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INTRODUCTION

John Dunmore Lang has been described by George Nadel as one of "Australia's founding fathers", and although this may be more apparent in the years after he entered politics, it is equally so from the beginning of the early eighteen thirties. His contributions in the fields of education, emigration, transportation and journalism date from this time. His efforts in these areas were in great measure due not to his originality of thought, but rather to his intense practical activity, foresight, and insistence on the maintenance of certain standards. By means of such practical activity he was able to demonstrate the benefits which could be obtained from the implementation of various policies, and was always ready to agitate for them to be carried out by the authorities. Seldom, however, did his proposals meet with prodigious success at the outset, but he never despaired of a successful outcome. In fact it is possible to say that he enjoyed the conflicts which arose more than the actual attainment of the objective. It was his religious background and beliefs which enabled him to endure opposition, and to overcome difficulties which would have undermined the reserves of most men. His position as leader of the Presbyterian community gave him a unique status in the colony, and ensured that he would
have an audience to hear his telling of Man's place in the universe, and in particular of John Lang's in the colony of New South Wales:

This thesis attempts to explore the increasing nature of Lang's participation in colonial affairs, both on a political and a social level, from his arrival in 1823 until the late eighteen thirties. The early years, from his arrival and until he became actively associated with the formation of the Sydney College in 1830, saw his main interest centre around the formation and development of his church. But this period was not free from intervention in the politics of the colony, as he came into conflict with the authorities over the position which the Presbyterian Church should occupy. Despite such difficulties, the church was established and had received official confirmation of its position in the colony by 1828. These problems are discussed in Chapter three.

The years 1830 and 1831 mark Lang's entry into the arena of colonial affairs proper. He formed his own educational institution and undertook an emigration experiment by bringing out artisans (or mechanics as they were then termed) from Scotland. Both of these ventures were approved by the Colonial Office after Lang had made personal representations whilst on a visit to England for that specific purpose. These ventures, and the actions leading to them, have been
examined in Chapter four. Unfortunately, Lang could not resist the temptation (though he would possibly not have described it as such) to advertise his success, which he did in this instance by writing a pamphlet. The successful outcome of any one of Lang's undertakings usually meant that, somewhere, the powers of evil had been worsened, and the education and emigration ventures were no exception. However, in this case the evil power, as viewed by Lang, happened to be led by Archdeacon Broughton, head of the Anglican Church in the colony. The Archdeacon took exception to the references Lang made to his Church and School Corporation and to his clergy, and a very unpleasant time ensued for Lang, which culminated in the passing of a censure motion against him by the Legislative Council in 1832. The activities of this period marked Lang's precipitate entry into public affairs, and, almost his exit from them. Chapter five deals with this aspect.

Lang's compulsive sense of activity, together with that fervent missionary zeal he exhibited towards all his projects, enabled him to pursue his education project and his emigrational ideas. Even though his actions had severely shaken his standing in the colony, he still had a place as a leading church identity. As well as continuing his interests in education and emigration, he interested himself in the problems associated with transportation, which by the mid-thirties was becoming an important and contentious colonial issue. The
development of Lang's interest in the transportation issue, and his continued efforts on behalf of education and emigration are outlined in Chapter six.

Chapter seven attempts to explore another aspect of Lang's varied contribution to colonial life - his literary pursuits. These comprised poetry, pamphlets, the History, his venture into journalism with his newspaper The Colonist, and several other more academic writings. But his literary activities were basically adjuncts to his other interests, though they also had an existence in their own right, and some of his more ambitious and thoughtful writings stand as milestones in early colonial literature.

Throughout all these enterprises there was one factor which united them, at least in Lang's own mind, and that was the church which he had established in 1823. His interest in this never flagged, although as the church grew, he found it increasingly difficult to maintain authoritarian control over its activities (or rather over the activities of those ministers he had brought out to cater for the needs of an increasing number of Presbyterian congregations). Chapter eight endeavours to deal with this, and also attempts to relate his theology, as he expressed and practised it, to the various ventures which brought him into contact with the public. It also attempts to demonstrate, at the same time, how Lang reconciled these activities with his idea of the role of a clergyman in society.
CHAPTER ONE

J. D. LANG

HIS EARLY YEARS IN SCOTLAND AND HIS REASONS FOR COMING TO NEW SOUTH WALES

Man, like a ship with many a sail
Spread to a favouring breeze,
Embars before Hope's flattering gale,
Upon the world's wide seas,
Right sure he will not, cannot fail
To gain his port with ease.

