, though formulaic in character, require this firm control. The dialogue of temporal concerns is possibly the most telling in the discussion of the diary. This becomes doubly apparent when the dynamic ceases at the end of 1838 and the reader is left with a sense of loss as the drama concludes. The discussion portrays the picture of a Wesleyan Methodist who has been caught in financial and temporal concerns and brought almost to the brink of bankruptcy. It also shows that he was reproved, admonished and rescued by the stern monitoring of his fellow Wesleyans, who adhered strictly to the Rules of the Methodist Society.

The third and lesser dialogue to be discussed is Henry Jennings’ proselytising to his convicts, in-laws, relatives and general public. The Wesleyan Methodist habit of proselytising in relation to death bed situations is deemed relevant and therefore introduced in the last segment. An attempt has been made within all the dialogues to introduce other related diary and situational materials to reinforce and highlight the discussion of Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary.
Spiritual Diaries

This background discussion of spiritual diaries will contribute to some little understanding of the four year spiritual diary, 1836-9, of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist attorney, Henry Jennings. Tom Webster alerts the reader to an early and possibly isolated example of spiritual diary writing in the example of St. John Chrysostom (347-407), a church father who commended self-examination through the metaphor of a diary. Chrysostom wrote ‘Let this account be kept every day and have a little booklet in thy conscience and write therein thy daily transgressions’.  

Pre-Reformation Christians would not have had such a need for this practice as sorrow for transgressions and sins was absolved through personal confession and shriving at appointed times. Historians such as Margo Todd, Diane Howard and Stephen Greenblatt have suggested that the actual writing and keeping of spiritual diaries was a distinctive feature of the Renaissance, when there was a sense that ‘self could be deliberately fashioned’.  This was a time when self-representation was more individual and honest. Scrutiny of the inner life encouraged self examination and personal responsibility. Howard refers to the 1559 publication, a ‘Myrroure for Magistrates’, which encouraged the idea of recorded personal history as a mirror for readers. The writer William Baldwin wrote that ‘here as in the looking glass you shall see if any vice be in you.’

Webster disagrees with ‘the New Historicist view that the sixteenth century was the supreme moment in the creation of self, as we understand it.’ He regards the spiritual journal as ‘more of a response to the specific demands of a particular religiosity’. Webster
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4 Diane Howard, ‘Autobiographies in the sixteenth-eighteenth Centuries’ (www.dianehoward.com/autobiographies_16th_18th_centuries.htm).
5 Webster, ‘Writing to Redundancy’, p. 40, citing Frances Barker, The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection (London and New York, 1984), and Stephen
places the private diary as an element in devotional practice for English Protestants in Elizabeth’s reign. Protestants, who were on a more intellectual level than those in general society and who were possibly looking for signs of election, saw the spiritual diary as a logical step towards conferring it. He sees a considerable amount of advice issuing from this period from the 1580s. This advice encouraged self-examination, meditating, confessing, praying and generally dealing with the day in a godly manner.6

The godly persons who followed the above devotional examination programme moved easily into the habit of keeping notes about their general success and condition of their souls. One example was Robert Blair, who began his diary in 1616 ‘having heard of some diligent Christians who daily took brief notes of the condition of their souls’.7 Isaac Ambrose also explicitly made the crucial step from self examination to diary writing in 1641. He wrote that ‘We read of many Ancients that were accustomed to keep diaries of their actions and out of them take an account of their lives’.8 Margo Todd has produced an excellent commentary of the Puritan Samuel Ward’s diary for the period 1592–1601. Steeped in the unquestioned Puritanism of the 1590s, the diary is in folios of much diversity, sometimes in the form of a prayer, sometimes including outside happenings. Ward was a student at the Puritan Christ’s College, Cambridge, and Todd reminds the reader that Ward’s diary should be read in the context of a young man at a university college. Todd sees the self-fashioning process that Ward undertook as a kind of a demeaning process. With considerable lists of his faults and transgressions, he was intent on transforming himself from a rather jolly boy into something that was pious, disciplined and sober. Faults included a tendency to oversleep and to nod off at sermons. There

6 Greenblatt, Renaissance Self Fashioning from More to Shakespeare (Chicago, 1980).
8 Webster, ‘Writing to Redundancy’, p. 45, quoting Ambrose, p. 118.
was also a tendency to gluttony, and he managed to make a connection between the gluttony and drowsiness at services.\textsuperscript{9}

Samuel Ward needed models in his religious ascent and they came in the form of two dons, Laurence Chaderton and William Perkins, who were leaders in the text and Bible centred university community. Todd discerns signs of a dependency in Samuel Ward on the \textit{Confessions of St. Augustine}, particularly in the listing of sins and over indulgence in food and the relating of the sins of the flesh to considerable spiritual conflict.\textsuperscript{10} She also sees Samuel Ward’s daily confession of sin as the study of contrasts with Catholicism. For Protestants, the Christian life was to be under perpetual scrutiny, a self scrutiny that did not have mediation of a cleric. The text of his diary ‘heard his confessions and the written word was the image of the priesthood of all believers’.\textsuperscript{11}

By 1650, when Protestantism was the official religion and the Church of England was disestablished, Jeremy Taylor’s \textit{The Rule and Exercise of Holy Living} was published to teach day to day conduct rules for souls looking to attain salvation. Taylor advised daily self-examination, ‘in contrast to the considerable portion of time spent in vanity and other omissions of duty’.\textsuperscript{12} He stressed that it was no use making a general account at the end of a person’s life; it had to be done on a daily basis. Taylor goes into considerable discussion on how to conduct one’s self examination,\textsuperscript{13} but does not appear to make the step from self-examination to spiritual diary advice. Webster also comments on ‘the wealth of advice to self-examination, but the ‘lack of exhortations, specifically, to keep diaries’.\textsuperscript{14}

Another Puritan diary is that of Michael Wigglesworth of New England, 1653-1657. Wigglesworth taught at Harvard University and served as minister to a Puritan congregation. Edmund Morgan

\begin{footnotes}
\item[13] See devotional literature discussion in this Background Chapter 1.
\item[14] Webster, ‘Writing to Redundancy’, p. 38.
\end{footnotes}
describes Wigglesworth’s diary as ‘a kind of account book in which he rendered up the assets and liabilities of his soul with the debit side receiving most entries’. He also cross-referenced his sins which was a type of account book. Wigglesworth was ‘obsessed with guilt… he took pleasure in abasing himself for his sinful heart for his pride, his own valuing of creature comforts and his neglect of God’. Webster sees this period in essence as when ‘the new godly self was constructed by a narrative, through a form of piety that demanded the dissolution of self.’ This was a conscious process about to embark in several stages.

John Beadle, an Essex minister, urged the recording of personal information in journals for self-examination. In 1656, he published A Journall or Diary of a Thankfull Christian, a dialogue between self and God, and the re-reading of which increased the self abasement process. John Wesley was influenced by the advice of Jeremy Taylor’s Holy Living and, as he was preparing for ordination in Lent 1725, he commenced a diary. Unlike his later journals, this was a private record, although he later drew on it when preparing his journal extracts for publication. His method of writing changed over the years, and by 1734 he adopted a tabular format, which he referred to as ‘the Exacter method’, which made possible a concise and detailed record of his spiritual state hour by hour. As Ponsonby writes ‘regulation was the keynote of his life and of his religious system’. In 1730, members of The Holy Club at Oxford were ‘enjoined to keep a journal as to maintain in their mind, a sense of God’s presence’. Valentine asserts that ‘most of the itinerants, active in the establishment of the Wesleyan Methodist Circuits,
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16 Wigglesworth, Diary, p. viii.
17 Webster, ‘Writing to Redundancy’, p. 43.
adopted the practice’, and that diaries of Methodist preachers had a ‘unique spiritual intensity and religious vibrancy’. In particular, William Grimshaw, an Anglican/Methodist, kept a large folio account book into which he daily entered his spiritual debit and credit, his sins on one page and his good deeds on the other. Elizabeth Jay calculates that Wesley imparted his diary keeping method to other Methodists in Oxford, and these records were ‘sometimes compared at meetings where discussion of individual progress took place’.

The autobiographical works of the German Pietists focused on conversion and new birth, just as August Herman Francke did in 1790, putting his religious experience of conversion in the tradition of Augustine. Here, the structure was conviction of sin, followed by anxiety, despair of faith, desire for redemption and wrestling in prayer.

The pietist examples, particularly in the Moravian community, appeared to have a slightly different shape from diaries of English Puritan heritage. The German versions were often supplemented with interpretations of the conversion story and collective biography. The Moravians had Bandenbubeln (or) Brandenbriefen, which were bound up volumes of confessions. This is all somewhat removed from the simpler, daily examination, spiritual diaries. John Bennet, who was initially a Moravian sympathiser, converted to Wesleyan Methodism in 1742 after meeting Wesley. He began his diary to be more ‘watchful over his words and actions from day to day, and as a monitor of his spiritual growth’. Valentine’s book, *Mirror of the Soul*, is somewhat confusing, in that he does not make it clear whether he is referring to Bennet’s Journal or his diary. Given that he explains Bennet wrote both diary and journals, he needs to make it much clearer as to which he is referring as they were distinct entities.

---

26 Valentine, *The Mirror of the Soul*, p. 3.
The diary was written mostly for completely private use and occasionally shown to intimates; the journal was often utilised, particularly in the Methodist sense, for propaganda in the wider field. Bennet’s diary revealed fears, doubts, insecurities and hopes and was a true mirror of the soul, with a literal belief in demonic hosts and powers. Struggling with the enemy, Satan, and diabolical forces was a constant thread throughout. Accompanying it was the entrenched belief that evil forces were trying to destroy the young Methodist societies.

In such Methodist literature as *The Methodist Magazine*, death bed scenes, holy dying and last words of the deceased were spelt out in detail in Bennet’s diary, together with ‘an almost self righteous satisfaction in the misfortunes of the ungodly’. In the nineteenth century, the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee ruled that ‘it is peremptorily required of every Missionary in the Connexion to keep a journal, and to send home frequently such copies and extracts from it. It may give a full and particular account of his labour, successes and prospects’. This injunction was written at the commencement of the Rev. William Horton’s journal, which commenced in 1821 when he landed in Hobart Town as a Wesleyan Methodist Missionary. The front page then continued with this resolve by the Rev. Horton:

> A design to improve myself, faithfully to record the manner in which I spend my time well. I hope these will tend to make me more diligent and by daily registering my religious experience. I shall be led to strict self examination and stimulated to greater earnestness in the salvation of my soul. Further by writing everything important that may come under my observation, I shall probably accumulate a treasury of useful knowledge and qualify for usefulness in my ministerial office. The extracts I will send to the Committee will be under 1) Employment of time, 2) Religious experience, 3) Original thoughts and observations, 4) Memoranda gleaned from books.

In the strict sense of the word, this introductory page of the Rev. Horton’s was not that of a spiritual diary or journal, but an admixture of both. The journal then turned totally towards a running
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commentary on daily events. Whether the Rev. Horton had a separate more intimate spiritual diary is not known.

The Rev. Thomas Jagger, Wesleyan Methodist minister in Fiji, 1838-1845, certainly kept the obligatory journal for a charting of his progress to be sent home. This has been published by a great, great granddaughter. However, for the interest of this thesis there was another small private spiritual journal and both are still held in the Methodist Church Archives, Fiji National Archives. The diary for 16 April to 30 September 1845 is a splendid example of a spiritual diary kept by an intelligent Wesleyan Methodist Minister. Typical of the range of entries is as follows:

**Thursday 17 April 1845:**

God was with me in the bush. I was assured that God had brought me to Feejee for his work and to use me. I yielded my all to him without reserve.

**Friday 18 April 1845:**

Feel an utter disrelish for the world. It has no charms for me. Oh for a continual confidence in God and an assurance of being heard when I make mention of his name. 29

Contemporary with this period is William Arthur’s *The Successful Merchant, Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett of Kingswood Hall,* 30 mentioned in the Introduction to this thesis, and I refer the reader back to the commentary on *The Inner Life* which is composed from remaining fragments of Budgett’s diary. Typical of the diary was this sample:

**Sunday middle day Jan 6 1822**

The last week has been a very unprofitable one. I see great prosperity in what Thomas à Kempis says, ‘The beginning of temptation is inconstancy of mind and little faith’. I have been suffering all the last week from want of resisting temptation in the beginning. I am now very low. I have before me Hervey’s Meditations, Baxter’s Saints Rest and the Sacred Volume.

---


Another Wesleyan journal in the nineteenth century is that of Launceston layman Walter Powell. It consists of a journal in eleven folio volumes and stretches from 1844 to 1867. Commencing in Launceston, it was taken through to Melbourne and England, and is described in part by Benjamin Gregory in his book, *A Thorough Business Man: Memoirs of Walter Powell*. The journal appears to be part journal of daily occupations and part spiritual history. According to Gregory it is a ‘prodigious, persistent and intense self scrutiny and it is invaluable to watch the unfolding of Powell’s spiritual life. It shows the decisiveness of his Christianity and the renouncing of a self pleasing life’. Slothfulness, neglect of duty and covetousness all appear in the diary, and a good insight is shown into the meticulous ordering of a Wesleyan Methodist, in the advice from the Rev. Mr. Eggleston to Walter Powell to found a Biblical Common Place Book. This book was to have an index of doctrines, duties and promises, and Powell was to arrange all scriptural passages under the various headings as they were read. For instance, under the heading Atonement he was to place all passages referring to that truth in Revelation. The onerous nature of the task appeared daunting for Powell, who realised ‘that this will require much wisdom, but I must do my best keeping in view the promise, let him ask of God, and it shall be given him’.

An interesting contrast in spiritual diary writing is that of Ralph Merry who lived in the Lower Canadian-New England borderland in the period 1798-1863. Merry, who had chronic ill health, had allegiances to the radical Methodist Protestants and the Freewill Baptists. From a conversion experience in 1809. Merry detailed a complex document of lay religious behaviour with its many spiritual reversals, visions and religious experiences. J.J. Little feels that ‘Merry recorded his feelings not for self analysis but to reinforce the need

---


for ongoing religious faith’. It is interesting for this thesis to note that one of Merry’s favourite books was the memoirs of the Cornish Methodist the Rev. William Carvosso, father of the Rev. Benjamin Carvosso of Hobart Town. In his diary in April 1839, Merry noted in an entry on Carvosso ‘that he had obtained a great increase in faith’. Little makes the point that ‘Merry’s cultural horizons were obviously not circumscribed by the sermons of local preachers’.

Yet another Wesleyan Methodist spiritual diary, in colonial Victoria, is that of Thomas Cornelius Camm, who founded the Methodist Church at Koroit, Victoria. He had many comments on wasted time and time not well spent. Walter Phillips comments that Camm’s entries ‘reflect the Methodist teaching of the Stewardship of Time and the uncertainty of life’. Belief in heaven and hell, divine judgement and eternal punishment were still strong in Colonial Methodism, though the diary was kept in what was regarded as a period of revival in Victorian Methodism. Camm refers to low points in his religious life and Phillips says that ‘he set himself an impossible standard of religious life and devotion, perhaps intensified by the Methodist doctrine of Christian Perfection. It encouraged persistent introspection and self altruism’.

---
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Henry Jennings  circa 1880
**Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary**

As the son of a Congregational minister, Henry Jennings would have already been exposed to the practice of keeping a spiritual diary or certainly the practice of self examination. Also extant is a spiritual diary of his sister Eliza Pettingell née Jennings from the period January 1821 to December 1824, which was brought to Van Diemen’s Land.\(^{38}\) It was commenced two years before her marriage and is full of private thoughts and meditations. At twenty six years of age, she was writing ‘O Lord let me live to thy service’.\(^{39}\) Although she died in 1824, the four year period seemed to be the norm for spiritual diaries at the time, as Henry Jennings presents his in a four year period.

At the same time as Henry Jennings’ diary was commenced in January 1836, it appeared that his wife Alicia, who had become a Wesleyan Methodist, kept a diary and the two exchanged their diaries on their wedding anniversary day in early June and commented freely upon them.\(^{40}\) Jennings was happy to have an insight into Alicia’s mind, finding that she had been humbling herself before God and that they could be a mutual help and comfort to each other. Alicia, for her part, took the opportunity to make the comment ‘that there was a great sameness in Henry’s journal and it was very evident that he was not walking by the spirit’.\(^{41}\) In other words, she doubted the extent of Henry’s true commitment. There is no suggestion that these diaries were read by anyone else, even Henry Jennings’ band mates, Philip Oakden and John W. Gleadow. The Jennings’ standards were high and demanding as well as self-flagellatory. Deep sincerity shows through, aligned in Henry’s case to a thread of carping criticism when others did not rise to his demanding standards.

---

\(^{38}\) Diary of Eliza Pettingell, 1821 - 1824, Jennings Family Papers, MS9432, SLV.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

\(^{40}\) Alicia Jennings’ spiritual diary of this period is not extant, only a nine month’s Journal, from January 1856 to September 1856, in Melbourne when she had rejoined the Anglican Church. The Journal gives mainly social comment.

\(^{41}\) Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary, Jennings Family Papers, 10 June 1838, MS9432, SLV.
Henry Jennings commenced his Spiritual Diary in January 1836 and finished it in December 1839. At the commencement, in his own words ‘he had been attending regularly upon the ministry of the Lord for the last twelve months’. He had had his conversion experience and felt it appropriate to commence a diary for spiritual purposes. This diary was annotated every Sunday evening, reinforced by the sermons of the day. For a background of understanding about Henry Jennings’ household it is relevant to look at the Van Diemen’s Land Census for 1842-3. Jennings lived on his large estate Coronea at Entally, some twelve kilometres outside Launceston; his legal practice was in Charles Street, Launceston. The census revealed that there were twenty three people living in the household; sixteen of these people were free and the remaining seven people had tickets of leave or were assigned. There were some thirteen Wesleyan Methodists out of the twenty three people.

The household seemed constantly to expand to house visiting Wesleyan Methodist ministers who came to town to preach, as well as the Congregational ministers Mr. Miller and Mr. Beazley. The Congregational / Independent connections were strong within the Jennings family and Henry’s brother Joseph Gellibrand Jennings, a deacon, was received as a member of the Independent Chapel, Hobart Town, in 1834. The Independent Chapel had been formed in Hobart Town, in March 1832 by Henry Hopkins and others, including Joseph Gellibrand Jennings’ wife Elizabeth, who had been a member of the Independent Chapel at Poole, England. This strong Independent connection was further compounded by the marriage of Sarah Jennings to the Rev. Joseph Beazley. The sisters of Alicia Jennings constantly visited and stayed. They were Mrs. Thomas
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42 Jennings, Diary, 3 January 1836.
43 This Census was the first complete Census in Van Diemen’s Land; any previous notation was incomplete.
45 Mr. Beazley made an offer of marriage to Henry Jennings sister Sarah Jennings Diary, 1 October 1837.
46 Church of Christ Assembly, The Independent Chapel, Hobart Town, 9 June 1834, NS 477/1, AOT.
Pitcairn, Mrs. Edward Dumaresq, Mrs. James Gray and Mrs. Matthew Franks. Other visitors included members of the extended Pitcairn, Russell and Gray families.\textsuperscript{47} The detailing of this list of visitors is to emphasise that Henry Jennings’ household and establishment were considerable and required a constant flow of money.

Henry Jennings’ diary, which was written every Sunday evening, combined self-examination of the past week’s failures and triumphs, interspersed with other family and local matters. The imperative which drove the diary was spiritual advancement by faith from week to week, but there was a dual and equally strong dialogue throughout the diary. It was that of Jennings’ financial problems, which posed the dark underlying thread of his living beyond his means and trying to solve the problem by buying more land. The language and outline of the diary are formulaic and do not appear to veer from the Puritan diaries of Samuel Ward and Michael Wigglesworth and the Puritan self-fashioning process which Margo Todd discusses in the diary of Samuel Ward.\textsuperscript{48} In a sense Jennings’ diary followed the course of what Ponsonby calls ‘the more or less conventional formula of self disparagement’.\textsuperscript{49} The emotions are constantly voiced, coldness and deadness are examined minutely. Valentine comments that ‘this self denigration characterises early autobiographical accounts of Methodist preachers’.\textsuperscript{50}

Rather than discuss the Spiritual Diary in a chronological fashion, this thesis will examine and explore the various dialogues which emerge from it and which can often seem to mirror earlier published spiritual diaries, contemporary Wesleyan Methodist morés, as well as contemporary Van Diemen’s Land society. In the diary, the New Year of each year produced a review of the past year and a redirection for the coming year. The watch night service and covenant renewal also took place at this time within the Wesleyan Methodist Society. Additionally, each week of the diary generally

\textsuperscript{47} Henry Jennings’ sister Sophia married Robert Russell of the Clyde Company.  
\textsuperscript{48} Todd, ‘Puritan Self Fashioning’.  
\textsuperscript{49} Ponsonby, \textit{English Diaries}, p. 16.  
\textsuperscript{50} Valentine, \textit{Mirror of the Soul}, p.20.
started with the statement that the past week had showed his failures, lukewarmness, backwardness, coldness and worldly mindedness.

The two main dialogues driving the Spiritual Diary are that of spiritual advancement and that of temporal concerns and are a good example of a Wesleyan Methodist caught between the two worlds of Spirituality and Mammon. It is the Wesleyan Methodist trying to find a compromise between the two, but at the same time being suffused with anxiety. Discussion of these dialogues will be followed by an examination of Jennings’ proselytising attempts amongst his own convicts, his own social class and the dying. The last topic dying will be expanded to include a discussion of the Wesleyan Methodist ritual of holy dying.

First Dialogue: Spiritual Advancement

As Henry Jennings had become a Wesleyan Methodist, there was an obligatory communal element to his membership and that obligation shaped his vision and forced him to provide an example of piety. Webster sees the phenomenon of spiritual diary writing as ‘a means by which the godly self was maintained, indeed constructed through the act of writing’. Jennings attempted to fashion himself in accordance with the prevailing Wesleyan Methodist culture in all things, except debt and speculation. This chapter will discuss the aspects of Jennings’ spiritual advancement through such benchmarks as lukewarmness, gluttony, indolence, sloth and early rising, watchfulness, bible centred text and sermons, backsliding and care of time.

Lukewarmness

Lukewarmness in religion was something to be avoided in spiritual advancement and Jennings made frequent references to his own lukewarmness and constantly complained of it in his character. He wrote ‘My desires are sincere for a growth in grace but I am in a great danger of lapsing into lukewarmness’. Again in March 1838,

51 Webster, ‘Writing to Redundancy’, p. 40.
52 Jennings, Diary, 13 June 1837.
he tried ‘to act up to my experiences of last Sunday, I have grown again into lukewarmness’.\textsuperscript{53}

Lukewarmness was regarded as a very real deterrent for Christians at this period. This is backed up by an advertisement in the \textit{Cornwall Chronicle} 31 August 1839 for books sold by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge at Mr. Cameron’s shop in Brisbane Street, Launceston. The particular book of interest advertised was \textit{The Dangers of Lukewarmness in Religion}. This type of publication was available to Jennings and the reading public that discussed concerns about lukewarmness. The \textit{Chronicle} of the same date also advertised through the SPCK a homily against gluttony, and the Spiritual Diary revealed Jennings’ own concerns when he wrote that ‘I am still being gluttonous, eating freely of things that are injurious to me’.\textsuperscript{54} Margo Todd emphasises that the Puritan Samuel Ward in his diary connected ‘the sins of the flesh with their immediate spiritual as well as physical consequences, flesh and spirit were intertwined’.\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{Indolence, Sloth and Early Rising}

Indolence and sloth, particularly in early rising, were a strong obstacle to Jennings’ spiritual advancement. Not a week passed in the diary without a reference to this omission. John Wesley had written forcefully when castigating the rich in his sermon: ‘You cannot deny yourselves the poor pleasure of a little sleep … you cannot get out in the morning because it is so dark, cold and perhaps raining too’.\textsuperscript{56} Jennings’ problems lay with the demands of the early Launceston Wesleyan Methodist prayer meeting, for which he needed to rise at 5.00 AM and which he was incapable of attending. Early rising took on a new light in the sense of his obligation to the community that he had joined. Time and time again, he bemoaned his failure in this area, particularly as it was also tied into his leading his assigned servants in morning prayer. Often

\textsuperscript{53} Jennings, Diary, 11 March 1838.
\textsuperscript{54} Jennings, Diary, 27 October 1839.
\textsuperscript{55} Todd, ‘Puritan Self Fashioning’, p. 248.
his reasons for inability to rise were genuine, including not retiring until midnight, the night before. As he wrote ‘I did not go to the men for morning prayer. I had scarcely any time to be alone before Chapel, certainly not time for heart searching examination. What a train of circumstances follow from my neglect of duty. Oh that I may learn again from experience’. Jennings saw this inability to rise in the morning as provoking a train of events following upon it: ‘My not rising early in the morning, thus neglecting to assemble my men for prayer has so many evils upon it, there is a deadness to private prayer and every day many things are left out, this all proceeds from a want of faith and love, an entire giving up of myself to God’.  

Often after a late night, there was a complete collapse of Jennings’ good intentions: ‘this morning I got out of bed at 10 to 6 and actually went back to bed thinking I should be there until 6, but although lying awake, I did not get out again till 10 to 7. May this teach me the danger of entering into temptation’. At times in the diary, it seems as if Jennings took an almost delighted interest in his slothfulness: ‘This has again been a week of much darkness. I see that I have given away to a spirit of slothfulness lying in bed of a morning. On Wednesday morning, I went to the prayer meeting but lay down afterwards and didn’t get up half past seven. This morning I got out of bed a quarter before six and lay down again and didn’t get up till 7’.  

**Watchfulness**

Jennings saw all this as a need to press forward more and realised ‘that he had to be more watchful to use the grace he was given and to remember that he had a warfare to go, a fight to maintain’. There was in the Wesleyan Methodist psyche a constant fear of relaxing his guard, and this, particularly for Jennings, was tied
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57 Jennings, Diary, 1 January 1837.  
58 Jennings, Diary, 20 May 1838.  
59 Jennings, Diary, 12 August 1838.  
60 Jennings, Diary, 9 June 1839.  
61 Jennings, Diary, 7 July 1839.
into early rising: ‘May I be more prayerful, particularly may I even begin the day by rising betimes in the morning’.  

This constant fear of relaxing his guard can be identified with Margo Todd’s comment that ‘Renaissance self fashioning was always achieved in relation to something perceived as hostile and alien’. In this case, the battle was within Henry Jennings’ own identity. He certainly appeared to judge early rising as one of the fruits of holiness: ‘although I enjoy more peace of mind, the fruits of holiness are yet but scantly. I have only been up once to the 5 o’clock prayer meeting since I returned. I fear there is much apathy in my feelings’. It is relevant to note that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists in having 5 to 5-30 prayer meetings were adhering strictly to grass roots Wesleyan Methodism. In his commentary on the nature of John Wesley’s journal, W.R. Ward alludes to the fact that Wesley railed against the decline of early morning preaching and prayer meetings. The climate of the Southern Hemisphere was a little more conducive to early rising, but the fact remains that one can detect a real fidelity here to the rigorous demands of John Wesley.

**Bible Centred Texts and Sermons**

Margo Todd refers to ‘the shaping force of the text’ in relation to the Renaissance Puritan Samuel Ward who lived in Christ’s College, Cambridge, in the 1590s. This is equally applicable to Henry Jennings in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Bible centred community of the 1830s. Todd considers that the ‘Bible shaped Ward’s inner life and it conditioned how he would understand his relationship to the world’. Todd sees Ward’s diary as an attempt to apply God’s word to himself, and highlights the fact that Ward’s diary was structured so that always, following a sermon, the diary was busy applying the words to his own soul. This was found in Henry
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62 Jennings, Diary, 14 July 1839.
64 Jennings, Diary, 9 December 1838.
Jennings’ Diary. The weekly sermons by the Wesleyan minister often acted as a boost to Jennings’ spiritual equilibrium. The text had power and authority to interact and Jennings’ attention to it is noticeable in the diary from 1837 through to 1838.

In the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist community, it was generally the minister who gave the Sunday sermon, but occasionally, preachers, like Matthew Lasseter and John Crookes, delivered a weekly sermon. One sermon from Lasseter from Isaiah 30:10-11 discussed ‘the righteous man who had right views of himself as a sinner and right views of his present duties,’ and this considerably impressed Jennings.68 John Crookes preached on the morning of 15 October 1837 from Psalm 46 ‘there is a river of streams whereof shall make glad the city of God’, but Jennings deprecatingly wrote ‘there was much good in the sermon but not sufficiently practical for general usefulness’.69 The subject of Christian warfare was tackled by the Rev. J. Manton preaching from 2 Corinthians 10:14, and referring to ‘mighty weapons of our warfare putting down the strongholds of ignorance, prejudice and unbelief, all to be pulled down by the truths of the gospel’.70

The Rev. Mr. Simpson touched a raw nerve when he preached from 2 Philipians, 2:179. ‘If there be any consolation in Christ’. He cited that there was consolation to believers and consolation to backsliders. Jennings felt that his morning meditation had prepared him for the sermon, but Simpson took it a step further when he enlarged on those who were suffering from worldly embarrassment, who could not go into the world without meeting here, and there, those to whom they were indebted; they were unable to act upon the precept, owe no man anything. Positively though, Simpson stressed that Christ sympathised with their feelings and Jennings wrote ‘I felt much encouraged that Christ would bring me out of all my difficulties’.71

68 Jennings, Diary, 24 July 1837.
69 Jennings, Diary, 15 October 1837.
70 Jennings, Diary, 30 July 1837.
71 Jennings, Diary, 3 December 1837.
At the end of May 1838, Jennings was much comforted by the morning’s sermon 1 Corinthians:11-32, ‘When we are judged we are chastened by the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world’. His faith was strengthened and he felt ‘that the Lord himself would chasten and not allow backsliding to go unpunished, but preserve us from the condemnation of the world’.72

**Backsliding**

The repeated mention of backsliding shows that it was considered to be a very real entity by the Wesleyan Methodists. In 1838, there was a strong letter to the editor of *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* on backsliding. The writer, one John Wesley Barrett, elaborately detailed backsliders as those who had fallen from a state of grace into a sinful condition. Once they saw and felt the need for salvation and repented, they were made partakers through faith in God’s renovating and justifying grace. The letter is highly emotive and refers to backsliders as ‘cowardly, treacherous and foolish, twice dead and doubly damned, plucked up by the roots and fed to the fire. Backsliders were like a dog turned to his vomit and a sow that was washed in her wallowing in the mire’.73

In editing John Wesley’s Journal, Elizabeth Jay noted that ‘Wesley never minced his words, when he encountered backsliding in the various societies whose spiritual health he so carefully monitored’.74 There were hymns in the Wesleyan hymn book of the day especially targeting backsliders. They were for ‘Persons Convinced of Backsliding and for Backsliders Recovered’.75 Often the ministers personalised the sermon, giving more impact to their message. The Rev. Mr. Benjamin Hurst preached from Revelations and asked ‘Have you the knowledge of your sins forgiven, be given to each heart’. Hurst pointed out that it was the knowledge of all to do so and to feel. Obviously uplifted, Jennings wrote ‘May the Divine
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72 Jennings, Diary, 27 May 1838.
Blessing follow thy sermon’.  