(J. D. Lang)
The Sydney Gazette reported in its issue of Thursday 29th May 1823 of the arrival of Mr. John Dunmore Lang on the ship Brixton and stated: "... a clergyman of the Established Church of Scotland, Mr. Lang has come to the Colony to form a Presbyterian Church in Sydney, in communion with the Scottish National Church." Three months later, Lang's name again appeared in the pages of the same publication through his letter to the editor which informed those who might be interested of certain facts about Captain Muddle and his ship Andromeda. Captain Muddle replied to this letter - also in the pages of the Gazette - and offered advice to Lang, from the Book of Matthew, Chapter 5 verse 9: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Such was the manner in which Lang began his life in New South Wales, and it was to be in a similar manner that it continued. Lang apparently could not resist the desire to inform those who thought and lived in a manner unlike his. This was partly due to his family upbringing and to the particular ideas he gained during his studies for the ministry - especially to the influence of Dr. Chalmers. Professor Manning Clark has, if somewhat effusively, described Lang as being "... the preacher of an avenging Jehovah", and he continues by setting Lang and his theology into the Sydney scene of 1823:
- a harsh faith for a harsh society, [Lang was] a stranger to that remark of the blessedness of the meek, and how they would inherit the earth, for the potter had so fashioned his clay that it was pleasing to him to smite sinners, and humiliate the proud. Another wild boar had strayed into the vineyards of the Lord in New South Wales.

In Lang, says Margaret Kiddle, "...stiff-necked pride, independence, self-righteousness, pig-headed persistence and the will to succeed were almost caricatured."

According to Archibald Gilchrist, Lang was an "ecclesiastical misfit", and was born for the rough and tumble of political strategy and campaigning. "The din of battle was music in his ears. Breathing fire, brimstone and eternal damnation against all who did not think exactly as he did, he saw every cause he espoused as one of gigantic proportions." Consequently, he remained on good terms with few people for any length of time. A difference of opinion was made the occasion for launching into bitter recriminations of the behaviour of the person concerned, generally resulting in the alienation of good relations. In spite of, or perhaps because of, these characteristics, Lang was able to contribute much of value to colonial society and policies.

Lang was ordained at Irvine in Scotland, by the Presbytery of Irvine, on Monday 30th September 1822, and he recorded in his Sermon Record that this ceremony took place "...with a view to my going to New South Wales for the purpose of becoming the Pastor of a Scot's Church to be established there." He sailed on board the
Andromeda for Van Diemen’s Land on 14th October 1822. He was only twenty-three years of age, and to understand what influenced him to undertake this journey it is necessary to outline some of the important events in his life during those first twenty-three years.

John Dunmore Lang was born in Greenock, Scotland on 25th August 1799. His mother, Mary Dunmore, had succeeded in 1797 to the properties of her father, which comprised several small farms near Largs. William Lang, his father, was a workman in wood and stone, and when he came to Greenock he eventually set up in business as a blockmaker and ships joiner. Greenock in 1802 had a population of some 17,000, and due to its seaport, the trades of ships' carpenter and cooper became two of the most important in the town. In 1807 or 1808 the Langs moved to one of Mary Dunmore’s properties - the Nether Dochra farm - near Largs, and William Lang retired from his Greenock business.

It was in Largs that Lang attended the parish school and began to study Latin and Greek in addition to the usual subjects included in a well-based education of the period. This study was undertaken with a view to his entering the ministry. Lang, in his Reminiscences indicates that at a very early age his mother had marked him out to follow a career in the Presbyterian Church, and nowhere does he indicate that he doubted this to be his vocation. Unfortunately
we are even at this point confronted with an inevitable problem where Lang is concerned, and that is the accuracy of his information when writing in retrospect. In this case the Reminiscences were written late in life, and it is always possible that he saw things more clearly at that time, even where his own personal life was concerned. He was not averse to giving his own interpretation to events when he wrote of them - witness some passages in the various editions of his History. However, he does say of his mother (whose influence on him cannot be overestimated) that "... she was one in a thousand. To her strong mind and thorough Christian principle I owe everything. She had dedicated me to the Christian ministry from birth and I was brought up with this idea from my earliest childhood ...". 11

He entered Glasgow University at the age of twelve - a fact which seems to conjure up in the minds of most writers on Lang an idea that he must have displayed extraordinary brilliance. But university seems to have a different meaning, as Elie Halevy points out, in Scotland and England at that period. The "Scottish Universities can hardly be regarded as institutions of higher education" 12 as the student entered at age fourteen or younger and went through a course lasting four years, covering in the first year Latin and elementary Greek. The second was concerned with logic, which was compulsory, and in the third year moral philosophy, which combined metaphysics, moral philosophy proper, the philosophy of history and political economy. The last year brought
a course in natural philosophy - physics and chemistry, for which groundwork was laid in the second and third year by courses in mathematics. It was, in effect, "a superior type of secondary education..."  

The English criticized the system by comparing for example, the classical course in a Scottish University (Edinburgh, Glasgow and St. Andrews) as being on a level with that of an English public school. Every student at the university who followed the courses for four years left the university with an M. A. degree. Due to the Scottish system of scholarships based on the presbyteries, the quality of students tended to be very high - and this, in turn, tended to promote a well educated Presbyterian ministry. What must be looked for in the Scottish educational system, especially in the universities, is an extension of the system of the parish school. Encouraged in learning at these schools, the student could proceed to university, follow the courses for four years, and then go on to study for his chosen profession - be it the ministry, law or medicine. In his Reminiscences, Lang gives a similar account of the subjects taken by him at university to that just described. Lang indicated he "took the degree of Master of Arts (A. M.), which was not then done by Scotch students generally."  

Here we have a conflict of facts - Halévy's account of the courses was that most students graduated master of arts and then proceeded to study their chosen profession for the last four years. This, it appears, is what Lang did do as, speaking of himself, he says: "The curriculum for the master of arts degree was four years and the diploma was granted after the usual examinations, on April
11 1820. "15 So he was referring to the second four year course, and
as is not infrequently the case, he could over the years have placed
the emphasis where it would give the best impression.

Whilst at Glasgow University Lang came under the influence
of Dr. Chalmers, who in 1815 had become the minister at the Tron
Church in Glasgow. Chalmers's appeal as a preacher was such that
most of his listeners could not fail to be impressed, not only by what
he said, but by the manner in which it was delivered.

The eloquence of his discourse was absolutely overpowering;
his moral portraits were so graphically and vividly
delineated, his warnings and entreaties ... so impassioned
and earnest, his admonitions so faithful, his denunciations
so fearless and fearful, his exhortations to preventive
and remedial appliances so pointed and urgent. It was
thrilling, overwhelming. His whole soul seemed in every
utterance."16

One cannot help but compare such form of delivery with
what is known of that of Lang who, though perhaps not aspiring to such
heights, appears to have owed a considerable debt to Chalmers in this
regard. To Lang, a student of divinity and destined for a life in the
Presbyterian Church, Chalmers must have really seemed an ideal
example to follow. It was Chalmers who enunciated, over a period of
years, several principles, notably those affecting the labouring classes,
in education and economic matters. These were to some degree adopted
by Lang later on in New South Wales, and involved particularly Chalmers's
ideas for the working classes, and of the laws and principles which made
for their social betterment. From his studies, Chalmers affirmed two
particular principles, and these Lang apparently absorbed before his departure for New South Wales. They were, firstly the belief that the labouring classes could not reach economic comfort except through the building up of character (and this could only be achieved, by inference, through a Christian education); and secondly that it was the duty of the State to pass laws which would aid this process, rather than to make compulsory provision for the relief of destitution, which only led the working classes away from true economic progress.

Lang did not at this early stage follow quite so emphatically all of the theories held by Chalmers, especially those concerning the second point. However, in so far as education was concerned, Lang has stated that it was with this idea in mind that he came to New South Wales, and we cannot overrate the influence Chalmers may have had on him in this particular. Chalmers' example, shown in his work among the people during his incumbency of the Tron church, and in his study of the Christian religion and its practical application to the problems created by the social life of the times, was just the example Lang needed during his university years. Chalmers promulgated these ideas by means of his sermons as well as by actual practical application. Lang must have listened and absorbed these doctrines during many a service. Perhaps Chalmers, in his method of preaching as well as in his ideas, embodied what was most progressive, even modern in the sense of appealing to the younger members of the Presbyterian Church, at the
time. What he had to say was practical, and was well attested by his own demonstration. Not only could he formulate theories, but he could apply them. What we know of Lang strengthens the belief that he would have been very impressed by such a person. It was probably at this stage that Lang saw the benefits to be gained by action, and as is later evident, he obviously revered action. Even though his life was in many instances quite disjointed, it was full of activity. It was a form of activity which basically demonstrated Lang's fundamental belief of the place of true Christianity in life; and even of a rather arrogant assurity that the presbyterian religion (or in this case Lang's own interpretation of it) was the only way in which one could obtain lasting benefits both in this world, and, of course, in the hereafter. It is very easy to attribute too much in Lang to the influence cast by Dr. Chalmers, but even in later life Lang still seems to hold Chalmers as a model, and so I would feel that in his university years Lang probably felt very much under his influence; so much so that it becomes very difficult to define what precisely he owes to Chalmers, and what were ideas of his own creation. These were difficult distinctions to make at this early stage of his career at least.