76 All the Wesleyan ministers visiting and otherwise seemed to preach with what Jennings referred to ‘as an animated and forceful style’.  

77 This was the popular style and the ministers taking part were Simpson, Manton, Orton, Butters, Hurst and Waterhouse. There was quite a sense of dependency and relish issuing from Jennings’ Spiritual Diary about these Bible centred sermons from which hopefully fruits would appear. The Rev. Simpson in particular preached bedrock sermons with a powerful and awakening touch about faith. In early 1839 he used the text ‘Have faith in God, explaining that faith was an implicit trust in God in all circumstances and taking the concept to the various types of faith’.  

78 Jennings expanded these concepts in his diary and they obviously served to impress him as a directive for life.

Simpson also had the effect of stirring Jennings up with his text from Jeremiah ‘Leave us not’. One can see the influence of the sermon when Jennings realised ‘that the great cause of God leaving us was neglecting to grow in grace. I know God has blessed me greatly with his promises, but I have not denied myself sufficiently or taken up my cross daily. I should be more watchful and prayerful’.  

79 The culmination to this attention to the scriptural word for Jennings was when Simpson suggested that Gleadow, Oakden and Jennings should meet together for two and a half hours, once a week, for reading the Scriptures. The time of the meeting was to be five o’clock on Tuesday mornings.

Care of Time

Care of time was a cardinal precept for Wesleyan Methodists and Henry Jennings showed his concern for this in 1838: ‘So does time hasten on another week, time steals away, but this is not the case with the Lord, to Him we have to give a strict account of that. Oh that I daily learn to watch more circumspectly’.  

76 Jennings, Diary, 29 July 1838.
77 Jennings, Diary, 2 September 1838.
78 Jennings, Diary, 3 February 1839.
79 Jennings, Diary, 16 June 1839.
80 Jennings, Diary, 9 December 1838.
Care of time had been an important precept in 1656 for Jeremy Taylor when he wrote his *Rule and Exercise of Holy Living*. It had been one of instruments for serving a holy life. He wrote that ‘the care of time was necessary to avoid the idleness that leads to temptation. A person could order his worldly employment to make room for devotional prayer’. The Rev. Thomas Jagger, the Wesleyan Methodist Minister in Fiji in 1838, prayed in his spiritual diary ‘Oh help me study the speed of time and redeem the time because the days are evil’. Samuel Budgett, the ideal Wesleyan business man, was also anxious to redeem time and made this one of his resolutions in 1822: ‘I resolve to begin to redeem time and to be moderate in my eating, drinking and sleeping and to endeavour to make one word pass for two’. The typical repetitive comment in Jennings’ diary in regard to time was ‘little improvement in my use of time’.

**Second Dialogue: Temporal Concerns**

Henry Jennings’ diary was written at a period in his life when his legal business was flourishing and Launceston was economically stable. Yet he was in debt owing mainly to his life-style and his overwhelming desire for more land. The other two Wesleyan Methodist business men whose spiritual diaries have been mentioned in this chapter, Samuel Budgett and Walter Powell, were never anything but prudent in their dealings. Jennings on the other hand was sliding into bankruptcy and the unique quality of his spiritual diary is that his business concerns were so paramount. There was an inherent anxiety in Jennings. This was the anxiety of a Wesleyan Methodist caught between the two worlds of Spirituality and Mammon, and trying to find a compromise between them. Jennings was conscious of the fact that he was encumbered with too
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many things. He was aware of his worldly mindedness and asked ‘the Almighty to make my path clearer’.  

In this discussion of Jennings’ temporal concerns, worldly mindedness was a strong element in the topic. He admitted early in the diary that ‘I am going backwards into the world and being anxious about riches’. Anxiety about pecuniary matters pervaded Jennings’ thinking, particularly during prayer and devotions, and references to his pecuniary worries compound from the end of 1836 into 1837. This anxiety is voiced under the guise of referring to increasing worldly cares, and he refers to his rashness in entering into numerous engagements which were now oppressing him. Jennings’ language, referring here to numerous engagements in temporal concerns, replicates one area of the Wesleyan Methodist ‘Cautions and Directions addressed to Class Leaders’. Therein lay the harsh advice on how Jennings was to be handled within the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, and its importance to this thesis merits detailing below:

You may possibly find a person pleading his numerous engagements in temporal concerns, not only an excuse for not meeting his class every week according to the Rules of the Society, but also as a reason why his soul does not prosper.

If the business in itself is proper, it may for the sake of gain be pushed beyond the bounds of prudence in point of extent.

If men launch out beyond what their capital will command, they must always be embarrassed in their circumstances, or if they go beyond their capacity of mind, they must be perpetually encumbered in their spirits.

You must find out what it is in business that has hindered them in the narrow way and show them the absolute necessity of making the salvation of their souls the one great business of life and of bringing every temporal concern into subjection to it.

Such persons must be made deeply sensible that a lawful occupation properly managed is no hindrance to religion.

Soft words will seldom avail here, they must be drawn out of the snare if possible by the hands of Scripture and Reason and by the words of brotherly love.

---
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Again the Rule of the Society which forbids a person borrowing without the probability of paying should be frequently urged by every leader.\textsuperscript{87}

Gradually the scenario unfolded within the diary of the deteriorating nature of his temporal (i.e. financial affairs). The first tangible evidence was Jennings’ entry in early January 1837: ‘How I go on sinning with my eyes open. Under the plea that it would assist me in disposing of the property, I took more land into my possession from the seller, who had it under lease for three years and only on advantageous terms. Having it in my possession, I thought I should let it be, whilst having interest to pay, but this week I purchased some sheep to the value of £650. I did it without reflection and it has certainly occasioned me a great uneasiness this week’.\textsuperscript{88} Instead of cutting back on his land investments, Jennings continued to buy more. He knew that he had to be, in the Wesleyan sense, more regular and diligent in business, but feared ‘that he was confronting another snare, that of pursuing business for the sake of the world’.\textsuperscript{89}

As the pressure mounted, Jennings confessed that ‘I cannot keep my thoughts from the world … I am much afraid of worldly love but my business is increasing and I am much obliged to give closer application to it’.\textsuperscript{90} Again at the end of April, the spirit of speculation surfaced with him writing ‘this week I have endeavoured to purchase the estate of Coronea and have been thinking of selling this cheaper in order to get another that will answer my purpose better … I have no business to buy another and this desire for another is a mere continuation of my old spirit of speculation’.\textsuperscript{91}

Additionally, Jennings confessed that he was missing his class and too ready to find excuses for it. The confession exactly patterned the cautions laid out to class leaders. The first signs of some realisation of his behaviour are evidenced at this time and there is a suggestion

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{A Class Book containing Directions for Class Leaders, Ruled Forms for Leaders, Weekly Accounts and the Rules of the Methodist Societies} (London, 1842).
\textsuperscript{88} Jennings, Diary, 8 January 1837.
\textsuperscript{89} Jennings, Diary, 12 March 1837.
\textsuperscript{90} Jennings, Diary, 16 April 1837.
\textsuperscript{91} Jennings, Diary, 22 April 1837.
in the diary of selling his estate and certainly not buying another. The actual word debt now appears in the narrative and Jennings appealed to the Lord to ‘Make open a way to me. Better increase my substance or show me my duty how I may retrench my expenses’.\(^{92}\)

Jennings’ worldly affairs were now taking up the greater part of the diary as the crisis loomed. Spiritual advancement had to take a back seat. Gradually, the true state of affairs was revealed over the last months of 1837. He had an overdrawn bill for £450 for sheep purchased in 1836 due on 5 October, and he was unable to meet it. The true realisation of his behaviour began to sink in, and he realised ‘that in the past year, I have added to my engagements under the argument of getting clear from them by making more money. Love of the world and money has a deep hold on me’.\(^{93}\)

His entries then became conflicting, running the gamut of saying that he would have to give up everything for God and he was prepared, but not quite ready, to make the sacrifice. Typically, he wrote ‘I am prepared to give up everything for the Lord, but is it the Lord’s will that I should part with everything’.\(^{94}\) Prayers for his wife Alicia appear in the diary, drawing her into the responsibility of debt. The true state of Jennings’ finances was recorded in December 1837 when he stated baldly that ‘I have £22,000 worth of property with £17,000 to pay and scarcely any possibility of settling, it is a cumbrous load’.\(^{95}\) His expenses for the house were £300 a year, and family and personal expenses were £750 with the profits of his business being £900 a year. The £17,000 debt was the halter around his neck. Jennings saw the situation as a just punishment for his greediness and he prayed that the Lord would deliver him. Bankruptcy was the event to be feared and rejected within Wesleyan Methodism. It was specifically stated in the rules relating to the Society that ‘to prevent scandal whenever a member becomes bankrupt the Superintendent should talk with him and if he has not

\(^{92}\) Jennings, Diary, 16 July 1837.
\(^{93}\) Jennings, Diary, 8 October 1837.
\(^{94}\) Jennings, Diary, 8 October 1837.
\(^{95}\) Jennings, Diary, 3 December 1837.
kept fair accounts or that liabilities have been incurred without reasonable probability of meeting them, the member should be expelled immediately’.

Just as the Renaissance Puritan Samuel Ward needed the role models of the two Oxford dons Chaderton and Perkins for his religious ascent and self fashioning process, so too did Henry Jennings need Philip Oakden and Henry Reed as his mentors. A sense of deference to the opinions of these two men comes through strongly in the narrative, not just as financial advisers but as spiritual ones also. His relationship with John Gleadow, the other Launceston Wesleyan Methodist attorney, had more of a competitive edge to it. This is exemplified in Jennings’ voiced envy when Gleadow was made a Class Leader before himself. He asked ‘why was he called before me, he has been upwards of six months less a member than myself. I don’t think I felt anything like jealousy but why have I been kept back, The state of my affairs would be a sufficient objection’.

In the mentor role, Philip Oakden suggested to Jennings that he peruse the current book *Mammon* which was popular in Wesleyan Methodist circles. Jennings read it and felt ‘more convinced of the importance of living life to myself of denying myself and doing more for the cause of God’. *Mammon* had been written in 1836 by the Rev. John Harris, variously described as the Principal of New College, London and Dissenting minister of Epsom. He had previously written an evangelical publication called *The Great Teacher* and the publication of *Mammon* was in response to a competition for a prize essay. One hundred guineas was offered for the best essay on the love of money. A strong requirement in the essay was one that would bear on selfishness as it led men to live to themselves and not for God and fellow men. References to covetousness and the tremendous consequences of the vile crime of accumulating property which excluded from the kingdom of heaven was also a main
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requirement. The theme of stewardship and God’s message of ‘occupy till I come’ were also to be strongly emphasised and the completed publication made a strong impression on the public mind. The book dwelt in Part 1 on ‘sin or selfishness as a frustration of the divine plan and the Gospel as a system of benevolence’. Part 2 concentrated on the nature of covetousness, its forms and prevalence, its disguises and texts and Part 3 was the principle of Christian liberality explained and enforced.

Such a publication was designed to make Jennings reevaluate his position. Oakden was aware of this and had provided a guide in the shape of Mammon. The book made a strong impact in Wesleyan Methodist circles and reviews were published in The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine which hailed its appearance and commented that ‘the Magazine, where earlier volumes were published by Mr. Wesley, should hail the first symptoms of a resolute and successful crusade against covetousness’. Such was the feeling aroused by Mammon that it sparked a publication called Anti-Mammon written by two clergymen who withheld their names. The review, which appeared in The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine of May 1837, described it as malign, evil and bigoted.

Prior to his leaving on his trip to England in 1836, Oakden, as mentor, had expressed a desire to meet in band with Jennings when he returned from his trip. On Oakden’s return in April 1838, Jennings was overjoyed and poured into his diary ‘Oh may he bring the blessing of God, prove a friend to me indeed both spiritually and temporally. My soul longs to have someone to pour its cares and doubts into and I cannot but pray that he may be the instrument chosen by God’.
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been discussed in this thesis with the plan of individuals meeting in
groups of three or four people who were living for God alone and
practising self-denial, involving total abstinence from worldly
pleasures. However, an article in *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*
for November 1836 underlined the value of band meetings: ‘we reap
a double advantage over these men who merely keep a diary, for by
relating of its results, we hear the conferences of our brethren and
receive cautions and encouragements as our case requires and as
their love suggests’.  

The band meeting was a more intimate and
console extension of the spiritual diary. For Jennings, it was a coup
to meet in band with Oakden, who had returned from England as a
director of the newly established Union Bank of Australia and who
could possibly solve Jennings’ spiritual and temporal problems.

At this period Jennings seemed to decide ‘that in order to work
out his spiritual predicament all he had to do was walk by faith in
God and that faith would advance him and teach him to forsake all
and follow him’.  

The other person to meet in band with Oakden
and Jennings was John W. Gleadow, but Gleadow never assumed
the same mentoring role as Henry Reed in relationship to Jennings.
From early 1838, Reed seems to have adopted the role of reproving
class leader to Jennings. Reed adopted the position advocated in the
*Class Book Containing Directions for Class Leaders* where it was
advised that ‘reproof and admonitions are part of your office. Should
any of those who meet with you be overtaken by a fault, the evil
should clearly be pointed out to him and reproof given with
tenderness or sharpness, according to the fault. Members must be
watched over with a Godly jealousy’.  

Reed commenced the
reproofs in February 1838 when he spent the evening at Jennings’
home and informed him ‘how wrong he had been in going to Lady
Franklin’s evening party’.  

Jennings felt that he had gone to the
party as a necessary compliment to Lady Franklin, but then realised
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that ‘he had been conforming to the world and mixing in trifling conversations, and that he should confess his sin and find forgiveness’. This was the repressive grip of Wesleyan Methodism. Its rules forbade unprofitable conversation, lightness and social entertainment, diversions, recreation and worldly company. Jennings’ social position was being compromised by the requirements of the Wesleyan Methodists.

Reed enjoyed his role as reprover and admonisher. A clearer insight into his repressive behaviour comes through correspondence to Philip and Georgiana Oakden in 1842 from England. Reed’s wife Maria complained bitterly that ‘we are in Halifax and do not like it, because we have no friends. Mr. Reed refuses to visit worldly people and the only pious people we know are the tradesmen, with whom we do not care to associate’. Similarly, Reed had failed in London to make contact with Oakden’s evangelical business associates George Fife Angas, Samuel Jackson and Robert Gardner. Reed wrote that ‘I left my name both for Jackson and Mr. Angas … but I have not heard or seen any of them … I called again on Angas and I don’t know that I should have called again … I called on Mr. Gardner, but he was not in, so much for your friends’. Reed finally made contact with Samuel Jackson and had a spiritual conversation with him, but found that he was completely immersed in worldly things. This was one of the aspects of Reed’s complex character and the question has to be asked was Reed the type of man who accepted the demands of Wesleyan Methodism more wholeheartedly than others? Reed needs to be compared to Edmund Morgan’s assessment of the Puritan Michael Wigglesworth, whose ‘sense of guilt to pleasures, even his minding of other people’s business were not the anomalies
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of a diseased mind, but simply the qualities demanded of a good Puritan’. 112

The claustrophobic nature of the band meeting meant that Jennings’ band mates were privy to his financial problems and the general lack of privacy in the Wesleyan Methodist Society meant that Jennings’ financial woes were exposed. Directives began to flow from Reed and Oakden towards Jennings. On 13 May 1838, Reed pointed out that ‘Henry had to make a material reduction in his yearly expenditure and part with his present residence. It was his duty to do so at any sacrifice’. 113 Jennings realised that ‘I must do something, may the Lord advise me to what that something should be’. 114 Oakden’s reproof took a more practical turn and he went to Hobart Town to settle the sale of Henry’s land in the Brighton area.

Henry Jennings made efforts to economise in his large establishment and Alicia Jennings was cooperative, but could not see the need for the extent of the economies. Arrangements were made to relinquish the expense of the gardener and several other expenses, possibly including a governess Miss Cowie. 115 The Rev. Joseph Orton quoted to Jennings the case of Ferguson, a member of the Wesleyan Methodists, who had been in pecuniary embarrassment and come over from Hobart to be a clerk at the Commercial Bank branch. Out of a small salary, he saved sufficient to pay off his debts and lived on ten shillings a week. Further, Ferguson had contributed £25-0-0 to the Wesleyan Chapel in Hobart. These salutary tales had some effect on Jennings, who was ‘led to a deeper understanding of my expenditure and what I am to do.’ 116 Further reprimands came from Oakden who spoke to Jennings during the week of 30 September 1838 and told him ‘that the world and Mr. Sherwin were talking about his mode of living, that it was too expensive for his special circumstances’. 117

112 Wigglesworth, *Diary*, p. ix.
113 Jennings, *Diary*, 13 May 1838.
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115 Jennings, *Diary*, 5 August 1838.
116 Jennings, *Diary*, 26 August 1838.
117 Jennings, *Diary*, 30 September 1838.
With the Wesleyan net closing in, Reed called on Jennings a few weeks later and advised that ‘it was absolutely necessary that Jennings should sell the house in which he was living at any sacrifice and he, Oakden and John Gleadow would discuss the general arrangement of his affairs’. 118 There was more at stake than Jennings’ soul and reputation. The reputation of the whole Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society was in jeopardy, and it could not afford the bankruptcy of such a prominent figure. Decisions were made to sell the family home and land adjoining with other convertible property in Launceston and Hobart, in order to discharge the mortgage on the family residence. However, procrastination was still evident in Jennings’ entries which showed a reluctance to take the final steps: ‘I have for some time felt the necessity of a more complete giving of myself to the Lord, although we may not, like the Apostles, be called to a literal forsaking of all’. 119 On the actual sale day of his residence, no bids were received but some lots of ground sold for £430-0-0. The same situation occurred in the Hobart Town sale – no buyers attended the sale. Reed accompanied Jennings to the sale and spent his time in stirring up believers by preaching in the streets of Hobart; at the same time Jennings wrote ‘I could scarcely open my mouth for God’. 120

The only tangible remark to gain a further understanding of Jennings’ financial affairs was made at the beginning of 1839. Jennings felt ‘a comparative calm in my worldly affairs and I fear I am resting too much on that’. 121 There was no mention of what was sold and what wasn’t. Examination of Jennings’ Land Memorial Index in the Registry of Deeds, Hobart, reveal that from the period October 1838, there were seven land sale transactions in the succeeding eight months. Four of these sales were to friends or relatives - Henry Reed, Isaac Sherwin, Edward Dumaresq and W. Gellibrand, the last two a brother-in-law and a cousin. There was also one purchase by
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Jennings. Four land purchases were noted in November 1838, but these would have been delayed purchases coming through the Land Titles system and purchased before the crisis selling up period of October 1838.

With the threat of bankruptcy lifted and life on a more even financial keel, Jennings’ diary appeared to lose its dynamic. The dialogue about temporal worries had been all consuming and all that was left in 1839 were the well-worn formulae of slothfulness, late rising, gluttony etc. though there was an oblique reference to feeling at peace because of no trying worldly circumstances. The serpent of covetousness reared its head in September when Henry was accused by Sinclair of charging too much in connection with the Cleggan Estate and George Hobler protested against charges for procuring a loan of £5,000. Jennings agreed that he was showing an unbecoming love of money and wrote in the diary ‘May I humble myself before God and seek forgiveness for what I have done’. Recognition of his own weakness showed up when he identified with St. Paul: ‘I delight in the law of God, but I find another law in my members, warring against the law and bringing me into the captivity of sin in my members’.

**Third Dialogue: Proselytising**

With the completion of the discussion of the two main dialogues in the diary it is fitting to conclude with a look at the proselytising aspect of Henry Jennings and its impact on various threads of contemporary Van Diemen’s Land Society, his assigned convicts and his relations, in laws and social circle. Jennings had some assigned servants and these he referred to in a proprietorial tone as *my men*. He felt a strong duty to bring them to some sort of conversion experience and to this end he applied himself spasmodically. His program included assembly for morning prayers and evening prayers and often an individual man would pretend to be in the service of God, only to relapse. One such incident Henry
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detailed thus: ‘I have been much pained this last week, because one of my men whose change I believed to have been sincere, appeared to be giving away to the temptation of drinking and cursing and had come to the resolution not to abstain at all. I got my friend Reed to speak to him and convince him of his folly, and he obtained a promise from him that he would attend a prayer meeting. He has since regularly attended the means of grace and I trust the incident will be blessed to others of the household’.\footnote{Jennings, Diary, 11, 18 September 1836.}

This situation fell apart at the New Year in 1837, when the assigned men took the Monday holiday with Jennings’ approval. Jennings sadly discovered that ‘The one whom I made overseer, who understood all the principles of religion, was the one who led them in the mischief of drunkenness and rioting’.\footnote{Jennings, Diary, 1 January 1837.} Resultantly, the overseer received fifty lashes and six months in a road party and another man who had not done anything before got fifty lashes. This disheartened Jennings who saw the only remedy as being led in the ways of religion and regretted not having had more prayers in the morning. He was blind to the harshness of the punishment system and equally blind to the fact that the convicts’ culturally acceptable and easy mode of relaxation was drunkenness. He accepted the system and utilised it, but had little or no understanding or compassion for the men within it.

Jennings preached at the Penitentiary and Convict Hospital in Launceston and distributed tracts, but did not feel comfortable. He lacked the ebullience and bravura of Henry Reed. His wife Alicia held Bible classes for the female servants’ spiritual welfare. In his diary he confessed that ‘I find religious conversation hard to introduce’.\footnote{Jennings, Diary, 14 May 1837.} There is a noticeable contrast with George Palmer Ball’s men at Mountford, Longford and Jennings’ men. Ball presented the picture of the stable Wesleyan Methodist and Jennings’ diary recorded ‘the cementing of a Christian friendship with him, a man whose mind is
fully devoted to the word of God’.127 This was exemplified by the fact that nearly all Ball’s men had made a profession of religion. This was in sharp contrast to Jennings’ men whom he described as ‘having a decided distaste for family prayer and seldom came to the evening prayers’.128 In a sense, Jennings’ social framework was at odds with Wesleyan Methodism. He had come from a strongly religious upright family, and with a large element of social prominence through his relations to the Gellibrands and intermarriage with the Russells. His wife Alicia’s family, the Legges, were intermarried with the socially prominent Pitcairns, Dumaresqs, Franks and Grays.129 Jennings and his brother Joseph Gellibrand Jennings had doubts about their sister Sophia’s marriage to Philip Russell.130 They wondered if they should sanction the marriage by being present at it. The Russell family’s piety and seriousness were in doubt, and the doubts of the Jennings’ family were confirmed when they met them. Jennings’ proselytising took the shape of an admonishing letter on service to God and a two page poem entitled ‘Young Married Christians’.

The separateness from worldly people which Wesleyan Methodism advocated is very evident in the diary and it often seemed to impinge on normal social intercourse. Henry Jennings looked for spiritual improvement in social intercourse with his in-laws the Grays and Eliza Franks. He found it with the Grays and said that his sister-in-law, Eliza Franks, ‘was under serious consideration and looking to him for guidance and instruction’.131 His opinion of his own family in Hobart was ‘that there was too much conformity to the world and my sisters are in danger of being led away. Their consciences will not
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allow them to neglect the form of religion, but they are in great
danger of being satisfied with that and not walking with God'. 132
Jennings with his brother Joseph Gellibrand Jennings hoped to unite
their combined efforts as a means of bringing the family to be of one
mind. One of Jennings’ sisters-in-law, Sarah Pitcairn, was sympathetic
to religion. 133 Henry Jennings happily noted that she was ‘giving up
her mind to religion, but she is indulging in a strong prejudice
against Methodists, which is a hindrance, but that is how I felt before
I joined them’. 134 By June, however, her prejudices were
strengthening against the Methodists.

This was an example of the social prejudice against the
Wesleyan Methodists, particularly in establishment circles. They were
not completely socially acceptable and Jennings had in a sense
crossed a social divide with Gleadow, Oakden, Reed, Sherwin,
Palmer Ball and Bartley whilst still retaining their unique status in
Launceston. Robert Pitcairn and his wife, who were frequent visitors
to the Jennings, were equally resistant to Jennings’ proselytising.
Henry saw him as ‘a man of high standing in the community without
entering into the spirituality of religion. A man who asked, if it were
really necessary to make such a fuss about religion and should not
the life of a Christian be quiet reticence’. 135 Quiet reticence was not
the Wesleyan Methodist way and Jennings confessed to his diary
about Robert Pitcairn, ‘I would like to say to him you are heartily
welcome but our ideas are very different. You must not expect much
of my company’. 136

Occasionally, Jennings’ proselytising bore fruit as when he
visited Mrs. and Miss Aitken. 137 He felt that ‘Miss Aitken was willing
to admit she wanted a little more religion but was wholly blind to the
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Clearly Jennings’ efforts were to bear small fruit with the people of his own social class. The Wesleyan intrusive manner of conversion was not destined to appeal to that stratum in society. Where it was destined to succeed and where it always succeeded was in death bed conversions and reinforcement of pious conversion. Proselytising succeeded in the case of imminent death as with a client of Henry Jennings, Mr. E.H. Thomas, who called for his services to make a will. This was an ideal opportunity for a Wesleyan Methodist to inquire about the state of mind and soul of a dying person. Within Wesleyan Methodism, ‘Holy Dying’ was an important ritual. W.R. Ward feels that Wesley ‘regarded himself as offering a release from the tyranny of death in popular religion’. The good death was to be thankful, faithful and indeed almost celebratory and triumphant. The doctrine of perfection suggested that the death bed was to be a sanctified place. For those within Wesleyan Methodism who had the conversion or new birth experience and supreme assurance of personal salvation, it was important to monitor their death experience and be convinced that they had definitely been saved. The Evangelicals and Wesleyan Methodists had taken some colour from Bishop Jeremy Taylor’s book *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, published in 1651, but the Wesleyans’ own particular doctrine of assurance needed some drama on the death bed.

Richard J. Bell argues ‘that John Wesley initially constructed a Methodist framework of death through *The Arminian Magazine*’. *The Arminian Magazine* had been published by Wesley in 1778 to counter the predestination doctrines of his Calvinist rivals. Wesley published some 152 accounts of death bed scenes in *The Arminian Magazine* between 1778 and 1797, the year of his death. In Bell’s opinion ‘Wesley used the new technology of mass communication to provide tangible proof that holy dying was demonstrating the assurance of salvation. Often the reports of the death bed scenes had
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embellishments to perfect the tableau’.\textsuperscript{141} The Methodist Magazine, which commenced in 1798, carried on the traditional obituaries, including the death bed scene of the dying one. One popular phrase for the dying was ‘All is Well, all is well’. Hattersley agrees that ‘For Methodists a good death was essential proof of an assurance which did not falter to the end. Evidence of a joyful passing was essential’.\textsuperscript{142} John Wesley’s own last words were ‘the best of all, God is with us’\textsuperscript{143} and Henry Reed’s reported last words were ‘Precious Jesus, sweet peace’.\textsuperscript{144} John Gleadow used the phrase ‘two things are pillars of strength to my soul at this solemn time – the fatherhood of God and the sympathy of Christ. All is well, all is well’.\textsuperscript{145}

John Crookes died in 1870. His ‘Holy Dying’ utterances, as reported by the Rev. John Harcourt (son-in-law of the Rev. Nathaniel Turner), consisted of repeating two lines of the second verse of Toplady’s hymn, Rock of Ages, and his final words were ‘He is precious’.\textsuperscript{146} In 1843 the Launceston Wesleyan Sunday School reported with a certain amount of relish the dying utterances of some of the children in the Sunday School, saying that several children gave ‘delightful evidence of the practical application of the gospel truths’.\textsuperscript{147} One little girl dying from burns called out ‘Messenger of life, I shall soon be in heaven’.\textsuperscript{148} Another child dying of scarlet fever cried out ‘Hallelujah, Hallelujah, they are coming’.\textsuperscript{149}

Jalland concurs that the evangelical movement, particularly through Methodism, had ‘immense influence on death-bed behaviour’.\textsuperscript{150} She quotes the case of Wesleyan Methodist minister the Rev. William Schofield detailing an account of his first wife’s
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death in 1849 in *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*. Schofield emphasised 'his wife’s triumph over physical tribulation, with no reference to doctors or medicine, since pain was considered a test of faith'.\(^{151}\) According to Schneider ‘it was common for preachers, class leasers, family or friends to enquire into the spiritual condition of the dying one’.\(^{152}\) Often the dying one gave testimony in return and the testimony was repeatedly prompted down to the last minutes. Happy or joyful signs from the dying one often took the form of clapped hands, hand waving in token victory or in extremis, a crooked finger; there were also often cries and shouts using the word ‘Victory’. With this framework in mind and also the understanding that the Launceston Methodists had been, from their inception, exposed to copies of *The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* and the prominent articles on holy death, it is relevant to view Henry Jennings’ experience.