Lang was ordained on 30th September 1822 for the specific purpose, so he would have us believe in his Journal, of going to New South Wales and there to establish a Scots Church. 20 It is interesting in the
light of the position he was to occupy in the colony in later years, to
examine closely the reasons which prompted him to undertake such an
enterprising project. It becomes all the more interesting when we
realize that the Church of Scotland was not promoting him in any way.
His task was self imposed. The Bulletin, writing of him in 1882, said
that he arrived:

in a fashion almost without parallel among the founders
of distinguished colonial families. He came independent
of all government authority neither with the broad arrow
on his back nor with any badge of office on his shoulder. 21

Why then did he choose to come to New South Wales instead of settling
into the ministry in Scotland?

In the same article in The Bulletin quoted above are given
three circumstances why Lang looked towards the colony as the place
in which to practice his ministry. Though I doubt that they can be
considered reasons for Lang's leaving Scotland, they are nonetheless
interesting, especially since they were given currency in this article
after Lang's death. Thus one might expect them to have been
reasonably accurate. But, if anything, they are more inaccurate;
certainly the truth they contain makes them misleading. Briefly,
The Bulletin maintains the circumstances are:

(i) The wife of Commissary General Wemyss was an
intimate acquaintance of a lady friend of the Lang family.

(ii) Mrs. Lang had been foster mother to Sir Thomas
Brisbane.

(iii) George Lang (John Lang's brother) had gone to the
colony already.
Certainly, Lang did stay with the Commissary General on his arrival. Also, in passing, it was the Commissary General who obtained a position for George Lang when he arrived. But as for point (i) being a reason for leaving Scotland, it does not seem likely, nor is it apparent from the Lang papers. The Lang family certainly knew the Brisbane family, as Mrs. Lang's properties were once part of the Brisbane estates. But, as for Mrs. Lang being Sir Thomas's foster mother, it is a statement which I doubt, especially when one considers that Mrs. Lang only inherited these properties from her father in 1797 and the Lang family moved to them in 1807 or 1808. Also, as Sir Thomas Brisbane was born in 1773, and Mrs. Lang died in 1844, the conclusion would be that they might be almost the same age. Thus, while points (i) and (ii) were perhaps not basically incorrect, there is no corroborating evidence, and also they contribute little towards an understanding of why Lang should have chosen to come to New South Wales. Point (iii) of course is accurate. What were his prospects in the ministry in Scotland? Surely should they have offered much, he would not have ventured away before he had begun to practice in the ministry.

I could not help regarding it [the Scottish system of ecclesiastical advancement] as both humiliating and degrading for a licentiate to be kept waiting at the footstool of some nobleman or other ... I therefore directed my brother ... to make a moral survey of the country ... and in particular to ascertain the condition and prospects of the Presbyterians he might find in it. " 22

This does seem to be the main reason which motivated him to consider leaving Scotland. However, there are other statements Lang made at
various times, admittedly in different contexts, but which nonetheless reflect upon his motives for coming to New South Wales. For example, writing in 1831 in a pamphlet in which he outlined the efforts made in England to gain support for his Australian College, he says that:

[When I was induced to embark for New South Wales the first time in the year 1822, I cherished the hope that in addition to the furtherance [of religion] . . . I might one day be instrumental in effecting the establishment of an Academical Institution . . . on liberal and economical principles of the Schools and Colleges of Scotland. 23

The words I have emphasised - "was induced" - are most curious, since if true, would indicate that he was persuaded to leave Scotland. And if so, then who would have persuaded him, apart from perhaps his family? Or was he perhaps divinely induced? It is certainly not obvious from his own writings; but a similar circumstance is specifically mentioned by him in a letter to John Macarthur, where he states he came out ". . . with the approbation and concurrence of Sir Thomas Brisbane. 24

This fact will be mentioned later, especially the denial by Sir Thomas himself of ever having made the suggestion to Lang. The difficulty in trying to determine the reason for his decision to come to the colony brings to light a fundamental problem which it is impossible to ignore when endeavouring to gain an understanding of Lang's real motives. That problem is the very wide interests which he always had, and which, so it seems, enabled him to have been concerned for a particular undertaking many years before openly espousing it. Also, with him, most of his
writings were for a present purpose, and the purpose seems to have been to promote himself as well as the particular cause in which he was interested. This is not to indicate that he was necessarily a shallow or selfish person. It was rather that his religious beliefs and training strongly influenced him to consider that his motives at any given time were unquestionable, and therefore that any cause he sponsored should not suffer defeat by any of its opponents. At least he felt that defeat should not arise before he had made every possible effort, regardless of sacrifice, to stave it off.

Alluding to his reason for going to New South Wales in his Reminiscences, Lang says, when speaking of his years at Glasgow University, "[that] as I anticipated leaving Scotland for some foreign part..."[25]. This reference seems unlikely, for at that time he would have been only sixteen, and virtually promised to the ministry in Scotland. It is, in fact, another instance of his placing the emphasis where he wanted to decorate the narrative. Or, as is not unlikely, it would be a failure to remember, though he was fairly good at remembering where other people’s statements of facts were concerned.

It seems as though the Lang family was prepared to go to New South Wales when Lang’s brother George left for the colony in 1821. George was entrusted with several letters to John Piper, a Scotsman who was Naval Officer & Harbour Master & Collector of Customs, in which John Dunmore Lang, even then aware of an opportunity, decided to
recommend his brother to Piper. Lang included an indication that
the Lang family would sell their properties at Largs and follow George
out "... should he [George] meet with tolerable success and send us
good accounts of the country..." Lang says, also in the
same letter:

I myself am a preacher of the Church of Scotland, and
tho' I have no reason to despair of succeeding in Scotland,
I should willingly renounce my hopes in this country for
a time at least if I had the prospect of being useful to my
countrymen in New Holland.

So it seems that at this time the whole family was prepared to emigrate,
and this must have had its influence on Lang. Certainly, looking
outside the family circle, there were economic reasons which could
have prompted Lang to make the decision to leave on his own. The
main factor here was that between 1815 and 1823 in Scotland there were
more young ministers looking for churches than there were positions
to be filled. This substantiates Lang's comment, quoted earlier
in this chapter, on the system of ecclesiastical preferment which
naturally thrived when there was an abundance of clergy. For this
reason alone to emigrate was an admirable solution.

However, alongside the particular problems concerning
the ministry, there were other social and economic changes taking
place in Scotland at the time which must have had some influence on
the Lang family itself. The years 1815 to 1823 were ones of severe
economic depression, caused in part by the problems associated with
the ending of the Napoleonic wars. This, together with the breaking
up of the old Highland economy, which was founded on subsistence 
agriculture, caused severe hardship to many small farmers and tenant 
farmers. It was a problem which affected the middle class and the 
lower classes, and the solution which the people themselves seemed 
to make was, broadly, that the middle class emigrated, whilst the 
lower class went to the towns. This, of course, is looking at the problem 
in very general terms, and applying a very broad solution. But 
basically it was what happened over a period of several decades. The 
Lang family did not have large landholdings, but by no means were 
they so well off economically that they could afford to ignore the severe 
depression in agriculture. In fact they probably came within the category 
of small farmers - the ones who in times of poor prices and high costs 
of production would suffer most. So, as a family they had strong 
reason to look for greener pastures, as it were.

Following on from these social and economic problems was 
what may be considered another aspect which determined people to 
emigrate - the Lang family being no exception. This was the increasing 
space being given to articles in various Scottish periodicals on New South 
Wales and Van Diemen's Land. The most notable periodicals concerned 
were the Edinburgh Review and The Scots Magazine. The former, 
markedly Whig in its outlook, was little interested in the Empire being 
acquired, but it did have on its staff a reviewer, Sydney Smith, who 
was well informed on colonial matters. His readable comments began 
in 1803 and continued until after Lang had left for Botany Bay (as Smith
continually called the colony). The Scots Magazine was openly in favour of the colonies and in 1820 quoted, quite extensively, letters from New South Wales giving glowing accounts of life there. Also, these increasing reports coincided with a rise in the interest shown by Scottish people in the colonies - statistical records at the Colonial Office bear out this fact in emigration figures. Later, in 1822, The Scots Magazine aided further Scottish emigration when the agricultural situation worsened, and it advocated Van Diemen's Land as the most agreeable place to which displaced farmers could emigrate.

The other interesting periodical, founded in 1819, the Edinburgh Monthly Review, became very popular. Its policies were moderate Whig, and of interest from Lang's point of view is an evangelical tendency, shown in its outspoken comment that a clerical establishment similar to that carried on by Dr. Chalmers in Glasgow should be carried on in the colony, and should promote social and philanthropic works. Of course, it is only speculation to presume that John Dunmore Lang and members of his family read these periodicals, but it is possible that this was the case. Thus, together with the economic and social state of Scotland at the time, both from a farming point of view (the family properties) and from the prospects in Scotland (or lack of them) as regards John and his brother George, it is apparent that there were strong motives for the whole family to emigrate.
However strong the family motives may have been, in themselves they are no justification for what can be evidenced of Lang's own reasons. Certainly the future for him as an ordinary member of the clergy in Scotland was not a promising one. This appears to be his main reason for considering to leave Scotland, but it is not one to which he gives great prominence in any of his published books or pamphlets. Nor did he acknowledge it as the reason when he arrived in the colony. In fact it would appear as though his arrival could more correctly be attributed to his brother George, who, so Lang says, was instructed to make a survey for him of the state of the Presbyterians in the colony at the time with a view to Lang himself following. The whole issue is further complicated by various statements made during the conflict which arose in 1823 as a result of the Presbyterian address to the Governor asking for government aid to help in the construction of a church. Lang, it seems, was quoted in an article which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle* in London in which the various stages of the incident were outlined and the actions of Governor Brisbane severely criticized. It was stated that Lang had said he had come originally to the colony by Sir Thomas Brisbane's express invitation, with liberal promises of personal patronage and public support. Sir Thomas, in a despatch to the Colonial Secretary, Earl Bathurst, in which he answered the criticisms put forward in the *Morning Chronicle* article, referred to Lang, and said in part: "I trust that he[Lang] will have contradicted the
statement of his having been invited to the Colony by me...". 31