Jennings spoke to Mr. Thomas, who was dying of rapid consumption, about his state of mind and Thomas confessed to much drunkenness and he said he was resigned to the will of God. Henry disagreed and his response was ‘Man is depraved and must be born again, but Mr. Thomas did not seem to enter into the subject’.\(^{153}\) The next day Jennings brought Henry Reed as a reinforcement and Reed spoke to Thomas and prayed with him, but Thomas was too weak and depressed to say much. Miraculously in the night, Thomas appeared to have been visited by some sense of God and had a feeling of peace and joy, and was anxious to tell Jennings of his experience. Reed, Jennings and the Rev. Simpson were all convinced that it was the work of God, a type of conversion experience, and when Thomas died a few days later, Jennings recorded that ‘Mr. Thomas died today at 5.30 am. He did not speak after 12.30 the night before, but went off calmly and peacefully his faith unshaken to the last’.\(^{154}\)

\(^{151}\) Ibid, pp. 53-4.
\(^{153}\) Jennings, Diary, 24 December 1837.
\(^{154}\) Jennings, Diary, 31 December 1837.
Henry Jennings’ Diary ends in December 1839 on an inconclusive note. Webster sees this as the norm noting that ‘the lack of closure was a condition for the truly godly life, the authentically godly are in sense always in a state of becoming’. This opinion supports an understanding that the diary was only a portion of Jennings’ spiritual journey. Finally, it should be noted that there was never a suggestion in the diary of Jennings consecrating his wealth. His financial state did not appear to allow for such liberality.

What the spiritual diary has uncovered is the insecurity and turmoil in the psyche of the Wesleyan Methodist economic man of the period. The insecurity and turmoil particularly related to business affairs, and in Henry Jennings’ case, his weakness for land purchases and worldly values. One can detect here the direct thread emanating from John Wesley, the injunctions to Stewardship of Wealth and the injunctions against risky financial schemes.
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Chapter 7

Temperance and Political Pressure
Further Philanthropy

Introduction

This chapter centres on the temperance and teetotal movements in the early 1840s in Launceston, demonstrating how the teetotal movement arose out of temperance societies with British roots, which then moved through to teetotalism. Wesleyan Methodist ambivalent temperance and teetotal involvement in Britain is briefly discussed, as well as Wesleyan Methodist attitudes to drink in Van Diemen's Land. The society in Van Diemen's Land into which the teetotal movement came is delineated as well as the negative, social effects of being a teetotaller.

The nature of the Teetotal Society in Launceston is discussed in regard to its position as a secular body with some Wesleyan Methodist adherents, in particular a Wesleyan Methodist president, Isaac Sherwin. The egalitarian and cooperative attitudes of the Teetotal Society towards other denominations are highlighted, showing that teetotallers were regarded as one brotherhood. Stress is laid on the fact that the Teetotal Society was to become quite an influential body from its slow, often laughable beginnings. Discussion of the Teetotal Society is purely to demonstrate that it provided a type of training ground for preliminary political involvement. The political involvement will be explained to be the politics of influencing the issue of public house licences and limiting the retail trade of drink, particularly through the Annual Magistrates’ Licensing Meetings. This issue is shown to move from the presenting of a memorial to the formal step of a petition to the Lieutenant Governor. Wesleyan Methodist members of the Teetotal Society including Isaac Sherwin are discussed, as also middle rung Wesleyan Methodists who gained political training to be utilised later on.
The chapter then moves to an expanded discussion of John Crookes and his philanthropic work and involvement in the 1840s, all of which gave him an extra status and prepared him for his major political role in the anti-transportation movement. Other supporting middle rung involvement is discussed, demonstrating that the philanthropic energy of the 1830s appeared not to have diminished in the face of the upheavals of the 1840s. In a sense Chapter 7 is a bridging chapter, a period of marking time during the period of the economic depression. It is a lead in to the stronger political activities of Chapter 8.

Britain

In 1830, a letter in The Wesleyan Methodist Magazine advised 'banning ardent spirits from common use, because they are completely useless and moderate use is calculated to promote habitual use'.\(^1\) William Collins established the first temperance society in London in 1830 and the London Temperance Society became the British and Foreign Temperance Society (B.F.T.S.) in July 1831.\(^2\) This society was formed by philanthropists with a strong Evangelical bias. The first temperance societies were anti-spirits societies, which went through a second stage to total abstinence or teetotalism and finally prohibition. Stuart Andrews refers to the Temperance Movement as 'a call for moderation ending in a demand for prohibition'.\(^3\) Methodists were prominent in the anti-spirits movement often as individuals, because Methodists were traditionally against distilled liquor. They were cautioned to avoid buying or selling spirituous liquor, except in the case of extreme measures. Wesley had not included fermented liquor in his directive and had in reality recommended mild ale, pointing out its
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nourishing properties. Paisana sees the initial Wesleyan Methodist position on total abstinence and teetotalism as ‘a thorny issue, and the Wesleyan Methodists being much less supportive than other dissenting churches’. She argues that ‘Teetotalism was a divisive measure and a dangerous one for the church to adopt’.5

Total abstinence calls were heard in 1838, and in England a Wesleyan Teetotal Society was formed at Preston in 1838. Paisana emphasises ‘the dissension over the teetotal doctrine which caused divisions between the upper and lower ranks’.6 In Cornwall, however, teetotalism was sacrosanct amongst the Wesleyan Methodists because of the social need. The Rev. Benjamin Carvosso, pioneer Wesleyan Methodist minister in Hobart, published a pamphlet in 1840 of a sermon at the Teetotal Festival at Liskeard, Cornwall, called ‘Drunkenness, The Enemy of Britain, arrested by the hand of God’.7 Bailey, Harvey and Brace consider that ‘in Cornwall, Methodism gained ownership of total abstinence through the creation of Teetotal Methodist sects, and thus Methodism became the institutional driver of teetotalism and temperance throughout Cornwall’.8 In particular, as one of the efforts to influence and regulate the behaviour of young Methodists, links were made between teetotalism and religion. The Annual Report of the St. Ives Teetotal Committee recorded that ‘many instances have occurred proving the connection of teetotalism with the revival of God’s work’.9

At this period the London Methodist Conference was not anxious to allow teetotal and temperance societies a platform within the Wesleyan Methodist Society, and Bailey, Harvey and Brace
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4 Burns Annual Report, 1861, National Temperance League, National Temperance League, 1861.
7 Benjamin Carvosso, Drunkenness: The Enemy of Britain, Arrested by the Hand of God, a Sermon Preached at a Teetotal Festival, near Liskeard on June 9 1840, 2nd Edition (Barnstaple, 1841).
9 Ibid., p. 148.
describe the Conference’s view as seeing ‘teetotalism as divisive and fundamentally incompatible with the teaching of the Scripture’.  

**Australia**

Roger C. Thompson cites ‘the temperance movement as arriving in Australia from Britain in 1830 with temperance societies springing up with tea drinking meetings and some success with the signing of pledges’.  

Roe charts the progress after ‘Quaker missionaries Backhouse and Walker founded a society at Hobart in 1832’.  

In 1832 efforts were made with slender means to establish a society in Launceston upon the moderation system, which was accomplished in 1833.  

An annual report of the New South Wales Temperance Society shows that Wesleyan Methodist, the Rev. Joseph Orton, was a member of the committee for the first New South Wales Temperance Society in 1835. The aims of the Society concentrated on the moral influence of the temperance principle, but at the same time exerted a form of political pressure. The report condemned the ‘appalling fact that the revenue of the colony is derived from the importation of rum and that the executive is blind to it’.  

The *Launceston Advertiser* was certainly advertising monthly meetings of the Launceston Auxiliary Temperance Society at the beginning of 1834.  

The edition of 30 January 1836 refers to ‘temperance societies having been for some time established in Van Diemen’s Land, though the societies are much laughed at, for good to come of them’.  

In contrast, in England Harrison feels that ‘membership of a temperance society was often only the first step on the upward
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10 Ibid., p. 148.  
13 *Temperance Herald, Van Diemen’s Land*, July 1845, No. 1 for Domestic and Foreign Intelligence.  
15 *Launceston Advertiser*, 4 January 1834.  
16 *Launceston Advertiser*, 30 January 1836.
ladder’, it opened up opportunities for the talented, and was sometimes ‘a useful stepping stone to higher things’.

The teetotal, total abstinence movement in Launceston came into its own strength in the early 1840s and ran in tandem alongside the economic depression. E.R. Taylor sees the total abstinence movement as ‘another form of social and semi–political activity’, and he stresses the fact that the British Wesleyan Connexion regarded them uneasily because ‘they tended to become the centre of political hopes and interests’. Roe corroborates this statement saying ‘Tasmanian temperance spokesmen frankly argued for the return of sympathisers to the Legislature and engaged in short term politics’. In particular Isaac Sherwin, as President of the Teetotal Society, was to utilise this as an early training political platform.

So it was that the Teetotal Society which came into the social space of Launceston was not a religious entity, though having a good complement of Wesleyan Methodists. It was not only to be a secular Society, but one which had strong ecumenical overtones, where groups of people united over the same social problem of drunkenness. There did not appear at any stage in the 1840s an attempt to link teetotalism with the conversion experience of Wesleyan Methodism.

In September 1838, an attempt was made to establish teetotal societies in Sydney and Launceston, which adopted the total abstinence pledge. In 1838, the Launceston Temperance Society ‘discontinued its meetings in the belief that temperance would be better served by one society and the teetotal pledge became the sole one’. Moderation was abandoned for teetotalism. Revealing the
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18 Ibid., *Drink and the Victorians*, p. 133.
20 Ibid.
21 Roe, *Quest for Authority*, p. 170.
Launceston situation in a letter to his mother in 1839, George Best wrote ‘public houses are shut up nearly all Sunday, not allowing any tippling, only allowed to sell beer, but no spirits on that day. Any drunken person on the streets that day is taken up and fined five shillings’. However, Best also noted that ‘drinking was often meant to cure illness such as influenza, and one man drank a quart of whisky a day till he was well and there are many such cases’. This was also the case in England where ‘alcohol was important in the 1820s as pain killer’, and there were connections between drink and every aspect of life in a largely agricultural society. Drinking was regarded as a popular recreation in British agricultural society and was intrinsically woven into the fabric of everyday life. Harrison points out that ‘it was impossible to get in the harvest without harvest beer’. Moreover, sociability was often only obtainable in pubs which had ‘light, heat, cooking facilities, furniture, newspapers and sociability’. When teetotalism appeared, it threatened the fabric of everyday pastimes, and teetotalism ‘often required a complete change of friendships’, and, for the working man signing the pledge, meant giving up sociable pleasure. Society in Van Diemen's Land was largely agriculturally based and had inherited many of the attitudes and values just described. This was what Mathias calls ‘part and parcel of an old way of life imported to a new environment’.
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23 Letter Diary, George Best to his Mother, 30 March 1839, NS 252, AOT.
24 Best Diary, Ibid.
25 Harrison, Drink and the Victorians, p. 41.
27 Ibid, p. 47.
28 Ibid, p. 50.
Isaac Sherwin  circa 1850
Launceston

The Launceston Society was called The Launceston Teetotal Society and met for the purposes of total abstinence. The *Launceston Examiner* described them as ‘moderate in their pretensions to authority’.\(^\text{30}\) A meeting in early April 1842 revealed the composition of its members, and the Wesleyan quotient can be seen here. The President was Isaac Sherwin, taking the chair; John Tongs, blacksmith spoke vehemently on the evils of intemperance and William Tyson supported him. The meeting was crowded with working men, many of whom wanted to sign the teetotal pledge.\(^\text{31}\) Sherwin was not working class, but he was in a sense facilitating a society that had a large Wesleyan Methodist middle rung element, anxious to involve themselves in an influential body. Supporting figures were Joseph Stanley, who kept a Temperance Coffee House at the Sandhill, and John Stoneham, who kept the Temperance Coffee House in St. John Street, Launceston.\(^\text{32}\) Thomas Bonner and Walter Powell were bandmates in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society\(^\text{33}\), and were joint secretaries of the Launceston Branch of the Tasmanian Teetotal Society.\(^\text{34}\) This was a type of training ground for Walter Powell, who was to become one of the most liberal supporters of Wesleyan Methodism in Port Phillip (Victoria), and became one of the best examples of ‘Consecration of Wealth’.

It is difficult to put together a completely clear picture and overview of the level of drunkenness in Launceston and neighbourhood in the early years of the 1840s. Articles on the topic were not common in the newspapers and the solid facts are to be gleaned from the police reports, local intelligence reports and random incidents. In 1842 and 1843 in the *Launceston Examiner*, a

\(^{30}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 2 April 1842.

\(^{31}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 2 April 1842.

\(^{32}\) *Launceston Courier*, 1 February 1841, advertisement John Stoneham, Temperance Coffee House, St. John Street at the place known as the George Inn.


\(^{34}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 29 April 1843.
third of all the offences listed would have been drunkenness, and in a paper such as *The Teetotal Advocate* extra emphasis was given to the listings of drink related offences. Words used ranged from inebriety, tippling, drunkenness, drinking potations to getting tipsy and pottle deep. Some little feeling for the state of Launceston is gained from the following analysis of primary sources.

Examination of the minutes of the leaders’ meetings of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society for 1837-43, where expulsion edicts were listed, revealed, at the most, three expulsions a year for drunkenness over the period. This is hardly defining for the general population of Launceston, merely a pointer. Wesleyan Methodist Matthew Lassetter was one of the expulsions and charges were made against him on 25 August 1841 for drunkenness, which he admitted. The meeting was unanimous that he could no longer be a class leader and in September, he was expelled. By 1843, Lassetter had regained the fold and was made a class leader at Cressy. This occurred after he joined the Teetotal Society and was made chairman of the Teetotal Society at Longford. In January 1843, he confessed that ‘he was young in experience, but teetotalism was prospering in the minds of more respectable settlers, and that if he had ten talents, he would bring them all forward to the cause’. The Rev. John Manton’s diary revealed the path travelled by a Wesleyan Minister to teetotalism - from enjoying wine and port in 1834, to taking the pledge against spirituous liquors in 1849. The Rev. Nathaniel Turner’s position was also revealed to Manton that he bought of Mr. Warren ‘an eighteen gallon measure of wine for 90/-; it is equal to most of the port I have met with in the colony. If you put in one pound of lump sugar and a pint of brandy and let it stand and settle, it will improve’. By 11 August 1849, Manton was pledging that ‘he
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35 Methodist Church, Tasmania, Minute Book of Quarterly Meetings and Some Leaders Meetings, 25 August 1841, NS1006, AOT; and Methodist Church, Tasmania, Minutes of Meetings of Leaders of Wesleyan Methodist Society, Launceston, 8 September 1841, NS429/948,949, AOT.
36 *Teetotal Advocate*, 10 April 1843.
37 *Launceston Courier and Teetotal Advocate*, 2 January 1843.
would never taste spirituous liquors unless recommended by his medical attendant, in case of illness'.

Background Wesleyan Methodist support showed through with the testimony of a Mr. Thompson at the Teetotal Meeting who said 'that he had been helped to go 72 miles into the country by Mr. Gleadow, twenty one miles away from the public house. Many old soldiers like himself has seen the effects of rum on the troops and it was the sole cause of crime in the army'. Another view of the Launceston situation came through in a testimony given to Sherwin by a respectable tradesman, who asserted that ‘he could commence at the top of Brisbane Street and tell how every original owner of allotments had died of drunkenness and been carried off by it’. A positive experiment was instigated by Wesleyan Methodist Charles Chilcott in the harvest field. He collected his men together and told them that he intended to have no wine, spirits or beer at the harvest. During the harvest, no one was ill and the amount of work done was extraordinary. Two men cut four acres per week without a drop of spirits or beer. Similarly, no one asked for a drink when they had to put up the sheaves, which was very hard work. Chilcott perceived ‘an increase of endurance, lightheartedness and happiness, more regularity, more quiet, less trouble, and no fighting or quarrelling’. This was, in effect, the teetotal attempt to break down entrenched social agrarian habits transferred from Britain.
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38 Rev. Nathaniel Turner to the Rev. John Manton, 8 July 1834, 1 August 1834, AOT; ‘Copies of notes from diaries and letters made by E.R. Pretyman’. 1949, NS1258/1/1, AOT.
39 Rev. John Manton Small Notebook, NS1258/1/1, AOT.
40 *Teetotal Advocate*, 22 May 1843.
41 *Teetotal Advocate*, 14 August 1843.
42 *Teetotal Advocate*, 8 May 1843.
43 At the beginning of 1844, there were 1,372 members on the books of the Teetotal Society, and about 200 members had broken their pledge since the inception of the Society. The Wesleyan Methodist portion of the Society was strong with Isaac Sherwin, president, William Tyson, secretary, and Thomas Bonner and Thomas Stubbs, auditors. John Drysdale, Joseph Stanley and William Boswell Dean were also known as strong members. Independent Minister, the Rev. Charles Price, was the vice president.
William Tyson, Henry Reed’s reformed protégé, who took the role of secretary in 1844,²⁴ confirmed that when ‘he came to the colony of Van Diemen’s Land, he was a beer drinker, but when he became a spirit drinker, he had been known to drink 22 glasses of gin a day’.²⁵ He affirmed that ‘he had been sunk to the lowest ebb of mental and bodily incapacity and now, no longer saw his family tremble at the sound of his footsteps’.²⁶ Tyson stressed that ‘five years ago he was not worth a farthing in the world, now he was worth hundreds of pounds’.²⁷ Longford also produced a branch of the Teetotal Society in 1843 and met at Wesleyan Methodist Robert Heazlewood’s residence at the back of the Wesleyan Chapel, Longford. W.R. Ward typecasts the Teetotal Society when he wrote ‘low Methodists, as opposed to the higher status Methodist party, took up teetotalism, another undenominational movement of moral reform with its roots in artisan enterprise’.²⁸

The ambivalence of the Wesleyan Conference showed when they decided ‘their chapels should not be let to teetotallers for the purpose of holding meetings and that their members should not take part in teetotal debates. The Van Diemen’s Land Ministers had been similarly notified’.²⁹ In general, radical tendencies were to be suppressed.³⁰ Sherwin’s comments regarding teetotalism were often regarded as wild and indiscriminate, and the aggressive tone of the early Teetotal Meetings led to criticism. The Launceston Examiner spoke of ‘deafening roars of laughter, barely bordering on madness’,³¹ and Sherwin accused the Launceston Examiner of being in the pay of breweries and publicans.³² A letter to the Examiner from Q Q stated that ‘no ministers of religion attended teetotal

²⁴ Launceston Examiner, 30 October 1844.
²⁵ Teetotal Advocate, 31 July 1843.
²⁶ Launceston Advertiser, 2 June 1842.
²⁷ Launceston Advertiser, 13 January 1844.
²⁹ Launceston Examiner, 9 July 1842.
³⁰ Taylor, Methodism, p. 141.
³¹ Launceston Examiner, 13 August 1842.
³² Launceston Examiner, 16 July 1842.
meetings and that the Wesleyan Minister did once, but gave it up’.55 Q Q went on: ‘a few of the less discerning and less instructed of the Wesleyans are connected with the teetotallers’.54 The Rev. Nathaniel Turner declared through the voice of the Examiner, that ‘so far from being ashamed of the subject, I feel thankful that I am from principle and conviction a member of the Launceston Total Abstinence Society. I joined the Society twelve months ago’.55 Turner demurred and found excuses for not being present at the meetings, giving the reason that his public duties were so numerous that he had little time left. This was possibly true, but the hesitancy of the British Wesleyan Conference shows through here, as well as the fact that no other members of the Wesleyan elite were members of the Teetotal Society in its early days. There was no sign of Philip Oakden, who as a merchant imported spirits, wine and ale. Oakden’s letter diary running from 1833-42 is full of examples of his landing consignments of these drinks.56

Roe stresses that ‘everywhere temperance men scrutinised the licensing courts anxious to limit the retail trade’.57 This was the short term political pressure tool to be used. Roe continues ‘that temperance men attributed the depression of the forties to general extravagance, especially the export of capital to pay for liquor from abroad’.58 The fact that Roe calls ‘temperance an aggressive creed seeking absolute triumph’,59 pinpoints the kernel of the movement. In many ways the movement had overtones of Wesleyan Methodism about it, with its song books, its testimonials and its tea meetings. There were, however, suspicions about the teetotal movement, that it was a secular movement emphasising secular morality and extracting pledges against the principle of Christian free will. One could consider, though, that the movement could have appealed to the

53 Launceston Examiner, 27 August 1842.
54 Ibid.
55 Launceston Examiner, 3 September 1842.
56 Oakden’s only connection to the teetotal movement was to sign the memorial at the Annual Licensing Day Meeting in 1844.
57 Roe, Quest for Authority, p. 170.
59 Ibid, p. 171.
missionary spirit of Wesleyan Methodism’s desire to rescue the fallen.

The Launceston Courier printed on 12 April 1840 and delivered gratis to Launceston Advertiser readers became The Teetotal Advocate, 1 October 1842.\(^6^0\) In 1843, the Teetotal Advocate gave an excellent view of the Society’s progress, as well as an assessment of Isaac Sherwin’s behaviour and position. It also gave a view of the ecumenical cooperation between the Catholic St. Joseph’s Abstinence Movement and the Launceston Teetotal Abstinence Society, both united in the one cause. Without digressing too much from the main theme of the thesis, it is important to point out that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, particularly through the Evangelical Union/Alliance movement of the 1840s, showed little fraternal charity to the Roman Catholics in Launceston, particularly at the ministerial level.

Hempton describes the Evangelical Union/Alliance as something ‘in which denominational distinctions could disappear below the surface of anti–Catholicism and anti–liberalism’.\(^6^1\) Christian Union/Alliance meetings had been advocated since the 1830s and the Rev. Jabez Bunting took part in Christian Union meetings in 1843 and in 1846 he was part of the first Evangelical Alliance Conference in September 1846. Hempton considers that the Evangelical Alliance was for some Wesleyans ‘a way of testifying to their anti–Catholicism, their political pessimism, their missionary zeal and their Evangelical inclusiveness’.\(^6^2\) In Van Diemen’s Land, the first signs of Evangelical union came in Hobart in April 1844, when the True Colonist mentioned their second meeting in the Wesleyan Chapel with 700 present. By June in Launceston, the Union had
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\(^6^0\) The Teetotal Advocate was brought out by Isaac Sherwin and other Wesleyans including William Tyson, Thomas Stubbs and William Boswell Dean. Tyson and other abstainers frequently rose at 4 AM to erect the Temperance Hall. (Thad. W.H., Leavitt, The Jubilee History of Tasmania: Which is Incorporated The Early History of Victoria, Biographical Sketches & ‘Australian Representative Men (Melbourne, 1887); William Boswell Dean biography file, AOT.


\(^6^2\) Ibid, p. 196.
taken the shape of a united prayer meeting of the Presbyterian, Wesleyan and Congregational denominations with plans to unite in a monthly prayer meeting. By August, the Baptists and Independents were part of the group. Lectures were given at Union meetings and the Wesleyan Minister the Rev. Mr. Eggleston’s lectures often concentrated on the defects of Roman Catholicism. Criticising Catholicism for its idolatrous behaviour, he stressed that vigilance was needed and any in the Evangelical Union should be protected from the insidious advance of error. The *Launceston Examiner* questioned the fact that Catholics and Quakers were not admitted and Wesleyans Henry Jennings and Henry Reed both spoke for unity amongst denominations. Jennings said it was lamentable to think that bitter feelings should ever exist amongst different denominations. Bigotry did not appear to be present in the Wesleyan Methodist laity, it seemed to be a ministerial attitude.

Teetotalism was the glue that united the Teetotal Society in Launceston and the St. Joseph’s Total Abstinence Society, and they often exchanged speakers. On the platform at St. Joseph’s Sherwin said ‘that their cause was truly a Catholic one in which all Christians could join’. The Rev. Charles Price, Independent minister, also joined him at such meetings at St. Joseph’s. The ultimate expression of their cooperation came in the Grand Teetotal Demonstration when a procession of teetotallers mustered in the Horticultural Gardens; this included carpenters, joiners, mechanics, saddlers and cordwainers with accompanying bands, banners and the Sacred Harmonic Society. The St. Joseph’s Abstinence Society were there with their flag advocating domestic comfort and sobriety and their banner denoting that they were the St. Joseph’s branch of the Father Mathew Society. Father Theobald Mathew was the Irish apostle of temperance and the poor man’s friend. As a unifying force, he was
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greatly admired on all sides in Britain and he had single-handedly promoted the cause of temperance in Ireland with remarkable success. Beginning in Cork, he had administered the teetotal pledge to thousands. Harrison feels that ‘Father Mathew’s close cooperation with non-conformist teetotallers… must have moderated anti-Catholicism amongst English protestants at the time’.  

The *Teetotal Advocate* expressed the point clearly: ‘religion was intended to be the bond of union amongst men, but it is the bone of contention. Total abstinence has total charity and good will to all, there is no sectarianism and this is conducive to the moral improvement of all’. Here can be seen the hint of the secular suggestion that teetotalism, the secular force, was supplanting religion. 

As president of the Teetotal Society, Isaac Sherwin was the butt of criticism for people wishing to show that he had feet of clay. One such episode evolved around the insolvency of Jonathan Griffiths, merchant and ship owner. Without pre-empting the later discussion of the economic depression, suffice to say that Jonathan Griffiths became insolvent on 28 June 1842 and Sherwin was one of the co-trustees of the estate. As an agent of Griffiths’ creditors, Sherwin had to oversee and release the dispersal of bonded spirits for seamen employed in Griffiths’ ships. The *Teetotal Advocate* reported ‘that he had been put in the anomalous position of having to provide stores for one of the several vessels belonging to Griffiths’. Sherwin explained his position to the committee of the Teetotal Society, placing himself in their hands. The committee argued that ‘Teetotallers did not have to forfeit their right to hold individual positions where spirits had to be administered’. The taint of a connection to alcohol seems to have clung to Sherwin. In her history of the Sherwin family, Ann Fysh claims that Isaac Sherwin owned both a brewery and a hotel without providing any evidence to back
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up the statement,72 and this statement is repeated in Ivan Heazlewood’s History Notes on the Westbury Methodist Circuit,73 using Fysh as an authority.

We have some evidence to support Fysh in 1844 when the Launceston Examiner alluded to Sherwin and the Cataract Brewery. It claimed that ‘when the lease of the Cataract Brewery was lately for sale, he made no sacrifice to get it again into his possession and employ it in a less objectionable trade’.74 The Cornwall Chronicle, with its scurrilous bent, printed a letter from P who asked ‘whilst Sherwin holds the imposing position of President of the Teetotal Society, he is at the same time amassing a large fortune at the expense of the wretched victims of intemperance’.75 It would appear that Sherwin did indeed own the brewery. In August 1842, four months after he became president of the Teetotal Society, he was challenged at a teetotal meeting as to whether he received two or three hundred pounds a year for the rent of a Brewery. Sherwin replied that ‘he had let it on lease until 1850 and that if he were to renew it then, the question might be asked of him to some purpose’.76 When it appeared in the Launceston Examiner for sale in 1847 by Mr. W.S. Turner, it noted in the Title that it was part of a location to the late James Kirk and by him devised to Isaac Sherwin.77 Final revelation of Sherwin’s involvement comes in 1848 with an advertisement in the Launceston Examiner referring to an indenture made in August 1845, (Sherwin had retired as president of the Teetotal Society in October 1844), between Sherwin and William Turner, brewer, Mary Cowie of Woolmers with Philip Oakden and John Gleadow, trustees. Sherwin had defaulted payment of the interest and other monies; therefore the property was to be sold. The
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74 Launceston Examiner, 9 March 1844.
75 Cornwall Chronicle, 23 October 1844.
76 Launceston Examiner, 11 August 1842.
77 Launceston Examiner, 10 February 1847.
property included a tenement, a brewery and a malthouse with malting utensils.\textsuperscript{78}

Wesleyan, John Stoneham, owner of The Temperance Coffee House\textsuperscript{79} also came in for slander and castigation. ‘Old Teetotaller’, who was once the owner of a coffee house himself, complained that ‘John Stoneham’s coffee house had people coming and going at all hours of the night. Often when the public house closed, drunken soldiers and sailors are let in by Mr. Stoneham’.\textsuperscript{80} This was vigorously denied by Stoneham who accused ‘Old Teetotaller’ of ‘trying to take the house from over his head and that he kept a disorderly house whilst he, John Stoneham, had the Honourable Order of Rechabites in his house’.\textsuperscript{81} And so it continued. There were squabbles with the Mechanics’ Institute and accusations flung at the Launceston Examiner. A letter from a mechanic in the Teetotal Advocate states that ‘The Examiner wants to drive the Mechanics’ Institute in this town rough shod over the Teetotal Society’.\textsuperscript{82} It was suggested that the teetotalers were too extreme in their opinions and clashed with the moderate men in the Mechanics Institute; lectures for both institutions were set on the same evening and, as Stefan Petrow writes, ‘the Teetotal Society changed two meetings, but the management of the Mechanics Institute dominated by the Sect to which the Examiner belonged, refused to confer with the teetotallers’.\textsuperscript{83}

At a lecture in May 1844, Sherwin laid out the political effects as well as the moral and physical effects of intemperance. He devoted most of the lecture to the political effects, observing that intemperance produced ‘a great loss of life, property and time’;\textsuperscript{84} he quoted fifty inquests per annum in Hobart Town, seven tenths of

\textsuperscript{78} Launceston Examiner, 24 May 1848.
\textsuperscript{79} The Temperance Coffee House was then moved to Paterson Street, Launceston. (Teetotal Advocate, 7 August 1843).
\textsuperscript{80} Teetotal Advocate, 12 October 1843.
\textsuperscript{81} Teetotal Advocate, 28 October 1843.
\textsuperscript{82} Teetotal Advocate 1 May 1843.
\textsuperscript{84} Launceston Examiner, 25 May 1844.
which were due to intemperance. As well, there were 2,700 persons filling drunkards’ graves in the colony. With regard to public houses, Sherwin calculated ‘that there were 100 public houses in the island occupied by ten individuals daily and there was the loss of labour of one thousand men’.\textsuperscript{85} Sherwin further calculated that ‘£164,000 was spent by the colony on useless beverages and if the money had been judiciously employed, lasting benefits could have been confirmed on the colony’.\textsuperscript{86}

These political opinions expressed by Sherwin were only a preliminary to actual political action. It was particularly in the area of the licensing court and the magistrates that the Teetotal Society was to apply political pressure. The year before, the \textit{Teetotal Advocate} had declared ‘that the Teetotal Principle was independent of politics, but it cannot fail to exercise a powerful and salutary influence on the political welfare of the country’.\textsuperscript{87} The editor of the \textit{Teetotal Advocate} agreed that ‘The Teetotal Pledge does not meddle with political or religious controversies, but it exercises a most important influence both in religion and politics’.\textsuperscript{88} Public houses were deemed to be the cause of the problem. As Kilner states, ‘with a paucity of any alternative entertainment, the only form of relief for the lower classes from the monotony of colonial life was usually the public house’.\textsuperscript{89} Petrow suggests ‘that the number of licensed pubs was allowed to rise because the revenue from the licensed pubs saved the Government from financial embarrassment’.\textsuperscript{90}

The practicalities of influencing politics took the shape of Sherwin confronting the magistrates at the annual Licensing Day Meeting in 1844, and presenting them with a memorial petition. At this meeting, the magistrates met to grant licences to retail wine, beer and spiritous liquors. The memorial petition begged that no

\textsuperscript{85} Launceston Examiner, 25 May 1844.
\textsuperscript{86} Launceston Examiner, 25 May 1844.
\textsuperscript{87} Teetotal Advocate, 26 June 1843.
\textsuperscript{88} Teetotal Advocate, 7 October 1843.
\textsuperscript{89} Kilner, ‘Temperance and the Liquor Question’, p. 83.
new licences be granted and that every ill conducted public house
was refused a licence. The argument was ‘that public houses were
designed for the refreshment and entertainment of travellers, and
that intoxicating liquors were dietic and part of the refreshment, and
the present legitimate use should only be for travellers and diet’.91
Sherwin had rallied nine ministers of religion in the town to sign the
memorial and these included the Rev. Charles Price
(Congregational), the Rev. John Eggleston (Wesleyan), the Rev.
Henry Dowling (Baptist) and the Rev. John West (Congregational).
As well as the strength of the Teetotal Society, he had managed to
secure Wesleyan status and force in the shape of Henry Jennings,
Philip Oakden and John Crookes.