(Lang was in Great Britain on the first of his many trips home at the
time this despatch was written, and hence Brisbane’s hope that Lang
would already have communicated the falsity of the statement to Bathurst).

It would certainly seem that the statement was untrue, but if so, it
linger ed on as a supposed reason for Lang’s journey to the colony for
many years.

The whole incident of the Morning Chronicle article becomes
very peculiar when looked at in greater detail. The purpose of its
publication was to disparage Brisbane (it is presumed that Judge Field
who had been a judge of the old Supreme Court of New South Wales, had
much to do with its composition), and therefore to be able to show how
Brisbane had invited a clergyman to the colony with promises of
support, and then to publicly rebuke him was, if true, disparagement
of the worst kind. 32 However, there is no reason to believe it was
true, except that Lang wrote of it in a letter to John Macarthur in March
1826. 33 In this letter, Lang set out what he hoped to accomplish by
coming to New South Wales, and because Macarthur had been instrumental
in organizing the Presbyterians together after Lang’s arrival, Lang
apparently felt Macarthur was owed a full explanation of his intentions,
and why he acted the way he did over the incident involving the Governor
in 1823. Early in the letter he says: "In coming to New South Wales as
a Minister of the Church of Scotland - which I did with the approbation
and concurrence of His Excellency Sir Thomas Brisbane..." This letter was written after the article had appeared in the *Morning Chronicle* (August 1824) and so, if that invitation was incorrect, one would not expect Lang to state it so unequivocally to such a person as Macarthur, and some months after the issue had been brought into the open. But then the letter was a personal one; Lang had not denied or asserted the facts publicly, and Brisbane had left the colony: thus we can only speculate upon the truth of the matter. But it could be argued that Lang had already been playing a role in politics - and certainly had soon become a leading actor on the public stage.

In our review of the factors which influenced Lang to come to the colony, we have not been able to determine any one particular reason, but instead, there appear to have been several circumstances which all played a part in directing Lang, and his family, to look to New South Wales for better prospects. The most contentious aspect insofar as Lang himself is concerned, is the supposed invitation issued to him by Sir Thomas Brisbane. Unfortunately, it does not appear to be possible to determine the accuracy of this invitation (Sir Thomas denied it), and so, as a reason for Lang's decision to come out to the colony, it can probably be discounted. Perhaps Lang found it convenient to give this reason to Macarthur, though why he did so after the episode of the *Morning Chronicle* is difficult to imagine. Again, it would be only speculation to assume
that Lang knew that Brisbane had said nothing publicly about the issues raised in that article, and therefore felt safe to say that he had been invited out by the Governor. 34 (Admittedly, the Lang and the Brisbane families were neighbours in Scotland, so it could be believed that such an invitation might be offered). But this was just an incident, and only one of many which were to form a part of John Lang's eventful life in the colony.
CHAPTER TWO

THE COLONY OF NEW SOUTH WALES IN 1823

... Australia, thine
Are adamantine walls;

(J. D. Lang)
Lang's contribution to the colony during the first twenty years of his residence was due certainly to his own character, but also to the particular conditions existing within New South Wales at the time, especially at the time of his arrival. There was a spirit of adventure, coupled with the knowledge that a man could, in most cases, decide his own destiny - even if he had been a convict. This freedom from the restraints prevalent in Great Britain enabled men to rethink their attitudes and ambitions, and to aim higher - or, as also happened, to fall by the wayside. Consequently, a greater freedom existed - a freedom which Lang was able to make use of; and characteristically, he criticised others when they did the same, especially when their application conflicted with his, or his idea of how their freedom should be used.