The magistrates refused to receive the memorial or have it read
to them on the grounds that their duty was only to investigate the
fitness of the applicant for the licence, and that it was only in the
power of the Lieutenant Governor to actually limit the number of
licences. Wesleyan magistrate, Theodore Bartley, proposed that the
memorial should at least be read but this was rejected; he showed
further support for Sherwin by saying ‘that the annual meeting was a
mere farce if they were not allowed to exercise their discretion in
determining the number of licenses granted’.92 Bartley continued the
argument with a letter to the Launceston Examiner supporting the
magistrates’ power to limit the number of public houses, and the
Examiner wisely stated that ‘discontinue the legal trades in the town
and you will have three illicit dealers in its place’.93 However, The
Examiner supported the right to memorialise the local bench and
licensing justices and agreed the memorial should not have been
rejected.

Further reinforcement came in a petition from the inhabitants
of Launceston in 1846 to Lieutenant Governor Sir John Eardley-
Wilmot and gives an understanding of the fight against the licensing

91 Launceston Examiner, 5 September 1844.
92 Launceston Examiner, 5 September 1844.
93 Launceston Examiner, 14 September 1844.
of public houses. It referred to ‘the force of the allurements placed in the daily path of the humbler inhabitants by the additional establishment of public houses’. The Launceston petition cited that in England, 722 petitions were lying before the House of Commons in May 1845 on the same subject of public houses, and demanded to know that ‘if such restraints were necessary in the mother country, how much greater extent are they required in this community, where a large number of the offences, which procured transportation, could be traced to frequenting public houses’. The petition pointed out that the licensing magistrates insisted that they had no power to limit the number of licensed houses or refuse applications and that a majority of magistrates, present at the annual Licensing Meeting at Launceston in 1844, had refused to read or receive the memorial addressed to the meeting. The petitioners challenged the power held by the licensing magistrates in the Colonial Licensing Act and stated that ‘the magistrates neglected the interests of the public, by refusing to exercise their discretion in granting or refusing licensing applications’. The petition called for Lieutenant Governor Eardley-Wilmot to introduce an Act in Council which attended to the wants of the community, and limit the number of licensed houses. The Launceston Advertiser blamed the magistrates for ‘they ought to have demanded the interference of the government, if their own powers were insufficient, or if they possessed a discretion, they ought to have rejected disorderly and dishonest applications’. 

In the period discussed in this thesis, it is not possible to ascertain the long term political gains, if any, made by the Teetotal Movement. Roe discusses ‘the development of licensed victuallers
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94 Petition and Opening Advertisement of Van Diemen’s Land Total Abstinence Society, 24 July 1846, Launceston, held in Total Abstinence Agency Association folder, A585, AOT.
95 Ibid.
96 Ibid.
97 Though outside the parameters of this chapter, it is appropriate to note a Licensing Act was introduced in 1854 to check the degree of intemperance in the community, the license fee was increased from £25 to £50 and Sunday closing introduced.
98 Launceston Advertiser, 31 August 1846.
associations in Sydney and Hobart as a possibly reflex of the movement'.

There is a note in the *Launceston Examiner* in 1849 announcing the Licensed Victuallers’ Society Quarterly Meeting for the northern division of Van Diemen’s Land. It also notes that the society was established on 7 December 1846. Sherwin retired as President of the Teetotal Society in October 1844 and then in the next year, 1845, he returned to the Sherwin family property at Bothwell called Sherwood. The *Australian Dictionary of Biography* entry by Ann Fysh for Sherwin intimates that he had heavy financial losses at this time but does not elaborate. Certainly his brother, George Green Sherwin, who was living at Sherwood, was declared insolvent on 18 May 1844, followed by the insolvency of his father John Sherwin of Macquarie Street, Hobart, on 28 August 1844. Isaac Sherwin had been involved in a protracted Supreme Court case throughout 1842 against a Mr. Tetley. As agent for the Van Diemen’s Land Fire, Life and Marine Assurance Company, Launceston, he had made out a policy for Tetley for the insurance of a ship, the *Paul Pry*. When the *Paul Pry* was lost, it was revealed that Tetley had not updated his policy premium and Sherwin refused to recognise the policy. There were four trials and, in each, the verdict was given in favour of Tetley with permission for Sherwin to appeal to the Privy Council. What legal expenses Sherwin incurred is not known, but they must have been considerable, and no doubt the Van Diemen’s Land Fire, Life and Marine Assurance Company shouldered much of the cost, but this case could have contributed to Sherwin’s financial embarrassment. Isaac Sherwin left the Teetotal Society at the end of 1844 and by March 1845 was gone from the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society. He spent nine years at Sherwood rallying his finances and by September 1854 was back in Launceston assuming

99 Roe, *Quest for Authority*, p. 166.
100 *Launceston Examiner*, 30 June 1849.
101 *Launceston Examiner*, 18 May 1844.
102 *Launceston Examiner*, 28 August 1844.
103 *Decisions of the Nineteenth Century Tasmanian Superior Courts*, Tetley v Sherwin, Published by Division of Law, Macquarie University and School of History and Classics, University of Tasmania. also *Launceston Examiner*, 1842.
municipal political responsibilities and rejoining the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists.  

**Emergence of John Crookes’ Philanthropic Activities**

It is timely at this point of the thesis to discuss the emergence of John Crookes as a major player in fashioning Wesleyan Methodist political involvement. The status theme, involving philanthropic activities, and used in Chapter 5 for the Wesleyan Methodist elite, is again utilised here to define the position of John Crookes. The relationship between charity, status and power is discussed by Peter Shapely, and he suggests that ‘the charitable profile underpinned a social, economic or political position in the community’. This was the direction which Crookes was to take. The charitable profile was to lead to political involvement, and, additionally Shapely argues ‘that this profile also underpinned their role as part of a middle class elite’. Crookes was also gradually acquiring the necessary capital to maintain status and dominance in the community. This was the man who had been spurned by the Rev. Joseph Orton and been rescued and protected by Henry Reed. He had served an apprenticeship with the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society as a class leader and committee member, and his commercial position had been ensured by Henry Reed when Reed took him into his ironmongery business as chief clerk in 1836. On Reed’s return from England in 1843, he dissolved the partnership he had with William Donald and Donald received £20,000. Eventually anointed by Reed as his successor, Crookes succeeded to the ironmongery and ship chartering business when Reed left for England in 1847. Throughout the 1840s, his name was constantly quoted in the newspapers for involvement in Sunday School Union, the Benevolent Society, Cornwall Auxiliary Bible
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104 Society Stewards, Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, Quarter Ending March 1846, NS 499/946, AOT.
107 Rev. Joseph Orton was dead on 30 April 1842 off Cape Horn. *(Launceston Examiner*, 31 December 1842).

Other Wesleyans cooperated in the missionary and benevolent societies in the 1840s and helped to maintain the charged energy of the 1830s. The economic depression of the 1840s threw up a pressing need for relief for some sections of the community. Joan C. Brown points out that ‘with the difficulties and embarrassments of the 1841-44 period, there were no subsidies or voluntary agencies, governors only acted as patrons’. In 1848, the Governor, Sir William Denison, seemed not ‘to understand the struggles of the voluntary agencies, the problem was seen as a moral one’.

His open handed liberality in later years to the Methodist Church could always be relied on when money was needed for Church enterprises. With the building of the new Wesleyan Methodist church in Paterson Street in 1866, Crookes donated £1,000, Gleadow, £200, Sherwin £200 and W.D. Grubb £400. Later, Henry Reed and Walter Powell each donated £500 to the fund and with another £100 by Crookes, the debt was entirely cleared, The Rev. C.C. Dugan, The Story of the Paterson Street Methodist Church (Launceston, 1932), p. 28.


John Crookes  1850 - 1860
John Crookes, along with other members of the Wesleyan Methodist elite and Launceston noteworthies the Rev. H. Dowling, the Rev. W.H. Browne, the Rev. Charles Price and the Hentys, vigorously supported the Cornwall Auxiliary Bible Society, which promulgated the placement of Bibles in the community. In December 1842, the society noted that 154 Bibles had been given away gratuitously and 190 had been sold at Launceston for £87-16-8. Crookes contemplated ‘placing a Bible in the hands of every child of man, the book which made him acquainted with his lost position and at the same time pointed him to a Saviour’.\textsuperscript{111} Crookes stressed that ‘the platform of the Bible Society was one where differences should be set aside and their despised penal society might flourish in the fire like Moses did’.\textsuperscript{112} Here one gains an insight into the strong attitudes of a Wesleyan Methodist in the colonial situation. Placed in an invidious and at times despised environment, their role was to foster and nurture the possibilities of the conversion experience and this was to be helped by ownership of the Bible.\textsuperscript{113}

Second rung, Wesleyan Methodist Matthew Lassetter had conquered his drinking problem and joined the Teetotal Society. With new acceptance, he too joined Crookes, Gleadow, Oakden, Jennings and Reed on the Cornwall Auxiliary Bible Society committee in 1845.\textsuperscript{114} The broader scope of the Colonial Missionary Society also caught the Wesleyan Methodist interest and cooperation. Philip Oakden was consistently in the chair of the Society in 1842 and 1843, and Crookes, Gleadow, Lassetter and Jennings were active members with Tyson and Lassetter from 1845. Wesleyan minister the Rev. Nathaniel Turner averred ‘that whilst the spread of general education was of intellectual and moral advantage, it was the

\textsuperscript{111} Launceston Examiner, 24 December 1842.
\textsuperscript{112} Launceston Examiner, 23 December 1843.
\textsuperscript{113} The Society held copies of Welsh, Gaelic, Irish and Hebrew Bibles, French and English testaments as well as a few scriptures in Chinese. (Launceston Advertiser, 16 February 1843.)
\textsuperscript{114} Launceston Examiner, 27 December 1845.
preaching of the gospel which was the great means of ameliorating the moral condition and promoting spiritual welfare'.

In the same month, a report from the Colonial Missionary Society gave a startling and perceptive view of how emigrants in the new world regarded themselves. As with Crookes’ revealing statement about Van Diemen's Land at the Cornwall Auxiliary Bible Society, this report laid bare the current thinking of the Wesleyan Methodists and their religious groups. It stated:

That emigrants find themselves in a new world, they feel themselves new creatures with hope previously unknown. The unappropriated soil invites them to become its possessors, they are the fathers of a new race which will multiply, there is no feudalism, no heredity, no desperate struggle of classes. Religion must be free, simple pure, and missionary enterprise is very obvious in a colonial situation.

This report is one of the clearest expressions of the religious colonial emigrants’ thinking and in particular, the missionary Wesleyan Methodists. Freedom, prosperity, equality and status were theirs in the new land, a new life with all its benefits, but at the same time pure, simple religion must be introduced into the colonial society in the real missionary sense.

The Wesleyan Methodists’ own Auxiliary Missionary Society was ever active in the 1840s and by November 1843, it celebrated its ninth anniversary. The newly-reformed Matthew Lassetter remarked ‘that the Christian missionary world was found to be one of the wise of the world for the object was the salvation of man and the glory of God’. The Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society committee comprised Reed, Bartley, Gleadow, Lassetter, Peter Jacob, Mason, White, Chilcott, Oakden, Jennings and Sherwin. The treasurer was Isaac Sherwin and the Rev. H. Gaud and John Crookes were the secretaries. In 1847 at the thirteenth anniversary of the Society, Crookes declared ‘he would like to hear more of the joys that the missionaries felt in the prosecution of their work and he dwelt on

115 Launceston Examiner, 4 January 1843.
116 Launceston Examiner, 14 January 1843.
117 Launceston Examiner, 29 November 1843.
the privileges of the missionary. Peter Jacob was a lay preacher and schoolmaster at Longford and strong member of the Longford Teetotal Society, Thomas White was a lay preacher at Westbury and William Mason was a farmer at Longford. Previously at Launceston, and one of the foundation members of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, as well as being the schoolmaster, Jacob moved to Longford in 1841 to be appointed schoolmaster there. From early 1842, Jacob was subjected to a campaign run by the Anglican Rural Dean of Longford, the Rev. R.R. Davies. Davies appealed to the Board of Education with spurious complaints, but the main complaint appeared to be that Jacob was a Wesleyan and did not attend the Anglican service on Sundays. In 1844, at Davies’ behest, the Board of Education decided to remove Jacob. A protest was made by the Launceston Wesleyan minister the Rev. John Eggleston and supporters, and by 1845, the matter was submitted to the Colonial Secretary J.E. Bicheno and the Lieutenant Governor Sir John Eardley-Wilmot, who concurred with the Board of Education’s decision to remove Jacob. This was another case of a member of the Anglican clergy taking a hard line on Methodism and refusing to accept Methodism as an acceptable religious movement. The same situation did not arise in Launceston in the designated period of this thesis.

The Wesleyan Sunday School was a particular priority of John Crookes and a vital part of the Wesleyan Methodist ethos. The Sunday School movement had started in the late eighteenth century as a means of imparting religion and basic literacy to the poor. Children were brought together on Sunday for elementary religion and instruction. Credit for the introduction of this lay outside the Wesleyan organisation with Robert Raikes and the Rev. Thomas Stock at Gloucester. In 1785, Wesley published Raikes’ account of Sunday

---
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Charity Schools lately begun in various parts of England.\textsuperscript{121} There were protests against teaching anything but religious subjects in Sunday Schools and this increased after Wesley’s death. Sunday Schools had commenced without denominational control and were quite non-sectarian. By 1818, the teaching of writing in Sunday Schools was prohibited by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, although not fully stamped out. Hempton gauged that ‘by 1851, one third of the Sunday Schools were in the control of the various religious denominations who tried to exploit their potential for recruiting new church members’.\textsuperscript{122} By 1848, there was a Sunday School Union in Hobart and one in Launceston. The Union was established to give a more intimate relationship between all the Sunday School teachers in the same spirit as the Evangelical / Union Alliance. Rules were laid down against kidnapping other children and there was a rule that no child should be received into Sunday School unless the request came from the family. Philip Oakden concurred with this in 1849, when he described the Wesleyan Methodist Sunday Schools in Launceston, ‘there were 150 children at Paterson Street, 121 children at Margaret Street and there had been no foul means to take children away from other Sunday Schools’.\textsuperscript{123} Crookes established a Bible class for the older scholars with himself as leader. Its rigorous program is detailed in a teachers’ minute book for 1843. It stated that ‘teacher’s prayer meetings were to be held at 6 AM every Sunday morning’.\textsuperscript{124}

Walter Powell, one of the teachers, condemned himself with ‘I rose late and felt great condemnation, for we hold a prayer meeting for supplicating God’s blessing on our labours as Sunday School teachers. By my slothfulness, I have lost this favourable opportunity’.\textsuperscript{125} An idea of the intensity of the Sunday School

\textsuperscript{122} David Hempton, \textit{Religion and Political Culture in Britain and Ireland: From the Glorious Revolution to the decline of Empire} (Cambridge, 1996), p. 41.
\textsuperscript{123} Launceston Examiner, 12 May 1849.
\textsuperscript{124} Dugan, \textit{Paterson Street Methodist Church}, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
movement shows through at the Annual Meeting of the Wesleyan Sunday Schools in Launceston in 1849; there were 300 children on the platform for the service. One little boy had committed to memory through the year 1,400 verses of Scripture, and two girls, 3,290 verses.126

The need for the return of the Benevolent Society was aroused in 1843 with the after effects of the economic depression. Writing in the Launceston Examiner, ‘Homo’ said ‘the Benevolent Society is for the sake of the free immigrants, who are thrown out of employment by the depression, bereavement or illness. Prisoners who are not employed are under the Comptroller General and are fed and clothed’.127 The Wesleyan Strangers’ Friend Society was resurrected in December 1844 because of the prevailing distress and because there was no other such society. Gleadow, Jennings, Oakden and Reed were the visitors.128 There was more agitation in early 1845 stressing that the majority of those who suffered were unknown to the churches and ignorant of the means by which they could be supplied. There was a public meeting by May 1845 in Launceston to discuss relief of the sick and destitute poor, attended by sixty men including Wesleyan Methodists Crookes, Jennings, Reed, Gleadow, Knowles and the Rev. W. Butters. The final committee of the Benevolent Society included Wesleyans Oakden, Reed and Stubbs; their first object was to provide for the sick and secure lodging, secondly, to provide food to sustain life and thirdly to cooperate for the purpose of finding employment for those out of work. By 1849, second rung Wesleyan Methodists like Lassetter, Tyson and W.B. Dean had joined the Benevolent Society in an attempt to augment the depleted funds of the Society.129 Dean in particular was noted for his generous subscriptions and assistance to struggling families.130

126 Launceston Examiner, 5 September 1849.
127 Launceston Examiner, 27 March 1844.
128 Launceston Advertiser, 6 December 1844.
129 Cornwall Chronicle, 18 July 1849.
130 Biographical Sketch of W.B. Dean, in Leavitt, Jubilee History of Tasmania.
Born in 1821, William Boswell Dean, brother of fervent Wesleyan Methodist Catherine Dean, had come to Launceston in 1839-40 from New Zealand, after Henry Jennings had advertised for his whereabouts in Sydney. A ship’s biscuit maker by trade, and ardent supporter of temperance, he subsequently owned the Phoenix Bakery in Launceston. He contributed £50 to the establishment of the Teetotal Advocate. Additionally he bought the land in York Street, Launceston, upon which the Temperance Hall was sited. Dean’s activities commenced in the 1840s with the Teetotal Society, and this provided a basis for his later involvement in the Anti-Transportation movement with fellow Wesleyans John Denny and John Crookes. Dean’s energy and vigour were phenomenal, combined with great physical power.

The erection of the Bethel Chapel for the accommodation of seamen on the wharf also caught the eye of the Wesleyan Methodists. Henry Reed was in the chair, with Gleadow, Tyson and Lasseter giving their assistance. The Bethel Chapel was to be a place of worship for the express accommodation of seamen and had long been needed in Launceston. Other societies to receive Crookes’ attention in the 1840s were the Launceston Mechanics’ Institute and the Cornwall Fire and Marine Assurance Company. Philip Oakden was chairman of the latter and Crookes a director. John Gleadow and Philip Oakden were also on the Committee of Management of St. John’s Hospital and Self Supporting Dispensary with four others.

The turbulent events of the 1840s had not hindered or arrested the Wesleyan Methodist involvement in philanthropy and missionary societies. There was still the same configuration of the Wesleyan Methodist elite of Gleadow, Oakden, Jennings, Reed and Bartley,

131 Launceston Examiner, 20 January 1891, Obituary W.B. Dean.
132 Dean married Elizabeth, the daughter of George Best of diary fame in 1847, and his children’s christenings are registered in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Baptismal Register from 1848 onwards. NS499/975A, AOT. See also Biographical Appendix for further information.
133 Launceston Examiner, 3 February 1847.
134 Cornwall Chronicle, 8 December 1849.
135 Launceston Examiner, 20 August 1845.
assisted now by second rung Wesleyan Methodists such as Lassetter, Tyson and William Boswell Dean who had gained preliminary political training in the Teetotal Society. Status had been achieved in the 1830s for the Wesleyan Methodist elite and now Crookes had joined them. By his involvement in these societies, John Crookes was to gain a status and positive voice which would be sufficient to involve himself in the next stage, political agitation of the 1840s.

It would be unwise, however, to ascribe the attainment of status as the only imperative which drove the Wesleyan Methodists, including John Crookes, towards philanthropy and benevolence. Robertson notes that ‘few personal documents remain in which the Halifax, Nova Scotia – Wesleyan merchants recorded their attitude towards benevolent societies and institutions’. 136 Robertson discusses the second and third generation Wesleyan merchants of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and emphasises that ‘they felt it incumbent on themselves to demonstrate to their fellow Methodists and to the wider society in which they lived, that mercantile capitalism and Evangelical piety were not mutually exclusive’. 137 This was what Robertson calls ‘faith in action’. 138

Launceston, similar to Halifax, Nova Scotia, was a seaport and urban centre, and vulnerable to economic vagaries, and, as in Nova Scotia, societies and individual philanthropists had to rescue the poor in times of pressing need because of Government inaction. Robertson argues that ‘the Nova Scotia Wesleyan Methodists pursued with energy and devotion Wesley’s call to “give all you can”, and they were not motivated by half-defined ideas of social humanitarianism, they were giving all their time and resources because of their devotion to the Wesleyan Evangelical faith’. 139 Nevertheless, status had been maintained for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite
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which now included John Crookes, and some political know-how had been absorbed by William Boswell Dean, William Tyson and Matthew Lassetter through involvement with the Teetotal Society and civic exposure. The stage was set for serious political involvement.
Chapter 8

Simmering Resentments, Rights
Political Agitation
and
Anti-Transportation

Introduction

Chapter 8 begins by noting the changing tenor of the British Wesleyan Methodists’ attitude to politics. From a stance of non-involvement, the philosophy of liberalism began to influence Wesleyan Methodists in the 1840s, raising the possibility of rights. It will be suggested that this emphasis on rights possibly filtered out to Van Diemen’s Land and helped to propel the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists to political agitation. They asserted their rights in the areas of assigned labour, inter-colonial duties, general commercial advantage and elective franchise.

Precipitating factors for political agitation and involvement are discussed, and were based on such grievances as the discontinuance of the assignment system, the introduction of probation gangs, the labour market, quit rents and the economic depression of 1841-44. A sense of the changing attitudes of the Wesleyan Methodists and others to the subject of transportation is conveyed at this stage. The chapter will then detail the commencement of political stirrings which included the Wesleyan Methodists. The escalating police costs, the lack of money in the Treasury and the inter-colonial duties on wheat will be shown as contributing factors to the general dissatisfaction. The chapter will then move through to the Wesleyan Methodists’ growing realisation that they had to help themselves and influence British opinion in Whitehall. It will be proved that the formation of the London Agency was largely due in great part to the efforts of John Gleadow, Philip Oakden and Theodore Bryant Bartley,
with the cooperation of such wealthy non-Methodist country
gentlemen as Richard Dry and James Cox.

The aims of the London Agency were the reform of the
transportation system, the removal of English duties on colonial
grain, the extension to Van Diemen's Land of the principle of
representative legislature and the furtherance of female immigration.
The London Agency was the initial step which ran alongside and
evolved into the impetus for the Anti-Transportation Leagues. The
major irritation of the probation gangs will be shown to accelerate
the attitude to transportation as turning from the desire for reform to
complete abolition. The call for abolition will be shown to be
bolstered by the growing moral attitude to behaviour in the
probation gangs. John Crookes is shown as an emerging frontrunner
in the Anti-Transportation movement, particularly that which
involved tradesmen and mechanics.

The method used in this chapter will be to note the Wesleyan
Methodist presence at significant political meetings. This is the most
effective way of emphasising their role in the complicated events of
the 1840s. The chapter concludes with a discussion of rights and
how the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists felt that their rights had
been jeopardised. This discussion will firm up the underlying
reasons for their involvement. This thesis argues that in the 1840s,
the Wesleyan Methodists involved themselves in political causes for
the selfish reason that they felt their commercial and pecuniary rights
were being threatened. In a sense, the cry for legislative rights and
the moral indignation against the probation system played a
secondary role for them. It is only from a close reading of their
speeches and comments at public meetings detailed in this chapter
that one is able to understand their underlying motives. There are no
other personal documents extant that give a clue to the reasons for
their involvement.

As specified in the introduction to this thesis, this chapter
concludes in 1849 because of the dispersal of some of the main
figures of the Wesleyan Methodists. The reasons for these various
dispersals are explained in a separate Biographical Appendix, which contains biographical information to flesh out a clearer picture of the movements of the individuals. For general information, there is a brief summing up of the eventual events which led to the gaining of legislative rights and the abolition of transportation, and there is a table laid out of the mature political electoral involvements of some of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. Once again, this conveys an idea of the realised potential of these men and explains the eventual outcome and movements, particularly of the Wesleyan Methodist elite group.

**Challenging the No Politics Tradition**

The traditional no politics involvement rule of the Wesleyan Methodists in Britain fostered by John Wesley and nurtured by the Rev. Jabez Bunting was inevitably to change its appearance in a colonial situation, and respond and expand to accommodate local pressures and demands. David Hempton comments that ‘Methodism both fostered radicalism and opposed it’ and the paradox was that it accepted ‘authority on the one hand’, but desired justice and fair play on the other. ‘The urgency of the economic and social problems determined the respective weight given to each’.¹ This was to be the situation in Van Diemen’s Land in the 1840s. A combination of economic, social and political problems led to political stirrings, agitation and involvement by the Wesleyan Methodist elite. Allen B. Robertson concurs with regard to the Halifax Methodist merchants, whose ‘political activity was an inevitable outcome of their position within society in response to provincial economic concerns’.²

Both E.R. Taylor and Robertson discuss the political philosophy of liberalism which was influencing some Wesleyan Methodists in the 1840s in Britain. It was a concept of modifying religious belief, tradition and authority. Taylor particularly emphasises ‘that grim
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insistence upon rights, so characteristic of contemporary liberals, which influenced some Methodists. Possibly some of this new philosophy did filter out to Van Diemen’s Land, to combine with the turbulent events of the 1840s which catapulted the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists into a political consciousness and reaction. The evangelical fervour of the 1830s was to be translated into broader secular concerns in the 1840s. These secular concerns were sometimes overlaid with religious beliefs, but more often than not financial considerations. Histories of Van Diemen’s Land contain no discussion or examination of political involvement of the Wesleyan Methodists. What were the events of the 1840s that provoked political involvement? It is important to define the economic reality of the period, such as the depression and other precipitating factors.

**Grievances and Resentment**

Hartwell sees ‘the cause of final opposition which resulted in political independence as being found in the depression. Depression caused the first major crisis in public finance, made the convict system unworkable and self government necessary’. Additionally, Hartwell talks of the political dissatisfaction which had been present in the colony. The economic depression merely highlighted many long term resentments which had been simmering within the community. Resentment had commenced in 1831, when the sale of land replaced the free granting of land to settlers. Until 1836, Britain had shouldered the total cost of the convict penal system, and local revenue from land sales had been the prerogative of the Van Diemen’s Land government. After 1836, the land fund was partly absorbed into supporting pauper immigration and paying for the colonial police and gaol system. Previously, the latter had been the responsibility of the convict establishment costs. As Hartwell points out, ‘grievances were aggravated in the forties, a boom in 1839-40 boosted land sales and the demand for labour…the colonial
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government committed itself to an expansive immigration scheme on the basis of expected land sales at boom prices.\(^5\)

Resentment was also caused by the ending of the assignment system where convicts were assigned to masters. Brand comments that ‘assignment had been a relatively cheap method of convict management, as the employer relieved the government of food, clothing and accommodation costs…whilst being of great benefit to the colonials, providing a low cost labour force which required no wages’.\(^6\) By 1838 in Britain, it was felt that the assignment system was flawed and not proving to be a deterrent to crime rates. Sir John Franklin, Lieutenant Governor of Van Diemen’s Land, supported the assignment system, but his private secretary Captain Alexander Maconochie saw assignment as ‘a type of slavery, degrading both master and convict’.\(^7\) He suggested a form of probation system and a House of Commons Select Committee on Transportation headed by Sir William Molesworth recommended abolition of the assignment system and an altered system of discipline.\(^8\)

In July 1841, Franklin sent home a copy of the new probation regulations which his government had adopted in the absence of instructions from the Secretary of State.\(^9\) Finally in 1843, Sir John Franklin received Lord Stanley’s despatch on the probation system.\(^10\) Transportation was being discontinued to New South Wales and the prisoners sent exclusively to Van Diemen’s Land and Norfolk Island. Thereafter ‘all convicts would be worked in gangs on their arrival and after a period, these prisoners would seek private work through government employment sources or hiring stations’.\(^11\) The probation system was broken down to three successive stages. Initially, the

\(^5\) Ibid, pp. 188-9.
\(^7\) Ibid, p. 9.
\(^10\) Ibid, p. 326.
convicts would serve in the probation stations, the second stage was in public works where the men were paid and the third stage allowed convicts to be employed as free men. Hartwell explains that ‘By 1840, the abolition of assignment meant the cutting off of about 1,000 convicts to the labour supply for the free settlers’,\(^\text{12}\) and at this time, there was a short fall in time until the probationers were available for fee paid labour. As David Meredith and Deborah Oxley write, ‘The size of the entire labour force was influenced by the rate of emergence from the probation gangs and from the emigration out of the colony’.\(^\text{13}\) Calls were heard for immigration under the bounty system.

**Bounty Immigration**

*The Colonial Times* on 31 March 1840 published an article headed Public Labour, which deplored the drain of labour to other Australian colonies, Port Phillip and South Australia.\(^\text{14}\) Hartwell points out ‘that there was an accumulated balance of £60,000 in the land fund and it was decided to devote this to immigration’.\(^\text{15}\) Burroughs refers to this ‘as the colonial government’s misguided dream to meet the crisis’.\(^\text{16}\) Bounty immigrants were brought out into a society teetering on a falling market and where the first group of probation convicts were about to be dumped on a market for private employment. The *Launceston Examiner* considered that ‘the attraction of this new labour force, as distinct from the penal one, was to be the benefit expected from a diffusion of moral health through the community’.\(^\text{17}\) Immigration agents were appointed and bounties were regulated to be paid on various claims on immigrants. Some of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were involved in the

\(^{17}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 19 October 1842.
scheme; they were Henry Reed, Philip Oakden, John Gleadow, George Palmer Ball, Samuel Horton, the Rev. Nathaniel Turner, Henry Jennings and William Dawson Grubb; all of whom were applicants in the period 1841-43.  

Henry Reed had left on a trip to London on the *Prince Regent* in June 1840. Before his departure, the Launceston Immigration Aid Society had enlisted his aid as an authorised agent to procure farm servants. They had met at the Cornwall Hotel on 6 February 1840 and laid down immigration regulations. Three years was to be the term of service and wages were to be £20 for males and £12 to £15 for females and one third of the passage money had to be retained by the employer out of the annual wages. From perusal of the Bounty Immigration Lists, it can be seen that the immigrants assigned to the above Wesleyan Methodists were not all necessarily Wesleyans themselves; their religion was across the range of Church of England, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic and Presbyterian.

On 9 February 1842, Reed returned in the *Elizabeth and Jane*, one of the bounty immigrant ships carrying fifty three immigrants. Reed brought out his own Yorkshire kinsman, Henry Rockcliff, wife and family and these were some of the very first bounty immigrants. Rockcliff was to oversee work on the property at ‘Old Wesleydale’ at Chudleigh, Henry Reed’s cherished country place. An indenture agreement signed in England on 2 December 1840 shows the agreement between Reed and Rockcliff. The Rockcliff party made up of the family and single men had left England on the *Essex*,
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December 1840 and arrived in Launceston 5 May 1841. The underlying interests of the Wesleyan Methodist elite had propelled their involvement in bounty immigration. At all times the primary motivation for these men was economic survival, and the support of any movement that would ensure this. Self-interest played a large part in their dealings.

Self interest was clearly shown in their reaction to the Molesworth Committee which decried transportation and recommended its abolition. A public meeting in Launceston discussed this document on 27 March 1839. Wesleyans Philip Oakden, John Gleadow, Theodore Bartley, Major W. Gray and Benjamin Horne all added their name to a petition to the Queen not to allow the cessation of transportation. These same men were part of the respectability of the northern part of the Island of Van Diemen’s Land, deeply concerned for their own economic future. They argued that transportation coupled with assignment removed the convict from the scene of his crime, eased the state of the cost of maintaining the convict, and gave the convict skills in the various trades. The committee formed for the transmission of the petition to Her Majesty and charged with obtaining more signatures comprised thirty gentlemen and the four Wesleyans were Benjamin Horne, Philip Oakden, Major William Gray and John Gleadow.

This was the expedient political face of the pro-transportationists who felt that their needs were being neglected. In eight years, these Wesleyans and others were to achieve a complete volte-face and go in the opposite direction. Patricia Ratcliff concurs

23 In contrast, some of the last bounty immigrants were the Trebilcocks, Trethewies, Mays, Gilbersts and Oulds, Wesleyan Methodists from the St. Columb area in Cornwall who arrived in the Indian on 31 December 1843, too late for bounty payments. (CB7/8/1/1, AOT, and personal communication from Gillian Pavloski).

24 The addition of free labour brought into a falling market coincided with the release of probationers into the market in September 1842. Some immigration sponsors became almost bankrupt such as Launcestonian Henry Dowling, but no Wesleyan Methodists. Hobart Town Gazette, 30 September 1842; Government Notices, 29 September 1842.

25 Launceston Advertiser, 28 March 1839.

26 The committee included leading settlers’ names like William Archer, James Youl, Andrew Gatenby, Lewis Gilles, James Henty.
and describes the situation as ‘an amoral position which the settlers adopted as a colonial expediency’. Ratcliff uses this argument to further the position of her subject, the Rev. John West, who was later to be at the forefront of the Anti-Transportation movement. It should be noted that at the meeting, the Wesleyan minister, the Rev. Mr. Simpson spoke in support of the pro-transportation movement; no dissenting Wesleyan voice was heard. John Gleadow addressed the public meeting at length and his comments highlighted his own hypocrisy and emphasis on personal status. Claiming to put ‘self interest aside’, Gleadow thought that the assignment system tended to achieve ‘the moralisation and reform of the prisoners…and it was strange that local Government and the Lieutenant Governor had not called on the gentlemen of the country, the most influential part of the colonists, instead of officials’. Despite the hypocritical denial of self-interest, this was a politically motivated involvement, a type of pressure to be exerted via the petition method. Petitions were common in the public arena, and this was just the beginning of the political phase. As the 1840s progressed, these men would move beyond the early petition phase to one of calculated political pressure.

**Economic Depression and Quit Rents**

Economic depression struck Van Diemen’s Land at the end of 1840 and beginning of 1841. Land sales fell and the cost of gaols, police and immigration rose; this meant a government on the verge of bankruptcy, attempting to call in quit rents and taxation. Quit rents had long been a festering sore in Van Diemen’s Land and the economic depression exacerbated the long held resentments. As Petrow writes, ‘quit rents were charges levied on land grants. The rate of quit rents and the conditions under which such rents were levied changed a number of times and became proportionally more
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27 Patricia Ratcliff, *The Usefulness of John West: Dissent and Difference in the Australian Colonies* (Launceston, 2003), p. 305.

28 *Launceston Advertiser*, 28 March 1839, extra Sheet.
severe in the nineteenth century'.

The Van Diemen's Land settlers resented the imperial colonial policy of placing a revenue gaining land tax on their already owned land. Petrow describes the colonists as ‘regarding quit rents as a type of ambiguous phantom, at a distance, that would never be levied and that in Van Diemen's Land, most colonists did not pay quit rents and invited the Crown to seek redress in the Courts’. Hartwell writes that with a saga of inherited difficulties regarding quit rents, Lieutenant Governor Franklin announced ‘the remission of all quit rents due before 1835 and the proposed collection of those due for 1835 and 1836 following’. Franklin’s plan did not succeed and Lieutenant Governor Sir Eardley-Wilmot dropped the regulation because of the depressed state of agricultural interests. (The Quit Rent Remission Act in 1863 abolished the payment of quit rents).

The worsening economic situation was described by Launcestonian George Best, who told his mother that ‘there never has been such a convulsion in trade since the first formation of the place, speculation has been carried on and some merchants have lost thousands through speculation in wheat’. In 1840, wheat was worth eighteen to twenty five shillings a bushel and many of the large merchants bought large quantities from ten shillings to fifteen shillings a bushel, but with the arrival of foreign wheat it fell to eight shillings a bushel. The wheat situation was certainly precarious and the Launceston Examiner reported in October 1842, that some 20,000 bushels had arrived in Sydney from Valparaiso with 100,000 more possibly following later. The merchants who had purchased large quantities of wheat had met the delay by giving bills of
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30 Ibid, pp. 6, 15.
31 Hartwell, Economic Development, p. 41.
33 Petrow, ‘Discontent and Habits’, p. 44.
34 George Best Letter Diary, Letter to his Mother, 31 August 1841, Papers of George Best and Family, NS252, AOT.
35 Launceston Examiner, 29 October 1842.
accommodation and Best’s letter diary reveals that some of the merchants who had entered into agreements with others for five years, for the whole of their wheat at eight shillings a bushel, had then failed when wheat fell to two shillings and sixpence a bushel.

Land speculation was also rife with higher rates of interest being paid on borrowed capital. Burroughs discerns that ‘settlers were encumbering themselves with a mortgage debt at a rate of interest no times of prosperity could enable them to pay’. According to Best, ‘many of the large property owners were in fact worth less than nothing, owing to large mortgages’. The Launceston Examiner spelt out the situation in an editorial by writing that ‘a few years ago, good prosperity gave rise to a stimulus of enterprise. The high price of wool and the opening of the new colonies created some hopes. Parties extended their expenses and added acres which they cannot pay for’. English merchants sent out more and more goods on consignment to the market, which was in danger of being glutted. Correspondingly, there was a lack of exports to Britain. As Hartwell points out, ‘there was a free economy developing in Van Diemen’s Land and this was dependent for income on the rate of export staples’. Broeze also points to inherent dangers in the importation boom. ‘With prices buoyant and profit rates up to 100%,’ partial remittances were sufficient to enable British principals to meet their obligations, ‘local investment and speculation were tolerated and even encouraged’.

As the market collapsed, the imported stocks could not be liquidated and loans were called in. This caused a chain reaction of bankruptcies in the City of London as well as the colonies; colonial agents were not able or willing to meet their obligations. 1840 was the last year for large exports of livestock to the markets of South
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36 Burroughs, *Britain and Australia*, p. 332.
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Australia and Port Phillip. These markets were now being served by overlanders from New South Wales, thus destroying the Van Diemen’s Land markets. George Best realised that ‘It was owing to the formation of the new colonies that farming produce rose to such an extraordinary value; the farmers expected it to be always so and set up their equipages and borrowed large sums’. Additionally, these new colonies, who used to send their wool and stock through Van Diemen’s Land, now sent it directly to Britain.

The banks certainly played a role in the economic crisis by extending credit. John McLaren, the Colonial Bank Inspector of the Union Bank of Australia, admitted that ‘the bank has been too liberal in lending money and that it would have to contract and suffer along with the rest’. Nevertheless, the Union Bank of Australia came through the depression relatively unaffected. Loans were only made to solid borrowers, who quickly paid, and at no time did it pass a dividend, 10% was maintained until 1844, when it was 6%. It was a parlous state in the depression. ‘At the depths of the depression there was about 5,000 men wandering around Van Diemen's Land, about 4,000 holders of conditional pardons and another 7,000 who had probation system passes which permitted them to work, only the settlers did not want them’. There was a strong competition for jobs between the free men and ticket of leave holders and now the probation pass holders.

**Insolvencies from Economic Depression**

Insolvencies were a type of marker to the actual strength of an economic depression and notable names in Launceston became involved. Jonathan Griffiths, major ship owner and whaling entrepreneur, became insolvent on 28 June 1842. As Dyster comments, ‘he was deeply committed to bay whaling, grain trading and intercolonial shipping and these various investments contracted
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Griffiths’ wheat account in particular was not able to be balanced, and ‘his debits outweighed his credits overwhelmingly’. This estate was under the management of Isaac Sherwin, Henry Reed and a Mr. Robertson who were to liquidate it. Griffiths had transferred part of his banking to the bank of Archer, Gilles & Co., and Sherwin was forced to charter a brig Scout to Port Fairy to prevent Messrs. Archer, Gilles & Co., who had issued a writ of foreign attachment, from obtaining a preference which would absorb the whole estate. Henry Reed returned from England in February 1843 and he made an offer for Griffiths’ whaling establishment at Port Fairy and the schooner Essington. He also advised the consignees with regard to keeping employed all the vessels belonging to the estate.

Another notable insolvent who failed in early 1843 was Michael Connolly, merchant. He had drawn extensively on his London principal John Gore & Co. in order to expand his business and then refused to remit. Broeze refers to Gore’s ‘unruly agents’. Instead of remitting the proceeds of cargoes sent out from England, Connolly had held on to these for reinvestment in Australia. He was inextricably linked with Griffiths in business ventures. Dyster stresses that the ‘two bankrupts were treated very differently. Jonathan Griffiths was kept afloat as long as possible and farewelled to Port Fairy with a grant of £100, whereas Connolly’s discharge from bankruptcy was contested; the townspeople esteemed Griffiths more highly than Connolly. Lewis Gilles, Philip Oakden’s close friend and brother of Osmond Gilles, was insolvent by February 1844, as was his bank, the Archer, Gilles Bank. By the middle of 1842, the Archer, Gilles Bank had been in trouble and Port Phillip bills on the bank

48 Launceston Examiner, 28 June 1842.
49 Launceston Examiner, 8 July 1843.
50 Broeze, Mr. Brooks, p. 161.
51 Dyster, ‘John Griffiths’, p. 29.
were dishonoured by the middle of 1843. The bank had given too many large credits and by the end of 1843 had to seek help. The Union Bank of Australia came to their aid with conditions. Their liabilities to the bank were £63,939 and £30,000 was advanced to them for their immediate debts.\textsuperscript{53} Lewis Gilles himself was insolvent and Oakden and Reed had the management of Archer Gilles & Co. for the purpose of winding it up. Oakden wrote ‘Mr. Gilles is offering four shillings in the pound guaranteed by Archer, Gilles & Co.. It is a most fearful situation to be placed in after being so many years respectably in the colonies’.\textsuperscript{54}

Another sense of Sherwin’s difficulties comes through in a letter from merchant James Alexander, London, to Oakden begging him to sort out Launceston merchant Mr. Raven’s affairs.\textsuperscript{55} Raven, ship owner and merchant, had an arrangement with Alexander and had refused to submit accounts for the last year, instead of every three months. Alexander intimated that Raven was in a sort of partnership with Sherwin whose business had failed.\textsuperscript{56} Other Launceston merchants who became insolvent were John Alexander Eddie and George McKenzie Eddie, who failed in July 1843, These men – Griffiths, Connolly, Gilles, Raven and the Eddies – were some of the leading merchants in Launceston. The only Wesleyan Methodist insolvents were Major William Gray of Avoca,\textsuperscript{57} and George Palmer Ball\textsuperscript{58}. Like Isaac Sherwin’s insolvency, notices did not actually appear in the newspapers for these men, but they were certainly in trouble financially. By May 1842, Major Gray’s land was for sale at St. Paul’s River and Avoca.\textsuperscript{59} The land advertised was in five lots totalling

\textsuperscript{53} Union Bank of Australia, General Letters, Colonial Inspector to London Secretary, UB2, 1842-49, 30 December 1842, 22 January 1844, ANZ Group Archives.
\textsuperscript{54} P. Oakden to J. Leake, 25 January 1845, Leake Papers, University of Tasmania Special/Rare Collection, L1/E44.
\textsuperscript{55} James Alexander was later on the New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land Commercial Association Board with Robert Brooks and in 1850 was a director of the English, Scottish and Australasian Bank.
\textsuperscript{56} James Alexander to Philip Oakden, per Jane, of 9 July 1844, Letter in possession of Oakden family descendant.
\textsuperscript{57} Launceston Examiner, 25 May 1842.
\textsuperscript{58} Launceston Examiner, 14 June 1843.
\textsuperscript{59} Launceston Examiner, 25 May 1842.
8,540 acres. Best commented to his mother that ‘the correcting hand of God tends to different effects. Major Gray, who could five years ago have sold estates for £30,000 is now obliged to sell to keep himself from prison; Mrs. Gray says that she would not have been without the trouble for any consideration’. Mrs. Gray ‘felt that their situation was for all the good of all people here. She had no doubt that people were beginning to think themselves superior to all power and that nothing would affect them, but now, they would learn that there was a God who ruleth the earth’.

George Palmer Ball’s trouble can be traced through the newspapers and the first sign of it comes in January 1843, when he tried to let parts of the Mountford estate at Perth in small lots. He may have succeeded in this for by 1846 he advertised Mountford House with 213 acres cleared and some small farms. By 1847, he had dissolved his partnership with a George Joseph Yates under the firm of Yates and Ball and by mid-1848, he had left Launceston (see note in Appendix). Summing up, it was Wesleyan Methodists Isaac Sherwin, Major William Gray, George Palmer Ball and Walter Powell who were hard hit by the economic depression. Joseph William Bell, non-Methodist auctioneer, and his Wesleyan Methodist wife Georgina Bell, had also been hard hit by the depression. On 21 July 1845, Bell was declared insolvent. As father-in-law and employer of Walter Powell, there was a tight, familial, business connection between the two. By November 1845, Bell and Powell had left Launceston for Melbourne, announcing in the Launceston Examiner in January 1846 that they had commenced business as auctioneer and general agents in Collins Street, Melbourne. Bell assured his friends in Van Diemen’s Land that any consignments made to himself or Powell would meet with speedy attention. In Hobart, the Wesleyan Methodist situation was somewhat different. The debt on the chapel was £37,000 upwards, and the Rev. J. Manton wrote ‘every
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farthing we can scoop together goes towards the interest and the worst possible feelings are directed against us. We are charged with a want of principle for running into debt, and having so fine a chapel’.  

The Rev. Manton explained ‘that when they asked for subscriptions, the chilly reply was let those who helped you into debt help you out’.

The Hobart Wesleyan Methodist congregation were disgraced by several bankruptcies of their people. Two were local preachers and two others who were class leaders failed for large amounts. The Rev. J. Manton wrote: ‘It was proved that their debts were contracted in the most bare faced and wicked manner and this is known throughout the length and breadth of the land, the people say the Wesleyans are all alike’. Manton admitted the faults and confessed ‘we could bear it, if it were not for the conviction that what people say is true’. The situation was not so in Launceston. The Rev. William Butters told the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee in London, ‘that we are blessed with great peace and an increase in prosperity in our circuit’. One of the secrets of the prosperity is revealed in a postscript to Butters’ letter to the committee. He admitted that for some years past the Launceston Quarterly Meeting laity were anxious to have the pecuniary affairs of the circuit in their own hands, and should have the same power as the English Quarterly Meetings on raising or lowering allowances. Previous ministers in Launceston had not agreed with the Quarterly Meeting members and Butters wrote that ‘Members of the Quarterly Meeting do not express any desire to contract the expenditures otherwise than at present, but they object to any remark at all upon any account over which they have not the sole control. The Rev. Mr. Simpson tried to make a change without success’.  
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the keys to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society’s success. Even through the economic depression, the hard hand of the elite controlled the accounts and allowed no commercial mistakes. It should be noted that in John Gleadow’s obituary, particular reference is given to the fact that in the years of the monetary economic depression, Gleadow rendered great professional service to his clients and but for his persistent efforts many large estates, heavily encumbered, would have passed to other owners. Gleadow was able to tide these people through their difficulties. A similar comment was made about Henry Reed, that but for his help in the depression many of the midland families would have gone under.

A late insolvency concerning Henry Reed, was that of James Henty in 1846. Because of commercial apprehension, Buckles & Co. had sent out their power of attorney to Reed in Launceston at the end of 1845 with regard to Messrs. Henty & Co. run by James Henty. Reed did not reveal the power of attorney and allowed Henty to continue to purchase the settlers’ goods for export. On behalf of Buckles, Reed foreclosed on James Henty in March 1846 and deprived him of further credit. Reed was criticised for keeping silent for three months and securing for Buckles the goods shipped by Henty. Marnie Bassett writes ‘the local creditors were angered because they were deprived of a share of the value and the growers, a full reward for their year’s work’. Attacks were made in the newspapers on Reed’s character and Wesleyanism, but he argued that what he had done was normal business practice and rallied mercantile support amongst Launceston business houses. James Henty was indeed insolvent as Buckles had suspected when they sent out the Power of Attorney. Reed had been placed in an invidious position and had acted on his commercial morality principles. Reed later assisted Henty & Co. with money to keep their business
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together. He told his old Vandemonian friend Andrew Gatenby, that ‘Since my arrival here in England, I have had much trouble with money matters in consequence of the ruinous wool price and my having assisted Henty & Co. to a very large amount to enable them to keep their business together and consign produce to Buckles, all of which I did without a farthing of benefit, determined to return good for all the evil spoken of me’.  

### Political Stirrings Involving the Wesleyan Methodist Elite

Having outlined the economic disruptions of the early 1840s, we now move on to the stirrings of political protest which included the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. A public meeting convened on 15 December 1843 was attended by thirty-six influential men, all from the northern division of Van Diemen's Land. They included notable citizens like the Hentys, Archers, Richard Dry and James Cox, and seven Wesleyans, Theodore Bryant Bartley, Henry Reed, John Gleadow, George Palmer Ball, Philip Oakden, Henry Jennings and Isaac Sherwin. The meeting discussed the depressed state of agriculture in the colony. Gleadow spoke at length about the effects of the cessation of agriculture and the *Launceston Examiner* acknowledged that ‘Bartley had originated and directed the recent movement’. Bartley stated that ‘I have been thinking about the problem for twelve months, but the shoe did not pinch as tightly as it does now’. The main grievance of the meeting was the injustice of imposing duties or restrictions of imports into Van Diemen's Land of the produce and manufacture of other Australian colonies. The
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meeting felt that their neighbours should be their customers and Sydney people would be their best ones, if they were not so hampered by regulations. The meeting considered all restrictions on inter-colonial trade as unjust, and that duties on Sydney tobacco should be remitted and, conversely, the duty on American tobacco should be increased. The meeting admitted that ‘it was in their interest to consider everything for the privilege of landing their corn in Sydney free of duty’. This meeting was the beginning of political murmurings and agitation by the Wesleyans and others; it was the concept of lobbying for rights where business was concerned, and intercolonial duties were a hindrance. Burroughs feels that ‘Britain’s apparent lack of sympathy for the colonists during the economic difficulties was a compelling argument for seizing control of their own affairs’.

Matters came to a head in the colony at the end of 1843. Robson states that ‘the economic depression exacerbated the matter of who was to pay for the huge police and gaol establishment’. Petrow agrees and states that ‘many colonists felt unhappy about paying the escalating police costs to control the increasing number of British criminals’. They felt that this was the responsibility of the imperial Government. There was little money in the Treasury, only £3,221.2.1, and money was needed quickly. The new Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Eardley-Wilmot, was forced to borrow from the banks and the commissariat. Petrow further explains that Eardley-Wilmot ‘courted Lord Stanley’s anger by intimating that the colony would require some help with police costs in future’, but Stanley showed no sympathy. After Stanley went out of office, the British Government finally agreed to pay two thirds of the civil police costs in return for control of the Land Fund.

---

78 Launceston Examiner, 20 December 1843.
79 Burroughs, Britain and Australia, p. 343.
80 Robson, History, p. 414.
82 Ibid, pp. 180-1.
83 Ibid.
In the continuing irritant of duty placed on Van Diemen's Land grain into Sydney, Eardley-Wilmot asked that Van Diemen's Land wheat could be let into England, duty free, as was Canadian wheat. Reed dominated the meeting and his suggestions denoted a slight shift in thinking as to how to solve the colony’s problems. Reed emphasised that ‘the markets of Britain were open, but the duties levied were a barrier against imported grain’. Reed claimed that unless markets were established, settlers would have to leave the country, leaving a large gaol behind. He felt that their cause was lost, unless the friends of the colony in London could be persuaded with strong argumentative proposals. He also referred to a committee of leading merchants in London connected to the colonies. If this New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land Commercial Association would present the meetings' petitions to the House of Commons they would have the most likelihood of success. Seemingly aware of their position globally, Reed further proposed that they should stress in the petition their own peculiar claims as a penal colony which distinguished them from anyone else. He realised that different political methods would have to be used. Their position as a penal colony was anomalous and the petition also carried a veiled threat, intimating that, without a good market for one of their staple products, most of the prisoners in private service would be returned.
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to the Government, where the additional expense would be crippling.

This shift in thinking also extended to Philip Oakden. At the meeting, he stated ‘that he had recently received a letter from England pointing out the necessity of the colonists acting for themselves and uniting to represent their claims to the British Government’.\(^8^9\) Was this the catalyst for a different approach to be taken politically? This thesis argues that this was a turning point for a renewal in political thinking and strategies and it had been directed at Philip Oakden. This turning point was supported by ‘Agricola’ writing in the *Launceston Examiner* in April 1845. He wrote that ‘nothing has been obtained without public agitation, let everyone ask for a stop to the streams of prisoners to the island, let our wheat be admitted duty free and let them ask for a member of Parliament with £500 per annum to do the business and plead the cause of Tasmania in the House of Commons’.\(^9^0\) Later, the *Launceston Advertiser* showed a certain naivety in reporting the negative result from the House of Commons when it lamented that ‘We did not foresee the result. We thought we only had to bring the matter before Parliament in a respectful manner, that acquiescence was certain’.\(^9^1\)

Lieutenant Governor Eardley-Wilmot was continually pressed for funds and by the beginning of 1845, he called on the Legislative Council to increase duties on foreign goods from 5% to 10%. Fitzpatrick notes that ‘the colonial revenue came from two sources customs and land. The financial depression was of course reflected in a falling customs revenue and land revenue was ceasing to exist’.\(^9^2\) Robson claims that ‘land sales were worth £23,000 a year for the nine years to 1841, £52,900 in 1840, £47,200 in 1841 and they had ceased

\(^8^9\) Ibid.
\(^9^0\) *Launceston Examiner*, 21 April 1845. Mr. Hutt put forward the petition to the House of Commons and it was refused to admit grain from Australia on the same terms as Canada. Henry Buckle and the Committee worked hard on their behalf advertising in *The Times* and a decision was taken to send another petition (*Launceston Examiner*, 8 November 1845).
\(^9^1\) *Launceston Advertiser*, 11 September 1845.
In fact, there was little saleable cleared land left in Van Diemen's Land. Wesleyan John Dunn, manager of the Commercial Bank in Hobart, offered to lend the government £30,000 at 7% and the governor took up a cash credit of £25,000 from the Commercial Bank for public works. Eardley-Wilmot placed further pressure on the nominated members of the Legislative Council and in October 1845 some members refused to pass expenditure for him. The men who challenged him and then resigned were referred to as The Patriotic Six; they were Charles Swanston, Richard Dry, William Kermode, Thomas Gregson, J. Kerr and Michael Fenton.

Replacements were made in the Legislative Council to take up the positions of the Patriotic Six and this is where Henry Reed’s ill-timed political involvement commenced. Along with John Leake, Henry Hopkins, F. von Stieglitz, Edward Bisdee and Cornelius Driscoll, Reed filled the places of the Patriotic Six in the Legislative Council. The mood of the newspapers and many others was antagonistic to the newly-promoted Legislative Council members. The Launceston Examiner thought they degraded themselves. It was seen as a ‘dishonourable action colluding with the Lieutenant-Governor who was carrying out the dictates of Lord Stanley in Downing Street’. The Launceston Examiner quoted the phrase ‘cats paw detachment’ in reference to the replacement nominees. Opinions varied, but one interesting point emerged about Henry Reed. This was not his first foray into the Legislative Council. Lord Normanby when Secretary of State had solicited him to accept a seat at the council table but he had not taken up the offer. He admitted in a letter to Eardley-Wilmot that ‘I have never interfered with politics
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and must plead ignorance of the political state'. But now self-interest dictated a change of tactic.