"[The] years between 1820 and 1840 were years [in the Australian Colonies] of great political, economic and social change." Colonial government was so constructed and maintained that all the elements in politics, the economy and social life revolved around the position of the governor. Lang's arrival coincided with the winds of change. Earl Bathurst, Secretary of State for the colonies from 1812 - 1827 fostered a policy whereby, broadly, the Church of England and a form of landed gentry were to be used to maintain stability. The situation in the colony had already shown that a system other than one of brute force was absolutely necessary; in fact it was being realised
that the colony was not just a penal settlement. Mr. Commissioner Bigge, sent by Bathurst in 1819 to investigate the condition of the colony, had confirmed those ideas previously expressed by Bathurst - ideas which in practice became known as Conservative.

Sydney Smith, the Edinburgh Review's authority on matters Australian, had proclaimed in 1819, of New South Wales:

"[i]t is a sink of wickedness, in which the majority of convicts of both sexes become infinitely more depraved than at the period of their arrival . . . As a mere colony, it is too distant and too expensive . . . a marsh, to be sure, may be drained and cultivated; but no man who has his choice would select it in the meantime for his dwelling place."

This comment, perhaps, highlights the colony's greatest problem - its continuance as a penal institution, or its gradual progression into a colony of free settlers. Lang certainly found the colony the "sink of wickedness" that Sydney Smith described. He also found that the failure to support free immigration to the colony had had devastating effects. In his Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales Lang indicated he thought that Governor Macquarie's procedure in discouraging free immigration was "... impolitic and preposterous in the extreme," and if the British Government had followed up the suggestion of Governor Phillip and encourage the immigration of persons of reputable character to the colony in its earlier days, the imbalance of convict and emancipist to free settlers would not have been so great - and furthermore the problem of inadequate grain supplies would not have occurred. But this view of the colony was Lang's view, written
moreover, in 1834. He did, however, highlight what proved to be the greatest problem in the colony on his arrival and for many years following - the clash of interests between the emancipists and the exclusives. Lang felt that had free immigration been promoted on a greater scale at an earlier period, this clash would have been mitigated - at least the emancipists would never have had sufficient numbers to play so dominant a role in colonial life.  

This political and social struggle was well under way before Lang's arrival in the Colony, but it became heightened in the twenties due to changes in the institutions of colonial government.

In the intermediate stage between autocracy and self-government, between 1823 and 1850, the governor's duties were difficult and often unpleasant. Although his first allegiance was to the Crown, he had really two masters; and in attempting to serve both, he frequently displeased both. He was the only person in the Colony who had to balance his duty to the Colony and to Britain.  

This was one facet of the governor's problems. Within the colony he had to steer a course between the two forces - emancipist and exclusive; a course which most governors found well nigh impossible to maintain without being swept towards one side or the other.

The evil of legislating for the whole community by means of a council composed of only one party is only checked by the power possessed by the head of the government.

Such was the opinion of Sir Richard Bourke, who, though holding office in the thirties, found that he had similar problems in governing the
colony as had Macquarie, Brisbane and Darling. One of the main problem areas was the relationship between the emancipists and the exclusives - and each of the governors found that he should protect the emancipists without incurring the hostility of the exclusives. To try and do this, and yet set the colony on the way to a more representative system of government was a task beyond the capabilities of any one governor.

In the twenties the emancipists were the largest free group in the colony, and whilst some of the leaders and members of the group had convict beginnings, this was not the case with the majority of supporters. What the emancipists objected to was a colonial society founded on Lord Bathurst's principles - which envisaged a form of landed gentry. The emancipist favoured wealth as a guide to social status in preference to dependance on one's background and present connections. The problem was not an easy one to see, since both groups favoured wealth as part of the social image - however, for the exclusive, wealth was coupled with power. They comprised the ruling clique in pre-Macquarie times and had established themselves on the land; new wealthy settlers were admitted as were also the important colonial officials. The exclusives had much to lose by the granting of political and social rights to ex-convicts. On the other hand, the emancipists could see no progress for the majority of the colony's inhabitants until control of colonial affairs passed out of the hands of the exclusives. It was at a crucial point in the struggle
between these two groups that Lang arrived in the colony.

Although colonial political and social problems were basically caused by the interaction of the emancipists and the exclusives, the issue which divided them, and which began to concern the ordinary member of colonial society from the twenties onward can be broadly classified as follows (although as public issues they were often interrelated) "... political authority, land policy, convict transportation, religion and education." ⁸ A brief outline of the history of each of these five issues is necessary so that Lang's attitude towards them (and he became involved with them all) can be understood in its correct perspective.

1. Political Authority

This aspect has already been considered when indicating the position held by the governor in the colony, but in general terms only. When Lang arrived in 1823, Sir Thomas Brisbane was governor, having succeeded Lachlan Macquarie in 1821.