At the end of 1845, the Government had borrowed another £7,000 from the Commercial Bank and it had not been sanctioned by the Legislative Council because of the Patriotic Six’s departure. At the Legislative Council meeting at the end of March 1846, its recently co-opted members were asked to pass the arrangement with the Commercial Bank. Reed had sailed into deep waters when he accepted the position on the Council. Lacking political experience, his expertise lay completely in commercial matters and this was backed up by a strong Wesleyan Methodist brand of commercial morality. When the resolution was put forward to pass the Commercial Bank £7,000 loan, Reed opposed it saying that ‘it ought not to have been sanctioned by the Council, it just formed a dangerous precedent and that the Lieutenant Governor should have applied to his Executive Council before seeking the additional loan’. Reed’s Wesleyan Methodist commercial principles then rose up and he asserted that ‘I have been a Bank Director for some years and I am surprised that any Bank would lend money on such security. As well, the colony should not increase its heavy load of debt and from a sense of duty, I vote against it’. On the resolution being passed, Reed and Henry Hopkins left the room and resigned. This was the short-lived political career of Henry Reed. Hudson Fysh feels that Reed’s action ‘gave a clear picture of his views on finance and constitutional government’. This thesis contends that it showed more than that. It showed the deep inner conviction of Wesleyan Methodist principles as aligned to debt and borrowings without security or certainty of payment. This subject has already
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been extensively treated in this thesis, but here, in Henry Reed’s short political career, it appears again.\textsuperscript{101}

\textbf{The London Agency}

The dawning realisation and understanding in early 1845 that they had to help themselves politically, and Philip Oakden’s comment that they had to act for themselves with the British Government, had echoed an 1844 editorial in the \textit{Launceston Examiner} which discussed the power of the existing parliamentary agent in London. Barbara Atkins has ably researched the origins of the Australian Agents General in the nineteenth century. She describes the gradual transition in ‘colonial settlers’ initial gratitude for a sign of British interest in their affairs to an independent attitude and self reliance which was out of proportion to actual achievements'.\textsuperscript{102} This was the position that the Launceston men of influence were placed in 1844-46. In the early 1820s in Van Diemen’s Land, the Colonial Office was the body for all executive action in the colonies and it went through the Secretary of State. By 1826, all complaints or requests were first scrutinised by the Governor and the settlers resented this type of censorship. Petitions from the colonies were often ignored by the British officials and Parliamentarians; there was a prevailing air of indifference. Often delegates accompanied petitions and one case already discussed in Chapter 2 is that of a Wesleyan Methodist attorney, Edward Eagar of New South Wales, who took a tenacious interest in furthering the case of New South Wales emancipists.\textsuperscript{103} Atkins says that ‘petitions increased after 1833

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{101} A contemporary view of Reed’s situation is found in a letter from Mr. McLaren, Colonial Inspector of the Union Bank of Australia. He wrote ‘Mr. Reed has accepted a seat in the Legislative Council and I have suggested that he resign’. (Colonial Inspector to Cummins, Union Bank of Australia, London, Private Letters, 1844-48, 20 March 1846, ANZ Group Archives.)
\item \textsuperscript{103} Governor Lachlan Macquarie could be described as a mentor to the emancipists. He consented to Redfern and Eagar leaving the colony for England to represent the majority class of citizens in their battle for civil liberties. He furnished them
\end{itemize}
from all sources, lessening their impact and in 1842, there was a series of standing orders which made the production of petitions a formal proceeding incapable of further debate’. Some of the Australian colonies lobbied through agents appointed by sectional interests for short term gains. In 1822, Edward Barnard, a senior clerk in the Colonial Office, had been chosen by Earl Bathurst to act as an agent, but the position was in reality that of a glorified office boy who performed various duties like paying accounts, pension and overseas allowances. In 1833 the British Government decided to consolidate the several agencies of the Crown Colony, and appointed Edward Barnard and George Baillie as Joint Agents General. Barnard was charged with the Agency of the Australia colonies. As Penson writes, ‘most of the other agents were pensioned off and George Baillie and Edward Barnard were to do the work of them all; they had to give up their other official duties and concentrate entirely on the agencies’. Their salaries were derived from colonial funds; Barnard received £800 per annum with New South Wales contributing £250 and Van Diemen’s Land £200. Both colonies frequently objected to these items in their estimates.

In the colonies, particularly Van Diemen’s Land, Barnard was regarded as unsatisfactory, but, as Atkins argues, ‘there were common misrepresentations of Barnard’s position his position was never intended to provide for the expression of political grievances’. The colonists then looked for other ways to express their concerns in London. John Alexander Jackson had been in Launceston since 1831 and prior to that in Sydney. He became a large scale agriculturist and in 1833 became editor of J.P. Fawkner’s Launceston Advertiser and associate of Henry Dowling junior. His public career included being Colonial Treasurer for South Australia
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104 Atkins, ‘Problem of Representation’, p. 25.
and then Colonial Secretary. He compiled the census in Sydney in 1846 and then returned to Launceston, after sending his acquaintances in Van Diemen's Land a circular in January 1846 proposing himself as agent in London for the northern colonists. 107 This coincided with the northern colonists’ angst about their many grievances and their desire to appoint their own representative.

The *Launceston Examiner* certainly commented on the positive aspects of an agency on 24 January 1846 so Jackson’s circular must have been widely known. 108 It is, however, the notice in the *Launceston Examiner* 21 February which reveals the strength and purpose behind the proposed London Agency. Wesleyan Methodist, John Gleadow was the provisional secretary and the provisional committee comprised James Cox, Richard Dry and Wesleyans Philip Oakden and Theodore Bartley. The committee advertised for subscriptions to pay Jackson as the proposed agent. Twenty nine subscribers were already published including Wesleyans Gleadow, Oakden, Bartley and William Boswell Dean. Other notables included large land owners like the Archer brothers and the Hentys. The *Launceston Examiner* dwelt ‘on the influence that a single individual can exercise at the Colonial Office and how Jackson had secured the esteem of the northern residents during his long sojourn here’. 109 The provisional committee did not wait for subscribers to come to them. Respective districts were set up and the subscribers were canvassed in that area. By 11 March, Henry Reed had contributed £10-10-0 110 and Wesleyans from the Midlands Benjamin Horne, Thomas Parramore and Samuel Horton had also contributed. 111 John Crookes was a subscriber, 112 as also were William Dawson Grubb and Matthew Lassetter. 113

---

108 The full circular of Jackson’s offer was published in the *Launceston Advertiser*, 12 February 1846.
110 *Launceston Examiner*, 11 March 1846.
111 *Launceston Examiner*, 21 March 1846.
112 *Launceston Examiner*, 27 May 1846.
113 *Launceston Examiner*, 22 July 1846.
The first meeting of the subscribers to the London Agency for Van Diemen’s Land took place on 29 April 1846 and the forty man committee included five Wesleyan Methodists Gleadow, Bartley, Oakden, Jennings and Henry Reed. Oakden was elected treasurer and non-Wesleyans Richard Dry and Henry Dowling junior were elected secretaries. Just as there had been a Wesleyan Methodist response to imperial banking in 1837-8, here was a Wesleyan Methodist political response to representation in London.

In her biography of the Rev. John West, who was the facilitator of the final anti-transportation movement, Patricia Ratcliff claims he was the inspiration behind the London Agency. She obfuscates by proclaiming that ‘John West was not mentioned on the committee because it seems to have been his custom to promote ideas and facilitate their life from knowledge and remain in the margins of the fray’. This is a specious assumption and her effort to credit West with being the inspiration has no solid evidence. West was certainly present at the first meeting of the subscribers, but his subscription of £1-1-0 was not presented until May. His co-proprietors of the *Launceston Examiner* James Aikenhead and J.S. Waddell had produced a joint subscription of £5 on 21 February, denoting a very early and active interest. Aikenhead was also on the forty-man committee for the London Agency. Ratcliff also seems to infer that anything that was written in the *Launceston Examiner* comes from the pen of John West. A.G.L. Shaw stresses that ‘it is impossible now to identify the authorship of most of the articles in the *Launceston Examiner* through the years that West was connected with it’.

Unfortunately, Ratcliff’s assumptions about West and the founding of the London Agency have been repeated in other sources.
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114 *Launceston Examiner*, 2 May 1846.
115 Ratcliff, *Usefulness of John West*, p. 380.
116 *Launceston Examiner*, 30 April 1846.
117 *Launceston Examiner*, 2 May 1846.
118 The *Launceston Examiner* had been commenced in 1842 in a partnership of the Rev. John West, Congregationalist James Aikenhead and J.S. Waddell.
and the mistake has its own continuum. No other sources back Ratcliff’s assumption. John Ward argues that ‘the London Agency subscribers were primarily mercantile in their interests…particularly interested in commercial policies and tariffs’. An examination of the subscriber list confirms that it was a mercantile move, backed solidly by the wealthy northern land owners and pastoralists. Certainly, John West himself never claimed to be the driving force behind the London Agency. His comment in his history was ‘The London Agency Association expressed the opinions of the country gentlemen’. It is not the contention of this thesis that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were solely responsible for the formation of the London Agency, but they certainly played a defining role. The whole saga of political agitation for rights regarding legislative representation and cessation of transportation is the story of many individuals, but to date the role that the Wesleyan Methodists played as a small group has not been emphasised or highlighted.

Another strong pointer to the Wesleyan Methodist initiation of the London Agency was John Gleadow’s statement at the first general meeting when he said ‘the committee under which the arrangements for appointing an agent, had been so far perfected was in the first instance self elected, but the time had arrived when the subscribers should nominate’. Of the five men in that provisional committee, three had been Wesleyan Methodists –Gleadow, Bartley and Oakden; the other two gentlemen Richard Dry and James Cox being wealthy land owners. These five men, self-elected, would have the claim to be the promulgators of the whole concept. The objective of the subscribers at that first meeting give an idea of what was to firm up
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122 West History of Tasmania, Henry Dowling, Launceston, 1852, p. 216.

123 Launceston Examiner, 2 May 1846.
in the later instructions to John A. Jackson. Bartley referred to duties on grain, whilst Gleadow felt that the abominable system of prison discipline (that is the probation system where large groups of men were herded together) demanded the services of an accredited agent. Henry Dowling also pointed to the need for a competent agent to see important petitions through committees.

There was a public breakfast where Gleadow presided, to herald Jackson’s arrival in Launceston. It was stressed at the time ‘that Jackson was appointed to secure no party interest but to support every measure emanating from the colony’. The instructions from the committee stressed that the main purpose was to serve the colony and ‘that the only ways in which the subscribers differed from the rest of the community was that they were prepared to pay for the maintenance of an agent for the common benefit of all’. The main concerns listed were:

- Reform of the transportation system,
- Removal of English duty on colonial grain,
- Extension to the colony of the great principle of representative legislature
- A request for female immigration either free or bond.

The subscribers made the special point of asking Jackson to lobby members of both Houses of Parliament and the British Press and other influential persons, in particular the New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land Commercial Association. Referring to the latter, the instructions said ‘in matters of banking and mercantile interest in the colony, their cooperation would be especially valuable.’ After visiting Hobart with committee members to solicit more subscriptions, Jackson left for London from Sydney in December 1846 with letters of introduction. He had been formally appointed for two years at a salary of £400 to be subscribed by the colonists. The significant hand of Oakden is revealed in a letter from Samuel Jackson (no relation), secretary of the Union Bank of Australia in
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124 Launceston Examiner, 4 July 1846.
125 Launceston Examiner, 11 July 1846.
126 Launceston Examiner, 11 July 1846.
London, dated 9 April 1847. Samuel Jackson wrote: ‘I received your letter regarding Mr. J.A. Jackson, who this week called with your letter of introduction, together with one from Mr. Clark. I have had it in my power to be of some service to him and shall feel justified in rendering any further service’. This was the ideal banking contact with Samuel Jackson, secretary of the Union Bank of Australia, and John A. Jackson carried another letter from George Clark of Ellenthorp Hall. The Wesleyan Methodist mercantile interest is seen here through the Union Bank of Australia and the Oakden contact.

Dan Huon feels that ‘the story of the London Agency is a neglected side of the anti-transportation story in the Tasmanian colonists’ recognised reality that all major political decisions originated in Whitehall’. Of John West’s involvement in anti-transportation in the late 1840s, Huon writes: ‘While West himself is of great interest, so are the less prominent and often obscure antis of the Launceston region, who gave the movement financial, emotional and organisational support’. Here Huon acknowledges the role other people played to a greater or lesser degree and in this thesis some of the ‘antis’ are revealed and uncovered. These include some of the Wesleyan Methodist elite, who were involved in the wider political agitation process of the 1840s in Van Diemen’s Land.

Complaints about the probation system gangs solidified in the 1846-7 period. A.G.L. Shaw encapsulates it by writing that ‘The principle reason for its failure was simply too many men were sent to Van Diemen’s Land. They could not be properly disciplined in gangs

129 George Clark of Ellenthorp Hall in the Midlands of Van Diemen’s Land was a wealthy landholder and agriculturist, prominent in helping to establish the London Agency in Launceston. George Clark and William Effingham Lawrence had been John A. Jackson’s sureties when he was appointed Colonial Treasurer in South Australia in October 1839; Penny, ‘John Alexander Jackson (1809-1885)’, pp. 7-9; G.T. Stilwell, ‘George Carr Clark (1789-1863)’, Australian Dictionary of Biography (Melbourne, 1966), Vol. 1, pp. 224-5.
131 Ibid, p. 97.
and when they obtained a pass they could not find work and unemployment led to idleness, vice and crime’.\(^{132}\) It was not only the generalised anti-social behaviour of the probationer gangs that was the cause of concern in the minds of the London Agency. It was also the specific one of active homosexuality, the unspeakable crime. John Gleadow at the first meeting of the London Agency said that ‘The increasing frequency of infamous crimes, if not checked, will call down the vengeance of an Almighty God’.\(^{133}\) This was the reason for the increased call for female emigration by the London Agency – female emigration either bond or free to redress the imbalance of the sexes. Gleadow, who had been an active pro-transportationist in the late 1830s, now in the 1840s turned around to anti-transportation sentiments, not just ostensibly for economic reasons, but partially for the recognition of ‘the unspeakable crime’ which had been hitherto disguised. Moral interests had now conjoined with the economic interests. It is necessary, however, to note McLaughlin’s claim that ‘one of the few views which anti–transportations, Denison and the pro–transportationists shared was that the probation system was a disaster’.\(^{134}\)

In January 1847 Lieutenant Governor Sir William Denison had been appointed to Van Diemen's Land and he circularised the colonies' magistrates for their opinion on whether the transportation system should continue. By March, a public meeting was called of the circularised magistrates and other interested parties. The magistrates were described as ‘the channel of communication to the public’.\(^{135}\) The other interested parties at the meeting were Oakden and Gleadow; Reed and Bartley were already included as magistrates.\(^{136}\) Huon considers that this was the point where ‘private


\(^{133}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 29 April 1846.

\(^{134}\) Anne McLaughlin, ‘Against the League: Fighting the Hated Stain’, *Tasmanian Historical Studies*, Vol. 5, 1995-6, p. 82.

\(^{135}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 31 March 1847.

\(^{136}\) The final committee of seven resulting from the public meeting were Henry Reed, Richard Dry, James Cox, William Archer, F.M. Innes, J.A. Youl and the Rev. Dr. Browne. (*Launceston Examiner*, 3 April 1847).
opinions became a public movement that was to turn itself into an uncompromising campaign against any form of transportation whatever.' The Rev. John West as the literary voice for the movement published three pamphlets including thirty-nine articles against the continuation of transportation to Van Diemen's Land, and a twenty-two page pamphlet *Commonsense, an Inquiry into the Influence of Transportation on the Colony of Van Diemen's Land* under the pseudonym Jacob Lakeland. As E. Morris Miller writes, 'West's mind was rich in ideas and he had a wealth of material at his disposal'.

As the movement spread to all classes, a public meeting of the tradesmen, mechanics and other inhabitants of Launceston was held in the Infant School in Frederick Street, on 19 April 1847. Included in the organising committee were two Wesleyan Methodists, teetotal trained leader William Boswell Dean, and builder John Drysdale. Henry Dowling junior was in the chair and Wesleyan speakers included John Denny (plumber and bandmate of Walter Powell) and John Crookes. Crookes attacked ‘the continued delay at the granting to the colonists of the exercise of constitutional rights of electing their representatives in the Legislative Council of the colony’.

This had been one of the demands made through the London Agency Association and here Crookes was highlighting the problem for the mechanics, tradesmen and others. Crookes further stressed that ‘the inhabitants of the colony had almost lost sight of the privileges of free subjects. They were like dogs on chains doomed to slavery and they were entering on a struggle for political and moral existence’. Despite the mechanics and tradesmen label, the meeting still included Richard Dry, the Rev. John West, the Rev. C.
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137 Huon, ‘Moral Means’, p. 96-7; The reply to the circular had the following results: 76% replied and 98% opposed the probation system. As to the continuation of the transportation 53% supported the continuation whilst 47% disapproved of it.
138 Published 12 April 1847 by the *Launceston Examiner*.
139 *Launceston Examiner*, Advertisement, 17 April 1847.
141 *Launceston Examiner*, Advertisement, 17 April 1847.
142 *Launceston Examiner*, 21 April 1847.
143 Ibid.
Price and Wesleyans Bartley and Gleadow. Public meetings were held on transportation in Hobart and Wesleyan influence was also prominent at a meeting in the Midlands at Campbell Town which included Wesleyans Captain Samuel Horton, Benjamin Horne and Isaac Diprose.144

At a large public meeting in Launceston at the Cornwall Hotel on 10 May with 1,200 people, Bartley and Gleadow were chivied for being pro-transportation in 1839 and being anti in 1847 because of the probation system. Speeches at the meeting were reported at great length in the Launceston Examiner, but the most interesting one for this thesis was that of Philip Oakden. It was lengthy but, in effect, it was the testament, sentiments and credo of a commercial Wesleyan merchant and businessman. Because it is so pertinent to this thesis, the report of the speech is reproduced mostly in entirety.145 Oakden said:

His opinion founded upon extensive experience was that transportation should cease for ever at once. He would confine his observations to the pecuniary advantages and disadvantages and elucidate them by experience. He went first on the broad principle of supply and demand. For many years, he had resided in one of the greatest commercial cities out of England (Hamburg), and found the principle applicable to money, merchandise, labour and agriculture, all being regulated by supply and demand, and he believed that anything that interrupted the natural relation between these ended in disarrangement and dissatisfaction. The same principle he thought applied to the colonies...

Almost every person agreed that the probation system was bad, all bad, but he had good servants under the assignment system and some good probationers, but it was not so now. It had been stated that the large wool grower would be benefited and the small tenant farmers ruined. He did not believe this. Every sixpence he had was invested in the colony and also £30,000 for another person (Robert Gardner), not invested in sheep farms but in agriculture. He could get his work done at less expense than at present, if transportation should cease tomorrow. The class of people transported now-a-days differed widely from before, arising from the modification of the criminal laws in the mother country. There were few now sent out from rural areas, being principally the refuse of large cities and manufacturing towns. He went the other day to the penitentiary and was the first applicant to a batch of twenty two pass holders. There was not one among them who knew anything of farming, they were

144 Ibid.
145 Ibid, 12 May 1847.
all of the class described. At Westbury, he applied for some men to
sheep shear, only one man knew about it. He would sooner pay £30
to a free man who understood the business than £10 to a
probationer and was sure his work would be done better and
cheaper. The penal system was bad for the prisoner and bad for the
master and they left no better than when they came. The persons
most favorable to transportation and with the best views of
reforming the prisoners would find his efforts abortive with the
present system. All the good men left and the bad remained behind,
and just as they were beginning to be useful, they left too. The
prisoners had a saying amongst themselves, the old prisoners they
called corn sacks, the present known as soujee bags. Every farmer
knows the difference between a good striped Dundee corn sack and
a soujee bag. It was said that we could not compete with the newer
colonies and that the land at Port Phillip was so much cheaper. This
was not so, the land lately realised as much as any land in this
colony, as high as £2 and £3 per acre, and we have the advantage of
made roads and vicinity to markets. He had no doubt that ere long
there would be a steam communication between this island and
India. Since 1834, he had taken great interest in the monetary affairs
of this colony and while in England devoted much attention to the
subject. He had never known the pecuniary aspect of the colony to
be so healthy. Commerce was equally so and only wanted freedom.
The Differential Duties Act was wrong in principle and on basis like
all such restrictions, would recoil upon the makers. He was sure we
would prosper without prisoners under proper management. Our
climate was one of the best in the world, do away with the impolitic
duties, do away with the name of our being the dust hole of the
Empire and it seemed now, the dust hole of Norfolk Island and we
should raise ourselves in the eyes of Europe and the world.

What has emerged to date were some varying Wesleyan
Methodist reasons for political pressure via the London Agency and
anti-transportation movements. Oakden’s reasons seemed to be
primarily commercial and intrinsically self-motivated. There was no
sign in his testament that he had ever noticed that the probation
gangs were not available to religious instruction. The protective

146 Soujee is semolina, and it was traded into the early Australian colony at Botany
Bay from India. When the colony was starving in its fourth year, the Atlantic from
Calcutta brought cargoes to Sydney, bags of rice, soujee and dholl. Presumably,
the soujee bags were of inferior quality to corn sacks.

147 In 1844, the English philosopher John Stuart Mill published Essays on Some
Unsettled Questions in Political Economy. These essays were further developed
by Mill in his Principles of Political Economy in 1848. It would seem likely that
Oakden was familiar with Mill’s essays because of their discussion of Supply and
Demand, Duties, Foreign Trade Imports and Exports. (John Stuart Mill, Essays
on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy (London, Second Edition
1874, First Edition 1844))
Wesleyan missionary stance of the 1830s to the convicts had diminished in the 1840s, as the convicts were no longer useful. John Crookes with his cry for legislative rights sent another overtone, whilst John Gleadow’s moral stance was to the fore. He also spoke at the meeting in support of Oakden’s pecuniary agenda, but referred to ‘the evils of the probation system and the abomination of the gangs, a question upon which he could not dwell because his feelings would overcome him’.\textsuperscript{148} McLaughlin points out that ‘the anti-transportationists developed and exaggerated a morality based criticism of convicts and ex convicts, and this moral crusade aided them’.\textsuperscript{149}

One week later, John Gleadow chaired the meeting of the London Agency subscribers to deliberate whether they would take under their wing the petition to abolish transportation. The original directive to the London Agency had been to reform transportation, but this had now moved to total abolition of the same. The task of drafting the document to John A. Jackson was given to West and his literary skills. The framing of these instructions on the abolition of transportation and the publication of the previous pamphlets mark the firm entry into the transportation saga for West and certainly not the founding of the London Agency as Ratcliff contends. It was Huon’s previously ignored ‘antis’ who had done all the spade work. West did emphasise in the letter that ‘prisoners have ceased to be the objects of much solicitude, the force of religious translations have been much reduced and they stand off from the free community, a separate caste resistant to instruction and real reform’.\textsuperscript{150} This comment that the prisoners had ceased to be objects of solicitude strongly bears out Oakden’s seemingly lack of concern for them in his speech. The missionary spirit had evaporated with the onset of the probation gangs and the hard economic facts of their lack of

\textsuperscript{148} Launceston Examiner, 12 May 1847.  
\textsuperscript{149} McLaughlin, ‘Against the League’, p. 97.  
\textsuperscript{150} Committee of London Agency to J.A. Jackson, London, Launceston Examiner, 26 May 1847.
usefulness had crept in. The Launceston Examiner considered that ‘the probation system was linked to the course of slow development in the colony, the economic depression of 1840 to 1845 and the inability to obtain representative government’. Public pressure was now focused on abolition of the transportation system. Brand comments ‘that the colonists had been happy enough to accept the benefits of free labour and they only turned on the system when its benefits to them were diminished’.

John Crookes was emerging as a frontrunner in the fight and was advertised as secretary of the committee for providing the cessation of transportation to Van Diemen’s Land at the end of May 1847 with William Henty as treasurer. A.G.L. Shaw writes that ‘by July 1847, the transportation of males was suspended for two years and the British Government agreed to pay both for the cost of the police and gaols and for the convicts employed in public works’. Shaw quotes the numerical state of the convicts at the end of 1846 as being 26,000; 10,000 were in government hands, 3,000 under punishment, 5,000 still in probation gangs and 2,000 unemployed pass holders. However, the breathing space was short lived and in 1848, transportation was revived with ticket of leave exiles being sent out. According to Huon ‘when Grey’s views were known, the impotent colonists, betrayed and enraged, believed that the British Government could not be trusted’.

Lieutenant-Governor Denison also supported transportation, asking for 4,000 convicts a year. The colonists soon realised that
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151 In a retrospective note written in 1869, Sir William Denison highlights the fact that the Anglican convict who had repented during his term of servitude always joined the Wesleyans when he was released from prison. This was because the lay agents of Wesleyan Methodism ‘sought him out, spoke to him in language he comprehended and asked him to attend their worship and provided sympathy and help which he had in vain sought for in the Church’. (Sir William and Lady Denison, Richard Davis and Stefan Petrow (eds.), Varieties of Vice-Regal Life (Van Diemen’s Land section) (Hobart, 2004), pp. 151-2.)

152 Launceston Examiner, 10 April 1847.
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157 Huon, ‘Moral Means’, p. 102. This was the third Earl Grey, Secretary of State.
Grey had ‘never intended to stop transportation for good…and criminals were going to be sent to Van Diemen's Land again’.\textsuperscript{158} Jackson’s reports back to London Agency subscribers in Van Diemen's Land were prompt and incisive and often managed to arrive ahead of official correspondence to Denison. Huon writes that ‘his communications as to the state of play in the power centre in London helped spur anger in Launceston and sustain the passion of the anti transportation movement’.\textsuperscript{159}

In mid-1847 with its transportation foment, no cause was too small for the political minds of the Wesleyan Methodists. In the matter of the Registration and Marriage Acts which threatened to be repealed, there were six Wesleyans on the fifteen man committee.\textsuperscript{160} It was as if the Wesleyan Methodist elite saw themselves as political leaders and agitators and, in this latter case, were supported by teetotal-trained middle-rung Wesleyans, Matthew Lassetter and William Tyson. Again in October 1847, Oakden, Jennings, Bartley and Crookes were part of a sixteen-man group protesting against the British Government’s plan to break up the penal establishments of New South Wales and remove the whole of the prisoners to Van Diemen's Land.\textsuperscript{161} The deputation to the Governor, bearing the petition on the subject’, included Wesleyans Oakden, Reed, Jennings and Crookes with James Cox as chairman and Wesleyan Bartley reading the address. This gathering was quoted at ‘thousands in number and the largest assembly of people ever held in Launceston’.\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{158} Shaw, \textit{Convicts}, p. 336.
\textsuperscript{159} Huon, ‘Moral Means’, p. 102.
\textsuperscript{160} Philip Oakden, Henry Reed, J.W. Gleadow, John Crookes, Matthew Lassetter and William Tyson (\textit{Launceston Examiner}, 31 July 1847).
\textsuperscript{161} \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 23 October 1847.
\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 3 November 1847.
Theodore Bryant Bartley
At the same time, John Crookes had published a letter to the Launceston Examiner openly challenging the magistrates who had voted in favour of transportation in reply to Lieutenant Governor Sir William Denison’s circular: ‘the facts have been recently brought to light that transportation is ruinous and degrading to the convict as well as the destruction of any interest spiritual and temporal of the colony’.

Crookes fulminated that ‘it was their bounden duty to write to the Governor and counteract their former erroneous opinion’. In a sense Crookes was exerting a type of public bullying. Crookes, Gleadow and Bartley emerged as the main Wesleyan Methodist political figures in the last years of the 1840s. Oakden was ageing and was to die of consumption 31 July 1851. The London Agency Meeting of 19 April 1851 accorded its regrets at the retirement of Oakden as treasurer. As the limits of this thesis are to 1849, it is important to detail the final political meetings that the Wesleyan Methodists helped to orchestrate. Crookes took the chair of a meeting of tradesmen and mechanics on 26 October 1848 to consider renewing petitions to the Queen and Parliament concerning a representative assembly and cessation of transportation. Wesleyans William Boswell Dean and John Denny were in a supportive role. Merchant Crookes’ role in chairing these meetings of mechanics and artisans can be seen as a type of facilitatory role.

The London Agency met a month later and the most positive result was a suggestion by Thomas Young, a painter, ‘that a league be formed to come into operation after the next harvest, pledging the members not employ any more Government hands and that a prospectus be handed to every colonist’. Gleadow supported the suggestion and by 27 January 1849, 300 people had formed an Anti-Transportation League.

163 The Circular, John Crookes, Launceston Examiner, 3 November 1847.
164 Ibid.
165 Launceston Examiner, 19 April 1851; Hobart Town Courier, 23 April 1851.
166 Launceston Examiner, 22 November 1848.
In a note from Government House, Lieutenant Governor Denison told Earl Grey that ‘Young had appeared to point out clearly the inconsistency of those attending the Meeting who declared against transportation as driving free labour out of the country yet persisted in hiring convicts in preference to free men’. The _Launceston Examiner_ felt that there was nothing to lose but much to gain by a demonstration and wrote ‘in early days Leagues were not unknown but confined to princes’. At a meeting to promote the Anti Transportation League in Launceston, James Cox and Bartley read instructions concerning the meeting. Wesleyan stalwarts were Gleadow, Jennings, Crookes, William Tyson and Thomas Parramore as well as a strong presence from the midlands. Gleadow liked the practicality of the League. He said ‘he was sick of the whole subject, we have talked enough and it was now time to work in the League and test the sincerity of those opposed to transportation – they were being asked to make a sort of temperance pledge’. In true Wesleyan style, Gleadow then hinted that ‘he would be happy to advocate a League to abstain from everything that paid duty’.

Running in tandem, another Anti-Transportation League sprang up on 1 February 1849 with another pledge to stop hiring male and female probationers. It was aimed at the tradesmen and mechanics who urged the adoption of a total ban on employment of male convicts. Once again, Crookes was in the chair with Denny as supporter. Crookes and other London Agency merchant subscribers had deeply desired representative government and John Ward suggests that ‘their attitude towards the problem of constitutional reform was affected most profoundly by a desire for free political institutions with the guarantee of a free liberal policy inclining towards free inter-colonial trade’. Ward sees their motive gaining
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representative government as an attempt to gain control over fiscal policy.\footnote{This Wesleyan desire to influence money matters is exemplified by a comment by Mr. McLaren, Colonial Inspector of the Union Bank of Australia, about Henry Reed as a local bank director. McLaren wrote 'Reed interferes too much in the fixing of exchange rates'. (ANZ Group Archives, General Letters, Colonial Inspector to Cummins, Union Bank of Australia Private Letters, 1844-48.)}

In the 1840s in Launceston, the Wesleyan Methodists had not only rattled their political sabres in the local scene, they had taken their political agitation to the British parliament to gain their socio-political and commercial rights; they had found their political voice in response to the turbulent events.

**Wesleyan Methodist Rights**

Summing it up, it is reasonable at this juncture of the chapter to swing the discussion back to the subject of rights and the Wesleyan Methodists. In the latter discussion, it is easy to lose sight of the Wesleyans in the complex events of the decade. It is also easy to quote from generalised sources about current feeling, but the topic in hand is the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists and political agitation, leading to anti-transportation involvement, so it is fitting to recapitulate on the question. It is considered that E.R. Taylor's comment at the beginning of the chapter that the political philosophy of liberalism current in Britain in the 1840s with its insistence on rights and influence on Methodists had filtered out to Van Diemen's Land and influenced the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite when they were dealing with the events of the 1840s.\footnote{Taylor, *Methodism and Politics 1781-1861*, p. 155.} Indeed, the Wesleyan Methodist elite might never have entered the political arena so early without the predisposing events of the 1840s.

The Launceston Wesleyan Methodist elite had grown into the understanding that they were in Van Diemen's Land to enjoy the pecuniary advantages, available land, commercial freedom and social equality. At the same time they were aware of their responsibilities in the missionary field, where they had to foster spiritual welfare,
collaboration in the moral aspects of penal redemption and reform, and offer the grand possibility of the conversion experience. It is timely to recall Henry Reed’s words noted in Chapter 2 where he said ‘that the wilderness (Van Diemen's Land) shall blossom as the rose’.174 This statement encapsulates the Wesleyan Methodist viewpoint in the 1830s. However, at the same time, it is evident that these men considered that they had rights, and rights that had to be heard. The right to assigned labour was taken away from them and replaced by a badly managed probation system. They had endeavoured to solve the labour situation with involvement in the bounty immigration system, but that had had mixed results.

The economic depression had highlighted and made apparent the fragility of the economy and insolvencies in their own group and the wider community had made them nervous, and ready to take more aggressive and direct action towards solutions; their commercial interests had been challenged by the imposition of inter-colonial duties, particularly the duty placed on Van Diemen's Land grain into Sydney and Britain. Additionally, the Wesleyan Methodists felt that they had particular claims for justice because of what Henry Reed had termed ‘the peculiar nature of the penal colony’.175 As free emigrants and independent British subjects who had been admitted to the colony, they had contributed to its progress with philanthropic, commercial, community and religious activities, which included liberality and consecration of wealth. They did not want to suffer restrictions on an elective franchise, and were not in Van Diemen's Land by sufferance like the convicts. They felt that they deserved to be treated in the spirit of liberty, like British citizens, not as convicts.

The anomalies and defects of the probation system accelerated in their minds the need for a positive and practical step towards a conduit that supported their rights. This independent attitude culminated in the formation of the London Agency in 1846. One can

174 Henry Jennings’ Spiritual Diary, 10 June 1838, 7 October 1838, Jennings Family Papers, MS9432, SLV.
175 Launceston Examiner, 2 October 1844.
conjecture at this stage in 1846, that the elite were beginning to understand more clearly that transportation was a deterrent to their rights. As C.M.H. Clark succinctly puts it 'In Van Diemen’s Land more and more people were coming around to the view that it was better to have the institutions of the free, than the material benefits of convict labour'.\(^{176}\) He refers to ‘the deep anxiety held, lest their rights as British subjects should be sacrificed to the schemes of the Colonial Office for the disposal of convicts’.\(^{177}\)

John Crookes put it quite firmly when he claimed in 1847 ‘that they had lost sight of the privileges of free subjects and they were struggling for political and moral existence’.\(^{178}\) Oakden’s more commercially linked opinion was that ‘transportation should cease for ever because of the pecuniary disadvantages and that Van Diemen’s Land could prosper without prisoners and proper management’.\(^{179}\) This growing realisation linking diminution of rights to the transportation system was now overlaid by the convenient moral umbrella. Crookes and Gleadow both seized upon this. In a letter to the *Launceston Examiner* 3 November 1847, Crookes stressed that ‘transportation was ruinous and degrading as well as destroying spiritual and temporal interests in the colony’.\(^{180}\) Gleadow stressed ‘the abomination of the gangs, a question he could not dwell on because his feelings would overcome him’.\(^{181}\)

This was the moral banner that the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists and others seized on to support their anti-transportation argument. It was a type of unassailable ammunition, whatever the truth of the matter. In a sense, the religio-moral benefits to the penal system in which the Wesleyan Methodists had initially collaborated with Lieutenant Governor Arthur had now vanished with the probation system. The great reformative and redemptive process was


\(^{177}\) Ibid, p. 438.

\(^{178}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 21 April 1847.

\(^{179}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 12 May 1847.

\(^{180}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 3 November 1847.

\(^{181}\) *Launceston Examiner*, 12 May 1847.
not possible with the intrusion of the moral stain. This was where
the Wesleyans’ struggle for rights had taken them. They had
advanced into the hitherto uncharted territory of political agitation.
Petrow discusses the subject ably in his excellent article on the
‘Vandemonian Spirit’ which he sees as ‘a characteristic of the free
settlers concerned for their rights’. It was ‘a local variant of the
characteristics of a free born Englishman’ and similar to the ‘rights
consciousness of the Americans’.182 Petrow claims that ‘Northern
Landowners felt it their duty to defend perceived threats to rights
and liberties antithetical to their interests’. In particular Wesleyan
Methodist ‘Theodore Bartley exemplified this ‘Vandemonian
Spirit’.183

Epilogue

Even though the demarcation line of the thesis is 1849, it is
thought important to lay out the bare facts of the aftermath of the
Anti-Transportation Leagues and also through a separate
biographical appendix, convey some idea of the movements of the
more noteworthy Wesleyan Methodists from the late 1840s onwards
to death. The biographical appendix is laid out on much the same
lines as the biographical appendix in Geoffrey E. Milburn, Piety,
Profit and Paternalism: Methodists in Business in the North of
England; c.1760-1920. It will be seen from this biographical
appendix how the Wesleyan Methodist Society changed its substance
and lost some of its important elite. A table of mature political
achievement is attached to Chapter 8 to reiterate and bring together
some of the information later contained in the Biographical
Appendix, and shows they how maintained their political identity
into the later years.

Aftermath of Anti-Transportation Leagues

After a slight hiatus in the anti-transportation movement in
eyear 1850, the Rev. John West won acceptance on 9 August 1850 for

182 Stefan Petrow, ‘A Case of Mistaken Identity: The Vandemonian Spirit and the
his proposal to seek the cooperation of all anti-transportation abolitionists throughout Australia. A meeting and conference in Melbourne in February 1851 led to the formation of the larger organisation at the end of 1851, that is the Australasian League for the Prevention of Transportation, West being the acknowledged leader of the campaign. Both John Gleadow and John Crookes remained prominent names in the League, and the local associations were dissolved. Richmond writes that 'members were to elect provincial councils which would send delegates to a general conference of all the colonies'.

In early 1851, the closely aligned question of legislative rights was solved when the British Government established Legislative Councils in the colonies. The Legislative Council in Van Diemen's Land was not to exceed twenty-four members, of whom one third would be nominated by the Queen with two thirds elected by the inhabitants of the colony. John Gleadow was elected in the first election of 1851 as a member for Cornwall for four years. Gleadow and supporters in the Council introduced a motion against transportation and Lieutenant Governor Sir William Denison, who favoured transportation, was beaten. According to Robson, 'this motion was to arrive at the precise opinion of some government members of Council'.

The League with its organisation, the new Legislative Council of Van Diemen's Land with its preponderance of anti-transportationists and the knowledge of the discovery of gold in Port Phillip all combined to sway opinion in Britain. This is supported in a despatch dated 14 December 1852 from Sir John Pakington, late Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Denison, which was received in Van Diemen's Land on 5 May 1853. All three points were referred to in Pakington’s despatch, namely, the associations opposing the practice of transportation, the Legislatures of New South Wales, Van Diemen's

---

186 Robson, *History*, p. 503.
Land and Victoria remonstrating against the practice of transportation and the effects of the discovery of gold.  

On the first of November 1856, the first Tasmanian Ministry under self-government was formed. The Tasmanian Constitution Act had provided for a House of Assembly of thirty members and a Legislative Council of fifteen members. There were forty one candidates, seven of whom had been in the old Council, and who stood for election to the thirty seats. Fourteen of their number were elected. A new era in Tasmanian history had begun.

---

187 Despatch, Sir John S. Pakington to Lieutenant Governor Sir William Denison, 14 December 1852, reported in Launceston Examiner, 5 May 1853, p. 472.
Table of Mature Political Achievement

This table is a tangible sign of the mature political electoral achievements of the group and a consolidation of the political achievement information in the Biographical Appendix. Five members of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists eventually became members of parliament at varying periods of time. This table runs from 1846 to 1879, a period of a little more than thirty years and somewhat fragmentary in its continuity, but it does convey some idea of what the first generation Wesleyan Methodists finally achieved and aspired to politically. This was an extraordinary achievement, considering the size of the elite. It has been decided to include William Dawson Grubb in the table, even though he does not appear to have political involvement until 1849. He appeared in the list of Wesleyan noteworthies and other citizens helping to convene a public meeting for petitions for Representative Assembly, abolition of transportation and criticism of the Lieutenant Governor Sir William Denison’s administration. He was only thirty two at the time, almost a generation apart from the other Wesleyan elite, Theodore Bartley (46), Isaac Sherwin (45), John Gleadow (48), Philip Oakden (64) and Henry Reed (43). He was the brother-in-law of Henry Reed and son of the Grubbs of the Bank Coffee House in London. He had originally come out to Van Diemen’s Land in 1832 with his newly-married sister and Henry Reed for a year. He then returned to London, studied law and returned to Launceston in 1842 and set up in partnership with Henry Jennings. He was an active member of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists and, even though he was strictly not a member of the established Wesleyan Methodist elite, he was politically exposed to the events of the 1840s. John Drysdale

---

189 *Launceston Examiner*, 8 December 1849.
190 *Launceston Examiner*, 9 November 1842.
191 In 1878, W.D. Grubb was chosen as the first lay representative sent to the Australasian Wesleyan Triennial Conference held in Melbourne. He invested heavily in mining and in 1854, Grubb and William Tyson established a saw mill at Upper Pipers River. *Launceston Examiner*, 10 February 1879, Obituary; M.J. Saclier, ‘William Dawson Grubb (1817-1879)’, *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (Melbourne, 1972), Vol. 4, pp. 305-6.
and William Tyson have been included in the table as an example of the success of two second rung Wesleyan Methodists.

It was decided not to include the name of William Hart. Though he became one of the most influential Wesleyan business men in Tasmania, and a member of Parliament for many years, his years of involvement and activity are too late for this thesis. He was No. 70 on the first Sunday School list in Launceston for 1835. 192

---

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Additional Information</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Crookes</td>
<td>Launceston Municipal Council, Alderman</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of Assembly</td>
<td>1857-1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reelected to House of Assembly</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drysdale</td>
<td>Member of Launceston Municipal Council</td>
<td>1869-1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ward Gleadow</td>
<td>In the first election for Legislative Council he was returned for Cornwall</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for four years. (In 1851 the Legislative Council became 2/3 elective and</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 nominative.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dawson Grubb</td>
<td>Elected Legislative Council as member for Tamar</td>
<td>1869-1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Reed</td>
<td>Member of Legislative Assembly</td>
<td>January 1846 - March 1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Sherwin</td>
<td>Launceston Municipal Council</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of Assembly, representing Selby. Legislative Council, member for Tamar</td>
<td>1861-1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District.</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tyson</td>
<td>Launceston Municipal Council, Alderman</td>
<td>Elected in 1858 and served several periods from then to 1876.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


199 *Launceston Examiner*, 9 June 1885.
Conclusion

Geoffrey Milburn’s closing comments in his lecture on Methodists in Business in the North of England, 1760-1920 are pertinent to this thesis. He wrote:

The historical assessment of the Methodist businessman we have had in mind is not always a straightforward task … we need to exercise both historical understanding and charity. These men lived in societies which were in many respects different from ours. They were men of their age and they lived by the light they had. They were also caught up in dynamic and challenging situations in which responses and decisions were not easy. … Their dedication and generosity challenge us today, and their best achievements deservedly command our admiration and our gratitude.¹

These words are applicable to the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, 1832-49, who had all the attributes mentioned, but whose additional pre-eminence came from the fact that they achieved extraordinary results in a short time frame. This thesis has aimed to answer the question posed in the introduction as to why were the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists 1832-49 so significant and what were the ingredients for this manifestation that took a small Wesleyan Methodist Society beyond the norm. In order to create a logical flow of understanding, the thesis has been divided into two sections, Part 1 and Part 2.

Part 1 first lays out the background of the formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Society by John Wesley. Here the aim has been to show the many and varied influences that came to bear on John Wesley’s patchwork of developing theology; those influences, such as Arminianism, the Evangelical Revival, devotional literature, German and European Pietism and the communitarian features of the primitive Christian Church, all percolated into a final theology, which was based on the possibility of the conversion experience. The

conversion experience was the theology that all Wesleyan Methodists would understand. It was the concept that men could be led to an understanding of a new birth, a conversion experience, which was the assurance of justification where man knew that he had a new relationship with God; he was freed from the guilt of sin. Man then understood that he could be led through to sanctification and finally Christian perfection. John Wesley’s own conversion experience would have certainly contributed to this ethos.

With that in place, Chapter 1 then addressed the subject of Wesley’s evangelical economic principles which were slightly altered in the early nineteenth century by the rise of the middle-class Wesleyan Methodist economic men who were moving into a denominational phase. The Wesleyan Methodist, middle-class business man understood that the world of business and commerce was a legitimate end. Business success was a sign of divine approbation and Wesleyan Methodists understood that commercial transactions had to be sanctified and then consecrated in benevolence. The pinpointing of the Wesleyan Methodist economic man foreshadows the rise of the reorganised Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in 1813, as part of the larger evangelical, international missionary expansion. The respectable Wesleyan men of commerce are shown in the thesis to be essential to fund the missionary endeavours of the Society and the clever juxtaposition of Christianity and commerce made by Wesleyan leaders is highlighted, where the gospel was joined to commerce. Wesleyan men of business had the green light to gain wealth, if they consecrated some of the proceeds towards missionary endeavours at home and abroad in the new missions. The gaining of wealth assumed a new cachet and a higher dimension when twinned with missionary expansion, and missionary benevolence could be part of the sanctification chain leading to Christian perfection. As David Hempton writes, ‘to the cult

---

2 John Wesley’s original directive had produced three rules, Gain all you can, Save all you can and Give all you can. (John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley*, Bicentennial Edition, ed. Albert C. Outler, Volume 2 (Nashville, 1984-95)).
of commerce was added an unparalleled enthusiasm for foreign missions.³

Part 1 concludes with Chapter 2 and the Wesleyan Methodist missionary trajectory being taken into the South Seas missions, with a loop establishment first at the penal colonies of Sydney, New South Wales, and then at Hobart, Van Diemen's Land. Examination of both these Wesleyan Methodist establishments revealed their shaky substance. The early failed New South Wales mission had many tensions and difficulties and is shown to have produced only a few Wesleyan Methodists, who figuratively consecrated their wealth with chapel building. Squabbling, resentments and dissidence were a feature of the early Hobart Society, with only one Wesleyan Methodist man of commerce emerging in the shape of John Dunn, who later formed the Commercial Bank. Despite the apparent failure of these missions, Wesleyan Methodist adherents clearly understood the aims and aspirations of their Societies. The message had been transferred from Britain via the missions, but it would take other significant ingredients to produce a successful mission.

Part 2 of the thesis includes six chapters, and initially defines the movement of Wesleyan Methodist missionary endeavours towards the burgeoning merchant town of Launceston in the north of Van Diemen's Land. The nature of the town has been emphasised in the thesis to remind the reader of its penal and frontier elements and that it was a town of opportunity for merchant adventurers, a town with imperial and global connections, a town with easy access to the wool, wheat, oats and barley of the hinterland; Hobart did not have the same easy access. Launceston was a town where economic development was going to move in tandem with the rise of the Wesleyan Methodist group.

It has been shown that the negativity of the two colonial Wesleyan Methodist missions at Sydney and Hobart was initially replicated at Launceston. The first mission in 1825 only produced

one strong Wesleyan Methodist economic man, Esh Lovell, who was willing to shoulder the financial burden. This situation only highlighted the essential ingredients for success. With the coming of Wesleyan Methodist Philip Oakden in 1833, a man of substance, a type of merchant missionary, a catalyst had arrived for the formation of an elite group. Here was the man who led the spark of revival. A core group was drawn into the orbit around Oakden and Isaac Sherwin (who was already resident in Launceston and a prototype for the economic man), who were prepared to consecrate their largesse by supporting the new mission. Here was to be the ideal solution for the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in London, a group prepared to shoulder the financial responsibility for the mission, taking it from the shoulders of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. With the exception of Oakden and Sherwin, this was a group of men who became converts to the missionary thrust; merchants/professional men who helped to raise the profile of the denomination’s laity; a laity who were going to preserve a strong intellectual/financial continuity for the Society.

The sense of joy in the situation was caught when the Rev. Manton wrote that ‘Some of the respectable and influential members of the community are casting their lot with us… we have lately seen such things as could not be expected in such a short time’.  

This group was the envisaged ideal of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. Here was the group imbued with the missionary sense in a penal land, a group comprised of men who were to be respectable leaders in the Launceston community, a group who were prepared to consecrate their wealth, a group who would enjoy Vice Regal patronage and support, a group who were to combine phenomenal energy, cohesion and harmony, a group conscious of its power in the face of ministerial control. This core group have not had their presence recognised by secular or religious historians, the only such group to have existed in early Wesleyan Methodism in colonial Australia.

---

1 Journal the Rev. J.A. Manton, 8 July 1835, NS1234/1/1, AOT.
Examination of the social construction of the Launceston Society revealed the ideal spirit of egalitarianism where half of the members had a convict background. The egalitarianism so beloved of John Wesley had been raised to higher levels in Launceston. Additionally, respectability, salvation and opportunity were offered through the Society to the artisan elements. This conclusion has been realised in the thesis by a small demographic study made possible by available data. The slight shift in the liturgy struggle within the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists is the one aspect that has been addressed by Australian Methodist histories, with writers viewing the situation as a parlous one, and not recognising it as part of the natural growth pattern of global Wesleyan Methodism in the missionary sense; it was a normal progression for a young viable Society. What was probably not completely normal was the ruthlessly confident position of the Wesleyan Methodist elite, born of their power to keep the Society out of debt, and this aspect has been fully discussed and examined in this thesis.

The nature and attitudes of the young Society are revealed once again in the perspicacious comments of the Rev. Manton: ‘We have many hearts, who while they are thankful for what they have done, regard it as almost nothing, and anxiously look for greater things, and appear determined not to rest until it is done’. Manton sensed the power of the group, their energy and their aspirations. The Wesleyan Methodist elite was indeed open to greater achievement and had the energy, will and desire to involve themselves deeper into the community. Whether consciously or unconsciously, they understood that status had to be established for any significant involvement. Land and property ownership had been from the inception in Van Diemen's Land looked upon as a necessary requisite to status. As the *Launceston Advertiser* had written in 1834, ‘there is nothing like land…the settler in Van Diemen's Land risked his all in the remotest corner of the globe’. Allen B. Robertson also suggested

---

5 Rev. J.A. Manton to Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee, 25 February 1836, AJCP, M133.
6 *Launceston Advertiser*, 7 August 1834.
that ‘it was property that defined Wesleyan Methodists in Nova Scotia and placed them in the upper rungs of society’.  

The thesis has established status through property and land ownership with a table of the land transactions of the Wesleyan Methodists from 1830-50 sourced from the Registry of Deeds, Hobart, Tasmania. Further status has been connected to individual commercial and professional achievements as well as membership of jury lists, and close involvement in philanthropic and civic activities; the latter being an accepted stepping stone to status in society. At the same time, there has been an understanding brought forward in the thesis that the commercial involvement of Philip Oakden and Henry Reed took them beyond the parochial setting and that at the same time they exercised patronage and protection towards second rung Wesleyan Methodists. Philanthropy has also been highlighted to show the dual affects of its influence. Not only did it bring credibility in its wake, it fulfilled Wesleyan Methodist injunctions to accountability for the human need in the community, combined with a sense of gratitude for their own prosperity.

With the establishment of status, the thesis was able to make a strong case for the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist involvement in banking. A table was laid out to illustrate this, whilst explaining the significant global shift that it took to have any Wesleyan Methodist from such a young Society involved in banking. In particular, the extraordinary phenomenon of Philip Oakden’s close involvement with the establishment of the second tier imperial bank, the Union Bank of Australia, cannot be over-stated.  

The thesis argued strongly in Chapter 5 that Philip Oakden’s involvement in the creation of the Union Bank of Australia was equal to that of George Fife Angas, and the detailed examination of the establishment answers the ambiguities that such historians as S.J. Butlin raise in their work.

---

8 The descendant of the Union Bank of Australia, the Australian and New Zealand Bank (ANZ Bank) is still a very viable bank.
With the establishment of Launceston Wesleyan Methodists in local and imperial banking, Chapter 6 clearly shows one type of conscience that drove the group. The original spiritual diary of Henry Jennings has been utilised to show the process of self examination that was common to those who had undergone conversion experience. Webster describes spiritual diary writing as ‘the means by which the godly self was maintained through the act of writing’.¹⁰ Spiritual and temporal concerns and preoccupations are all revealed in the spiritual diary. The main thrust that was extracted from Jennings’ diary was the revelation of his weakness for speculation in land transactions.¹¹ The abhorrence of speculation, and indeed bankruptcy, is given full rein in this chapter and the close, claustrophobic watchfulness of fellow Wesleyan Methodists in monitoring speculative behaviour is highlighted.

The final two chapters of Part 2 reveal the process of the movement towards political involvement. This is shown to have commenced with political pressure exerted through the Teetotal Society, particularly in the area of influencing the licensing system with its power to grant public house licences, and consequently, the retail liquor trade. Wesleyan Methodist involvement is brought to the fore, particularly that of Isaac Sherwin as also a certain political consciousness for some second rung Wesleyan Methodists. Further philanthropic involvement of Wesleyan Methodists in the 1840s is then highlighted, particularly, to point out the growing status of John Crookes as an emerging political player, as well as to remind the reader of the dogged attention to philanthropy exhibited by the Wesleyan Methodists, even during uncertain economic times. Without the complexities and controversies of the 1840s in Van Diemen’s Land, the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists might never have had the opportunity for major political involvement. It was a matter of circumstance, of precipitating events and triggered resentments. The final chapter has been structured in such a way as

¹¹ This has been backed up by the table of land transactions in Chapter 3.
to take the reader from the first concept of no political involvement of traditional Wesleyan Methodism to the necessary participation in the 1840s, when the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists saw their rights being eroded. The triggering resentments of the 1840s, such as discontinuance of the assignment system, the economic depression from 1841-44, the introduction of probation gangs, the labour market, quit rents, duties on colonial grain and lack of representative legislature have all been dealt with to illustrate the cauldron of resentment that erupted into the anti-transportation movement. As the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists were only a part, albeit a strong thread in the whole anti-transportation saga, and because their contribution should be acknowledged historically, their contribution has been extracted with the understanding that others played an equally defining role. However, strong emphasis has been accorded in this thesis to the Wesleyan Methodist’s involvement in the formation of the London Agency, a political pressure group which ran alongside and helped bolster the impetus for the anti-transportation movement.

The thesis concludes with the pragmatic understanding that many energetic societies have their use-by date. The whirlwind energy of Wesleyan Methodism was not something that could be maintained for ever; it needed challenges and the right men to respond to them. The Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society was certainly not finished at this date, but merely resumed a solid, pedestrian aspect. The flair dissipated because the collection of extraordinary men had dispersed. A full examination of this situation is gained from the biographical appendix. Some of the main figures of the core elite were no longer members of the Society. Henry Reed, the financial powerhouse of the Society, had left for England at the end of 1847 for further commercial opportunities, and Philip Oakden was ailing with consumption and dead by early 1851. George Palmer Ball had fallen victim to the effects of the economic depression and at first left for Port Phillip in 1848 and then for Britain. Henry Jennings left for Port Phillip in the latter half of 1849, probably
seeking greater scope for land purchases and Theodore Bartley appeared to withdraw from the Society in 1850. Major William Gray had also been a victim of the economic depression and had died in 1848. Walter Powell had been caught in his father-in-law Joseph Bell’s insolvency in 1845 and had left for Port Phillip. Second-rung Wesleyan Methodist Samuel Dowsett had left the colony and Matthew Lassetter left Launceston for the California goldfields in 1850, not returning for fifteen years. Isaac Sherwin did not return to Launceston until 1854, when he was once again financially viable. The three members of the elite group left in Launceston in the late 1850s were John Gleadow, John Crookes and Isaac Sherwin, and their mature electoral achievements are indicated in a table.

The group had achieved extraordinary things in its sixteen year period. Like the Nova Scotia Wesleyans whom Robertson described as ‘strong minded, self-made and non-submissive’, the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists had brought all the known Wesleyan Methodist attributes of initiative, zeal, piety, enthusiasm, organisation, moral earnestness and godly discipline to their mission. But additionally, they had gone beyond the normal boundaries of Wesleyan Methodism and achieved extraordinarily in banking and political involvement. The ingredients in Launceston had been favourable to them. There had been the penal challenge to which their missionary attitude had to adjust, and there was the energy of the developing mercantile port which stimulated the commercial side of the Wesleyan Methodists. It was almost as if the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists had fed on the energy of the growing town. They enjoyed the freedom from the strictures of a parent society in Britain and the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society; this isolation bestowed on them extra power and opportunity and the approbation of the Lieutenant-Governors had furthered their cause, particularly the patronage of Lieutenant-Governor Arthur. Their cohesion and compactness had been their strength, whilst most importantly, they

---

12 See Biographical Appendix for fuller explanation.
13 Robertson, John Wesley's Nova Scotia Business Men, p. 156.
had benefited from leaders like Philip Oakden and Henry Reed, two dynamic, devout men, who had helped eliminate the financial burden so familiar to Wesleyan Methodism. The Launceston mission had been a model mission in that it was self-supporting and not dependent on the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. Their philanthropy not only accorded them status, but fulfilled the precepts laid down by John Wesley. The economy and political challenges of the time had engendered a strong response from the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists, something which could not have been possible in British society. The achievements of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists 1832-49, deserve proper recognition in the global framework of Wesleyan Methodism. They were a unique manifestation.
Biographical Appendix

George Palmer Ball

George Palmer Ball’s financial difficulties have been explained in Chapter 8. By 28 April 1847, Matthew Lassetter had auctioned the whole of Palmer Ball’s household furniture, his library, animal stock and farming implements, as well as letting ‘Mountford House’ and 150 acres for a period of fourteen years. The actual property and acreage of ‘Mountford’ seems to have been sold to an Alexander Clarke of Ravensworth in July 1846.

By the middle of 1848, Palmer Ball had left Launceston for Geelong, Port Phillip, and entered into business with a Captain Hovenden. By 1849, Palmer Ball had purchased 252 acres of land in Port Phillip and by 1852, he had returned to England with his eleven children. George Palmer Ball died 18 September 1878 at Jacksonville, USA, at the age of seventy two years.

Theodore Bryant Bartley

It is difficult to ascertain how long Theodore Bryant Bartley actually remained a committed Wesleyan Methodist member. On the Wesleyan Methodist quarterly schedules, 1840-43, he is listed as a class leader at The Springs, and he seems to have relinquished that position at the end of 1844. Bartley is shown as being active in the

1 Launceston Examiner, 17 April 1847.
2 Launceston Examiner, 15 July 1846.
3 Launceston Examiner, 20 May 1848.
4 Title Deeds, Port Phillip Lands, New South Wales Government Gazette, 1850, p.
5 Outward Passengers to Interstate and New Zealand and Foreign Ports, 1852-76, PROV.
6 Walch’s Tasmanian Almanac, 1879.
7 Launceston District Circuit Wesleyan Methodist Quarterly Class Schedules, NS499/1006, AOT.
Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society from 1837 to 1850, and this date ties with his active collaboration with John Gleadow and John Crookes in the Anti-Transportation Movement until 1849. This date of 1850 would seem to be the date for his withdrawal from the Society, as his name does not appear in the chapel records after that date. One can only surmise that at some stage after 1850, Bartley slid out of the Wesleyan Methodist Society and back into the Anglican Church. The removal of Henry Reed and Henry Jennings and the death of Philip Oakden in 1851, were to change the social mix of the Launceston Wesleyan Methodists. A biography of Bartley written by descendants appears to have no knowledge of his Wesleyan Methodist connections and only notes him as a devout Anglican. He built the chancel of the Anglican Church, Hagley, in memory of Sir Richard Dry, with whom he was closely connected, and who had been Premier of Tasmania in 1866.

He was a Justice of the Peace and a Magistrate and from 1867-72 he was a Commissioner of the Launceston and Western Railway. Bartley declined to enter Parliament. He occupied the position of member maker for Launceston and the North and, on all public questions affecting the political welfare of the colony, he took a leading part. Petrow sees Bartley as ‘personifying the defence of traditional liberties and being at the forefront of anti-government campaigners’. In 1861 he spearheaded the campaign to introduce the Torrens system of land conveyance to Tasmania, and Petrow states that ‘Bartley was the founder of the Land Titles Reform Association (LTRA), which was formed in Launceston in early 1861’; John Crookes was also a member.

According to Petrow, the LTRA played an important part in publicising the advantages of the Torrens system, and urging
successive governments to legislate. In 1863, Bartley fought for the repeal of the Carriage Duties Act with John Crookes collaborating, and in 1870, he formed an Anti-Scab Association which requested Parliament to make amendments to the Act. Petrow suggests that the Association ‘sought to strike at certain unconstitutional and vexatious claims and to retain the power of appeal against the decisions of the magistrate’. In 1876 Bartley was presented with a purse of 600 sovereigns and a manorial address by northern colonists, thanking him for his efforts in their regard.

His friendship with John Gleadow and family was very close, and his daughter Emma Matilda was married to George Thomas Gleadow, son of John Gleadow. At the end of his life, Bartley suffered from depression and took his own life. He died on 23 November 1878 and left £3,750 in his will, not including real estate.

John Crookes

John Crookes was one of the hundred guinea patriots who had subscribed to the Australasian League for the Prevention of Transportation. In 1852, he became an alderman in the Launceston Municipal Council and continued in that position for five years. In April 1853, John Crookes was initiated into the ‘Masonic Lodge of Hope No. 4 T.C.’ in Launceston, which commenced in 1852. This was the second Lodge established in Launceston after the first Lodge, St. John’s, which commenced in January 1843. Crookes presided as Lodge Master for the period 1857-8, a period of economic depression in Tasmania. He was a member of the House of Assembly from 1857-63, and then again in 1867. He was Vice President of the Launceston Mechanics’ Institute in the periods

---

12 Petrow, ‘Carriages’, p. 83.
14 Copies of Wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/12, AOT.
October 1858 to December 1860 and 1862-63. In a sense, he took over the role of his mentor Henry Reed in the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, tirelessly consecrating his wealth and formulating ideas. With William Hebblewaite, he recommended the formation of an Australian Wesleyan Methodist Conference, and when the district committee was set up in 1855, he became one of the lay representatives. His obituary noted that he, Gleadow and the late Isaac Sherwin were the three oldest pillars of the Wesleyan Church in Launceston.

Since October 1855, he had been a Justice of the Peace and a visiting Justice of the gaol. In 1862, Crookes purchased 120 acres of land on the high point of the Sand Hill on the Westbury Road, two miles out of Launceston. By 1865, Crookes had built a lavish Corinthian mansion called Mount Pleasant, which was described in the *Cornwall Chronicle* ‘as one of the finest dwellings in the Australian colonies. It included two coachhouses and five stables, harness rooms etc., and twenty acres of the 120 acres had been carefully planted with scientific taste’. Crookes continued to run his large import, export ironmongery firm and in the 1850s he employed Wesleyan George Pridden Hudson, who had come to Launceston with his father James John in 1852. James John Hudson bought Dowling’s stationery business in Brisbane Street, Launceston. The Wesleyan connections were close as James John Hudson was a brother of Mrs. Elizabeth Horton of Somercotes at Ross. In 1864, Crookes admitted George Pridden Hudson as a partner into the firm, which became Crookes and Hudson. In September 1868, the sixty-year old Crookes married the twenty year old Charlotte Elizabeth Margaret Quick, the daughter of the Rev. W.A. Quick, Principal of the Wesleyan Horton College at Ross. They had an infant son, but two years later, whilst speaking at a public meeting, Crookes suffered a stroke and collapsed. He died three days later on 26 September

---

17 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 1 October 1870.
18 Land Purchase Memorial 5/1656, Land Titles Office, Hobart.
19 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 18 February 1865, p. 2.
1870. The documents lodged for probate by the trustees of Crookes’ will, on 3 March 1871 cited an estate of £10,000.20 A year later on 1 March 1872, there was a notice in the *Cornwall Chronicle* of a clear out sale at Crookes and Hudson’s firm, advertising greatly reduced prices for the wholesale portion of the business.21 The next day, George Pridden Hudson was declared bankrupt, with the first meeting of the creditors on 18 March.22 The debts of the firm were considerable, £44,605 in all. Amongst them, the Union Bank of Australia was owed £11,151, the firm of Walter Powell, London, £4,536 and Sharp and Terry, London, £23,531.23 There were eleven representatives at the bankruptcy hearing, all watching their interests, and they included the executors of the Crookes estate, and representatives of the Union Bank of Australia and the Commercial Bank.

Obviously John Crookes had over extended himself with the building of Mount Pleasant; he had spared no expense, leaving himself insufficient working capital to keep the business of Crookes and Hudson in a liquid state. If he had not died, he might have been able to have traded out of the situation, but his death revealed the deficiencies. He had failed to heed the basic Wesleyan Methodist commercial principles. Richard Green was appointed trustee of the estate of John Crookes and Crookes was declared bankrupt.

Henry Reed arrived back in Launceston in December 1873 and immediately rented Mount Pleasant and then purchased the estate at the 23 February 1874 auction.24 One can only surmise that Henry Reed’s explanation for leaving England in 1873 was more complex than that which he expressed in a letter to a friend. He wrote ‘At a

---

20 Copies of Wills Recording the Granting of Probate, AD960/9, Will Number 1467, AOT. (The trustees of Crookes’ will were William Dawson Grubb, Theodore Bryant Bartley and James Robertson.)
21 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 1 March 1872.
22 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 20 March 1872, 25 March 1872.
23 John Terry had been the former partner of Walter Powell in his firm, and on Powell’s death in January 1868, his will had a codicil that allowed Terry to borrow £25,000 at appropriate interest rates. (Alan and Margaret Nichols, *Merchants of Mixed Fortune: a History of the Powell and Beauchamp Families* (Sydney, 2000), pp. 61, 64-5.)
24 *Hobart Mercury*, 4 February 1874.
meeting in Mildmay I suddenly cried out to the Lord Here I am, send me, I see a pillar moving and I must follow’. Reed would have had knowledge of Crookes’ death and bankruptcy at least by 1872, and this would have been a strong precipitating factor in his decision to return to Launceston and salvage from the estate.

**William Boswell Dean**

William Boswell Dean was one of the first in Launceston to ship produce to California in 1849, on the discovery of gold in that state. Looking for new trading opportunities in 1851, Dean and Benjamin Cocker sailed to Circular Head to purchase palings for the Melbourne market at the Gold Rush. The journey was interrupted and Dean and Cocker found themselves in the Mersey River area where two splitters showed them samples of coal which outcropped on the River Don. Dean formed the Mersey Coal Company in Launceston, with John Gleadow, James Aikenhead, James Scott, John Crookes, Tregurtha, Weedon, W.S. Button, William Dawson Grubb and James Jennings (the brother of Henry Jennings). William Dawson, the former town surveyor of Launceston, was appointed surveyor and manager for the company. Dean withdrew from the syndicate because of escalating costs and started another company, the Don Coal Company, which worked a bed of coal on land on the Upper Don, belonging to Wesleyan Methodist John Denny.

Dean, in conjunction with the Cockers, built the first sawmill on the Mersey. He helped charter the vessel *Titania* for trade between Launceston and the North West coats of Tasmania, and also charted the steamer *Fenella*. He was connected with the opening of the Kentish Plains and was made Chairman of the Mersey Settlement

---


26 Cocker was a Wesleyan Methodist who arrived in Launceston with his family in January 1851. He was described as an agent of an English shipping house, and it was suggested that this was Henry Reed’s house. Mark Dalby, *The Cocker Connection, Yorkshire, Van Diemen's Land, Melbourne, British Columbia, Mexico, Tonga and Micbigan* (London, 1989), p. 29.

Association. Dean promoted ship building with William Tyson at Gravelly Beach, and dabbled in whale fishery.  

**Samuel Dowsett**

On 12 September 1849, an advertisement in the *Launceston Examiner* advertised at Perth the public auction by Matthew Lassetter of Samuel Dowsett’s household furniture, because Dowsett was leaving the colony. Dowsett is noted in the Hobart circuit history as having died in 1871.  

**John Drysdale**

John Drysdale had joined the Wesleyan Methodists in 1835. Mentioned in Chapter 3 as one of the early members, he was the foreman for Mr. R. De Little’s building, architectural business, and in that role invaluable to the Wesleyan Methodists’ building aspirations. Drysdale was a faithful Sunday School teacher and a class leader until his death in 1880, and he became assistant superintendent of the Sunday School in the last part of his life. He was a member of the Municipal Council from 1869 until his death, and was an old member of the committee of the Benevolent Society, Town Mission, Bible Society and Hospital Board. He was a Justice of the Peace and was on the committee for the building of the new Wesleyan Methodist Church in Paterson Street in 1866, and subscribed £200 to the cost. He was also a trustee of the Church. Drysdale was a member of the Launceston Mechanics’ Institute from its beginning in 1842 until 1877. He was on the Board of Management from 1862 to 1873, and was Vice President from 1874 to 1877. Upright and loyal, Drysdale did not take centre stage like the other members of the

---

30 *Cornwall Chronicle*, 4 March 1872.  
Wesleyan Methodist elite. He left the considerable sum of £10,900 at his death 13 July 1880.  

**John Ward Gleadow**

From the mid-1850s John Gleadow along with John Crookes, Isaac Sherwin, John Drysdale, William Hart and William Dawson Grubb formed the solid raft of respectability supporting the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society.  

At the first election of the Legislative Council in 1851, Gleadow was returned unopposed for Cornwall for four years, and in 1866, he was elected to the House of Assembly for Morven. In 1855, Gleadow as superintendent of the Paterson Street Wesleyan Sunday School, was handed a testimonial from the officers and teachers on the 20th Anniversary of the founding of the Sunday School. It was felt ‘that some of Gleadow’s best work was done in the Sunday School, establishing a virtuous character in the youth of the town’. From 1855-1861, he was a leading member of the Board of Education and in 1867, he was chairman of a Commission of Inquiry into the Management of the Queen’s Asylum for Destitute Children. In 1869, Gleadow sustained a serious injury from a fall from a carriage and a bolting horse and resigned from Parliament. With a life long interest in horse breeding, Gleadow was on a committee in 1849 with Richard Dry, Charles Henty and three others which proposed setting up a company for the exportation of horses to India for the Army. The Indian horse trade was a very lucrative one and a good horse in India brought £80 - £100.  

---

33 Copies of Wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/12, AOT.  
35 Tyson, *Wesleyan Sunday School*, p. 21  
37 *Launceston Examiner*, 26 August 1881.  
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Gleadow died at Launceston on 25 August 1881. In his will he left £4,150 excluding real estate. 39

Major William Gray

William Gray’s financial problems have already been detailed in Chapter 8. He died at his residence ‘Rockford’ on 10 March 1848 at 56 years of age. His obituary recorded that ‘he was late of the 94th Regiment of Infantry and had sold his commission for £3,200 to obtain a land grant. He had also been twelve years in Africa and from 1818 to 1821, he had headed an expedition to the interior to trace the source of the Niger and to search for traces of Mungo Park’. 40 Despite his financial difficulties, he left £300 in his will. 41

Henry Jennings

In April 1845, Henry Jennings was advertising for sale his large estate of Coronea near Entally. 42 By December 1846, he had purchased the well known ten acre property of Glen Dhu in Launceston. 43 By July 1849, Jennings was selling up and advertising for sale at auction some twenty eight properties and lots of land

39 Copies of wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/12, AOT.
40 Hobart Town Courier, 18 March 1848; Biography File 71/447 MOM, AOT.
41 Copies of wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/2, AOT
42 Launceston Examiner, 30 April 1845.
43 Hobart Town Courier, 19 December 1846.
including Glen Dhu. The terms noted that the proprietor was prepared to sell at a low rate.  

Jennings’ last appearance with the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society is when he is mentioned at a Special Leaders’ Meeting 18 June 1849 as being on a committee to select a schoolmaster and mistress for a Wesleyan Day School in Launceston. The Departure Passenger Lists for Port Phillip show the Jennings family departing in various family combinations from May 1849 to September 1849. At no time in the local Launceston newspapers or the Wesleyan Methodist Society records is there any explanation for Henry Jennings’ permanent departure for Port Phillip. His legal practice was left in the hands of William Dawson Grubb. On 11 December 1849, Jennings applied to the Melbourne Bar to practise as an attorney and solicitor. The subsequent behaviour of Jennings leads to the assumption that land purchase was one of the driving factors for his move. The scope for land purchases in Van Diemen’s Land had come to an end and Port Phillip possessed a vast new territory to satisfy Henry Jennings’ thirst for land. As well as this, his wife Alicia’s influence may have been a factor and also the indisputable fact that the drain to Port Phillip had been continuing for some time. In July 1847 the Rev. W. Butters had written ‘We are thankful that those who have left us for the adjacent colonies have not departed from the living God’. In the early months of 1846, ninety-three members had departed from the Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Society, with only three replacements.

From 1850-52, Jennings held the lease on the 24,000 acre pastoral property Tarween at Koo Wee Rup, from 1851-57 he held the lease on the 30,000 acre pastoral property Bunyip Bunyip, from
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44 *Launceston Examiner*, 21 July 1849.
45 Launceston Wesleyan Methodist Circuit, Minute Book of Leaders Meetings, 23 November 1847-8, June 1864, 18 June 1849, N5499/949, AOT.
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1852-59 he held the lease on the 3,840 acre pastoral property Balla Balla (Cranbourne), from 1853 onwards he held Garam Gam (Carrum, Mornington), and from 1853-55 he held Greenmount. In an article by Leslie A. Schumer about the Young and Jacksons hotel site in Melbourne, Jennings is referred to as ‘a solicitor who was a party to a large number of land transactions in those times’. John Batman had bought the prestigious half acre corner site at the first Melbourne land sale in 1837 and during the Batman family’s financial difficulties after Batman’s death, Jennings bought the block in 1852. He subsequently sold it to fellow Wesleyan Walter Powell in May 1855 for £2,980.

Jennings connection to the Melbourne Wesleyan Methodist Church seems to have lasted for the period from late 1849 to the end of 1853. The Melbourne Quarterly Meeting Minute Book showed him present at the Circuit Quarterly Meetings from 8 January 1850 to 6 July 1852. (These Quarterly Meetings were held once a quarter in the circuit and they were attended by all the preachers, local preachers and stewards). By 27 October 1853, Jennings is noted as having laid the foundation stone of the second Wesleyan Methodist Chapel in Brunswick.

It is easy to follow Jennings’ progress through a comment in *The Clyde Company Papers* which states that ‘after his move to Port Phillip, Henry Jennings worked under Bishop Perry to establish the Church of England and services were regularly held in his house, but he also seems to have been a Methodist class leader and circuit

---

52 Melbourne Wesleyan Methodist Quarterly Minute Book, 28 June 1841-29 June 1893, Box 1 Item 1, Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania.
53 Geo. B. Minns, Notes copied from the original handwriting of Thomas Wilkinson, Box 2/7.1, Uniting Church of Australia Archives, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania.
steward in the early fifties.\textsuperscript{54} It appears that after 1853, Jennings slid out of the Wesleyan Methodist Society and embraced the Anglican Church under Bishop Perry, who had arrived in Melbourne in 1848. This fact is reinforced by extracts from his wife Alicia’s diary January 1856-September 1856 where Alicia and Henry seemed to be constantly in the company of Bishop Perry and his wife, exchanging visits on a frequent and almost daily basis.\textsuperscript{55} Cannon also comments that Jennings was the agent and solicitor in Melbourne for the Sydney based Australian Mutual Provident Society which commenced business during the early days of the gold rush.\textsuperscript{56} The gold rush of 1851 in Victoria would have increased business and income for Jennings as an attorney and solicitor and this is reflected in the involvement in pastoral leases. His wife Alicia’s social aspirations and connections had always been linked with the establishment in Van Diemen’s Land and this was carried through on the removal to Port Phillip, particularly for Alicia. (She was associated with the establishment of the Women’s Hospital in Melbourne, the Governesses’ Institute and the Ladies’ Benevolent Society; all these foundations were associated with establishment committee membership).

The textural membership of the Melbourne Wesleyan Methodist Society would have changed radically after the 1851 gold rush and may no longer have been in keeping with the Jennings social position. What had been socially possible in Launceston, was no longer so in Melbourne. Walter Powell, a Wesleyan Methodist from Launceston, had made a fortune in the gold rush but left for England in 1856, returning in 1858 and finally leaving permanently in 1860. (See Powell biography). Henry Jennings died at St. Kilda on 23 August 1885, leaving real estate of £15,000 and personal property of £10,500.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{55} Alicia Jennings Diary, January 1856-September 1856, MS 9432, Jennings Family Papers, State Library of Victoria.
\textsuperscript{56} Cannon, \textit{Melbourne After the Gold Rush}, p. 208.
\textsuperscript{57} Probate Index, VPRS 3340/P2, 30/552, PROV.
Matthew Lassetter and Walter Powell

It has been decided to amalgamate these two biographies because of the close family ties between them. The biographical detail of these two people plus the Bell/Iredale group illustrates the connectional support, intermarriage and networking business intrigue so reminiscent of the Wesleyan Methodists. This type of work is well illustrated in Allen B. Robertson’s prosopographical work of *John Wesley’s Nova Scotia Businessmen, Halifax Methodists, 1815-1859*. There is not sufficient space in this thesis for a collective study of key data of this Wesleyan Methodist group under selected clear criteria, but the connections between the above mentioned families give the sense that it would be possible in another study.

When J.W. Bell and family and Walter Powell left Launceston mid-1845 for Melbourne, Matthew Lassetter took out an auctioneer’s licence and took over the business, organising sales to clear the Bell’s assets for dispersal amongst creditors. Mathew Lassetter's wife Elizabeth was the mother of J.W. Bell’s Wesleyan Methodist wife Georgina, and hence Matthew Lassetter was the step father of Georgina Bell. Walter Powell’s wife, Anne Bell was the child of J.W. Bell’s first marriage.

Matthew Lassetter’s wife Elizabeth died in 1844 and he remarried to a governess, Ann Eustace. He and his wife left Launceston for California and the lure of the gold rushes in March 1850 selling the auctioneering business to J.W. Bell’s oldest son William, who changed the name to Bell and Howe. Matthew Lassetter's two daughters appeared to have been totally neglected after their mother’s death and almost abandoned in Longford in squalor. The girls were rescued by Georgina Bell and taken back to Melbourne. Matthew Lassetter did not return from California until 1865. His only son, Frederick Lassetter, left Van Diemen's Land shortly after his mother’s death in 1844 and went to Melbourne where he worked in Easey’s Auction Rooms. By 1848, he had moved

---

to Sydney and to the hardware business owned by his uncle, by marriage, Lancelot Iredale a Wesleyan Methodist emancipist. R.B. Walker comments ‘how the ranks of the early Methodist office bearers in Sydney included emancipists Edward Eagar, John Innes, Lancelot Iredale and Thomas Street’. Iredale died in 1848 and Frederick Lassetter married his daughter Charlotte and bought into the Iredale hardware business; Iredale’s widow Kezia married the Wesleyan minister William Schofield a few years later. Michael Cannon discusses how ‘Frederick Lassetter took over the firm in George Street, Sydney and changed the name to Lassetter’s Cheapside doing a huge business in home furnishings and ironmongery. By 1890, he employed 1,000 people and had 100,000 account customers around Sydney. His was the largest ironmongery shop in New South Wales’.

Walter Powell, good friend and companion to Frederick Lassetter from the early Van Diemen’s Land days, used his life savings in Melbourne in the cause of re-establishing the Bell family and himself in business again. The business prospered, but by 1848,


60 Rev. William Schofield married three times and the marriage to Kezia Iredale in 1850 was his second marriage. Kezia died in 1863 (Australian Vital Records Index, New South Wales Pioneer Series, 1788-1888), and Schofield married a third time, dying in June 1878. When Schofield died he left the extraordinary amount of £40,000, almost comparable to that of Henry Reed’s will. A pamphlet published at Schofield’s funeral made the facile statement that Schofield had originally ‘been carefully trained to be a business man before becoming a Wesleyan Methodist minister, and that he invested small sums when he came to the colony’ (Biographical Sketch of the Rev. W. Schofield, Pamphlet *In Affectionate Remembrance of Rev. William Schofield who died June, 9 1878, Bondi House, Waverley, NSW*, NS499/1/113, AOT, p. 14). However astute in business he was, it would have been impossible for Schofield to have amassed £40,000. Without tracing through the wills of Lancelot Iredale and Kezia Schofield, it is fairly safe to assume William Schofield’s money came through his marriage to Kezia, and this facilitated access to Iredale money, which was very considerable from the ironmongery business. Schofield left the £40,000 to the Methodist Church in New South Wales, not his third wife, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church commented ‘it will relieve every church in New South Wales of the interest on borrowed money’. (Ibid, p. 14). In effect, the Rev. William Schofield was reconsecrating his wife’s Methodist wealth.

Walter Powell had taken his money out of the business and embarked with his wife for England, where he hoped to establish business connections. He stayed for six months and was introduced to business houses in the iron trade. He returned to Melbourne in February 1849, where he cautiously considered being an importer of wholesale hardware with a retail shop to weed off the surplus stock.\(^{62}\)

Powell opened a small office in Swanston Street, Melbourne, and then moved to permanent quarters at the corner of Swanston Street and Collins Street. With a slow beginning, the situation changed dramatically with the discovery of gold in Victoria in 1851. Powell’s hardware ironmongery business supplied all the wants of the diggers on the goldfields, as well as the domestic needs of the new immigrants. Frederick Lassetter in Sydney took twenty team loads of hardware to the diggings and traded goods for gold dust.\(^{63}\) Both Walter Powell and Frederick Lassetter made fortunes in their hardware businesses because of the gold rush. Both had learnt their Wesleyan Methodist commercial principles in the cradle of Launceston Wesleyan Methodism and Powell’s store became the largest hardware store in Australia. From the time Powell came to Melbourne in 1846, he immersed himself in the Melbourne Wesleyan Methodist Society giving particular attention to Sunday Schools and the Total Abstinence movement, a continuation of his work in Launceston. His efforts on behalf of the church were herculean and his example of consecration of wealth unparalleled. The Rev. William Butters wrote ‘In 1851 when gold was discovered in Victoria, Mr. Powell was one of the most active office bearers and notwithstanding the urgent claims of business, he was seldom absent from his post. His godly principle was still to seek first the Kingdom of God’.\(^{64}\)


The Rev. William Butters left a list of the main movements in which Walter Powell took part at this period:

- Helped the Sunday Schools with service and his purse.
- Increased ministerial strength to help the growing community.
- Established the Wesleyan Immigrants' Home.
- Provided additional Church accommodation for the thousands of immigrants pouring into the colony.
- Formed the Australian Wesleyan Mission Church into an independent body with a Conference of their own.
- Established a Wesleyan Book Depot in Melbourne.
- Financed the creation and furnishing of Wesley College.

In 1854, Joseph W. Bell had been in a serious carriage accident and debts of £20,000 fell due for payment. Walter Powell called a meeting of creditors and had the stock liquidated. One quarter of the debt was already owing to him. Powell offered J.W. Bell £300 a year and asked Fred. Lasseter to contribute another £100 per year. As well, Powell took over Bell's liabilities. In return for these favours, Bell had to promise not to return to business.

In 1856, Powell returned to England and stayed a year, making a side journey to America. By April 1858, he had returned to Melbourne and by March 1860, had left permanently for England. In 1861, he went into partnership with Henry Reed in a shipping business and this business was given over entirely to him in 1863. These two figures, Reed and Powell, were the wealthiest men to have come out of Launceston Wesleyan Methodism and both lived up totally to the Wesleyan Methodist principles for the committed Wesleyan business man.

Walter Powell died in January 1868 and Frederick Lasseter in 1911. Matthew Lasseter returned from America in 1865 and in 1870 travelled back to England with members of the extended family. He

---
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died in England in 1887. Walter Powell’s will was too complex to
detail in this biography.\textsuperscript{67}

\textbf{Philip Oakden}

Philip Oakden died of consumption 31 July 1851 aged sixty-
seven years. Signs of the disease were evident in April 1850 when he
complained of ill health in a letter to John Leake.\textsuperscript{68} His friend William
Fletcher, Colonial Inspector for the Union Bank of Australia, wrote of
him that ‘The little town of Launceston owes more to him, both
socially and commercially than would be generally believed could
arise from so unpretentious a man. The esteem and respect in which
he was held in that community was unbounded’.\textsuperscript{69}

Being aware of Oakden’s declining health, William Atkinson
Gardner, son of Robert Gardner of Manchester, arrived in March
1851 on the \textit{Hannah} to settle accounts. He had made an agreement
with his father Robert Gardner that he was to proceed to Van
Diemen’s Land with his family, where Robert had assigned all
properties to William on trust, to hold or sell, as well as income. A
further agreement of 5 September 1851 between father and son
showed William transferring £20,000 from his firm of Gardner,
Bazeley & Co. to Robert Gardner as a substitute for gaining Robert’s
property in Van Diemen’s Land.\textsuperscript{70} Robert Gardner had lost heavily in
the commercial distress in England of 1847-8 by speculation,
possibly in railways. Gardner spoke before the Sebel Committee on
Commercial Distress about the moral implications of railway
speculation.\textsuperscript{71} Gardner appeared to have traded out of his difficulties,
thus sparing Philip Oakden an earlier calling to account of his loan.

\textsuperscript{67} A & M Nichol, \textit{Merchants of Mixed Fortune}, pp. 64-67.
\textsuperscript{68} P. Oakden to J. Leake, Leake Papers, L.1/E88, 29 May 1850, University of
Tasmania, Special Rare Collections.
\textsuperscript{69} William Fletcher to S. Jackson, 16 August 1851, Inspectors Letters, General
Correspondence, UB5, U/102/3, ANZ Group Archives.
\textsuperscript{70} Anne and Robin Bailey, \textit{An Early Tasmanian Story with the Oakdens, Cowies,
Parramores, Tallochs and Hogg}s (Melbourne, 2004), pp. 99-100.
\textsuperscript{71} Commercial Distress, \textit{Parliamentary Papers (1847-8), viii, c 395}, pp. 367-71, as
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Henry Reed, had offered to see Gardner and arrange matters for Oakden’s protection. Oakden left £15,000 in his personal estate and the complexities of the real estate belonging to himself and Robert Gardner were sorted out in a Memorandum of Agreement between William Atkinson Gardner and Georgiana Oakden. Georgiana lost the farm at Bentley in the Chudleigh valley, but retained some forty parcels of land.

**Henry Reed**

Henry Reed left for Britain in December 1847 in the *Lochnagar*, and lived there for the next twenty-six years, returning in 1873 with his second wife Margaret Frith, whom he had married in 1863 after the death of his first wife Susannah. Reed left Launceston after he had suffered much criticism over an incident with James Henty. Whilst in England, Reed threw himself into preaching and philanthropy amongst the poor, and preached in Yorkshire and London. He built two mansions, Dunorlan at Tunbridge Wells and Dunorlan Villa at Harrogate. He set up a London shipping office and partnership with Walter Powell in January 1861 that lasted until January 1864 when Reed made the business over to Powell. Reed and Alfred Hawley were also behind the T.B. Walker shipping line to Australia and the ports of Launceston, Brisbane and Melbourne. Reed helped the China Inland Mission and worked with William Booth in his East London Christian Mission. He also gave generous financial support to the formation of General Booth’s Salvation Army.

Returning to Launceston in 1873, he purchased Mount Pleasant, the house and property of the late John Crookes and added to it (See Crookes biography). Reed purchased an allotment in Launceston at the corner of Wellington and Balfour Streets, and under the supervision of Frank Tyson, builder, he built fourteen parcels of land.

---

72 H. Reed, off Cape of Good Hope, to P. Oakden, Van Diemen's Land, 12 December 1847, Letter in hands of family descendent.

73 Anne and Robin Bailey, *Early Tasmanian Story*, p. 100.
workmen's cottages, three houses with the character of almshouses and a mission house attached, and three villa residences. His philanthropy continued with large donations to the Benevolent Society and the Launceston Hospital. As well, he returned to his old interest of horse breeding and purchased pure bred draught stock. He withdrew from the Wesleyan Methodist Society over differences concerning the taking up of collections and then instigated the independent Christian Mission Church in Wellington Street, Launceston, in May 1877. The actual Christian Mission Church was opened in April 1884 a few years after Reed’s death in October 1880. In Tasmania, Reed left a will valued at £57,000; this did not include real estate or holdings in Britain.

Isaac Sherwin

By September 1854, Isaac Sherwin had rallied his finances and returned to Launceston and a prominent position in the Wesleyan Methodist Society. In 1855, he was appointed an alderman for the Launceston Municipal Council and the first agent in Tasmania for the Australian Mutual Provident Society. In 1858, he was secretary and a director of the Launceston Gas Company. He was nominated a trustee and secretary of the Cornwall Free Hospital in June 1854 and when it became the Launceston General Hospital, he was the first chairman of the board, 1865-69. He was also secretary of the Launceston Horticultural Society from 1857-64. He entered the House of Assembly in 1861 for six years as the member for Selby and in 1867, along with Sir Richard Dry, he was a member of the Tamar District of the Legislative Council. He died on 27 June 1869. Excluding real estate, he left a will valued at £2,700.

---

74 Launceston Examiner, 11 October 1880, Obituary.
75 Fysh, Henry Reed, p. 145.
76 Copies of wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/13, AOT.
77 Launceston Examiner, 29 June 1869, Obituary.
78 Copies of wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/9, AOT.
William Tyson

Tyson continued to reside in Launceston as a devout Wesleyan Methodist, and in 1855, when sawn timber was twenty two shillings and sixpence per 100 super feet, he entered into partnership with William Dawson Grubb and constructed a tramway to the Upper Piper River where they erected a sawmill. Eight miles of tramway were laid and worked by natural horsepower; they also had a timber yard in Launceston.79

Tyson was a committee man of the Northern Tasmanian Railway League and later a director of the Launceston and Western Railway Company. In 1854, he was made one of the first property assessors in Launceston, and in 1858, he was elected to alderman of the Launceston Municipal Council. He was one of the proponents and a first director of the Launceston Gas Company in 1859, and was connected with the formation of the Northern Tasmanian Permanent Building and Investment Society in Launceston in 1858. At the time of his death on 8 June 1885, he was one of the oldest members of the Tasmanian Teetotal Society and the vice president as well as being a trustee of the Temperance Hall.80 William Tyson left £491 in his will, not including real estate.81

It is a revealing comparison to note that wealthy Wesleyan Methodist banker, John Dunn of Hobart, who died on 20 January 1861, left an estate of £116,000.82

79 *Launceston Examiner*, 9 June 1885, Obituary.
80 Ibid.
81 Copies of Wills recording the granting of probate, AD960/15, AOT.
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Virtual Religion Index (Online).
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