After 1823 although the governor's executive powers remained nominally unchanged until the granting of self-government, his legislative powers were much restricted by the formation of legislative councils. Nevertheless, the governor retained great power, even in New South Wales where his power was most circumscribed, and where the attack on autocratic government was the strongest. ... in New South Wales, all governors after Macquarie had to consider well the feelings and actions of the colonists. ⁹

This change in governmental machinery effected by the New South Wales
Act, 4 Geo. IV, c.96 "... authorised His Majesty to establish the Supreme Court of New South Wales by a Charter or by Letters Patent in accordance with the terms of that statute."¹⁰ The Act was based largely on the recommendations of Commissioner Bigge, though drafted mainly by James Stephen - an expert on colonial law and then legal advisor to the Colonial Office and later in 1836 to become Permanent Under-Secretary, and Frances Forbes - who was appointed first Chief Justice of the newly created Supreme Court under the Act. The important sections of the Act dealt with the extension of trial by jury and the constitution of a Legislative Council for New South Wales. It also made New South Wales a separate state from Van Diemen's Land.

The Supreme Court was constituted under the "Charter of Justice", which was formally promulgated on 17th May 1824, the year after Lang's arrival, when Frances Forbes took the oath of office at Government House, Sydney. The Statute in effect made New South Wales a colony with a true civil, as distinct from a military, government. The Legislative Council was to consist of from five to seven persons nominated by the Crown. Its position was to be mainly advisory, since the right to initiate legislation remained with the governor, and no law or ordinance could be laid before the Council by the governor for their advice or approbation (or be passed into law) unless a copy had first been laid before the chief justice - who had to certify that the proposed law was not repugnant to the laws of England. This was designed as
a check upon the governor's authority, his absolute power being curtailed not by a Council so much as by The Machinery of Justice. An Executive Council was also created. However, there was nothing in the nature of responsible government, for the executive council was quite separate from the legislative council, although in practice some persons were actually members of both.

2. Land Policy

This question, especially during the governorship of Macquarie, became very much a political issue as a result of Macquarie's necessity to support the small farmer who, by force of circumstance, generally turned out to be the emancipated convict. Large land grants had been made by all governors up to Macquarie, but it was during his term of office that the areas available for settlement increased enormously. Macquarie had felt that some check should be kept on the growth of large estates - hence the encouragement of the small farmer. Also, the colony was never far from the fear of shortage of food, and this could most easily be remedied by the encouragement of small farmers (the distinction being that the landholder with large pastures was more interested in grazing than in cultivation).

The arrival of more and more convicts following on the end of the Napoleonic Wars caused Macquarie to wonder at the colony's food producing capabilities. Thus, by necessity, he was bound to encourage small land settlement by ex-convicts if only to grow food
required by the colony. Also, the small free settler who came out, especially in Macquarie's early years as governor, seemed to be a poor type who basically found it impossible to improve his grant, and so sold it and drifted to Sydney. Thus the failure of the home government to promote free settlement with any vigor forced Macquarie to turn to the emancipated convict as "being the most reliable description of settler, and upon whom indulgences might be expected to have the best effect - ungrateful, useless and unreliable as the majority of them may have been." So it was that in supporting the emancipated convict and in making provision for the welfare of the colony such a feature of his policy, Macquarie provided some of the fuel for the colony's future political and social conflagrations.

Commissioner Bigge had investigated land matters in the colony, and in his recommendations he advised the continuation of emancipists as small farmers only in special circumstances. As a substitute he urged the revival of public agriculture in the establishment of new convict settlements to the north. He also advised that further land grants should be made only on proof being supplied by the applicant that he could provide adequate capital for his venture. In essence, what Bigge was trying to indicate was that a form of free immigration (or at least of free land holding) should be advocated as opposed to the continued encouragement of the small emancipist settler. The task of implementing these recommendations fell to Sir Thomas Brisbane,
who on Lord Bathurst's instructions abolished the practice of granting land to ex-convicts.

Bigge also recommended the encouragement of free settlers, who should be persons of some responsibility, and not likely to become a burden to the colony. They should be granted land commensurate with the capital they could employ to develop it.

The Bigge Report had two important effects on the colony, for not only was some sanction given to political forms apart from the governor's powers, but a policy which involved the actual support of free immigration was evolved. From the Report to the actual implementation of the immigration scheme was another step indeed, but the colony was given not only a measure of importance by these decisions, it was made aware of the fact that it was to be no longer just a holding area in which convicts worked out their sentences. A separate existence, in the future at least, had been acknowledged by the home government.

3. Convict Transportation

In New South Wales in 1820, of a total of 23,939 persons, 9,451 were serving sentences (convicts); a further 5,798 were either holding pardons, had had their sentences expire or had been granted tickets of leave. Such was the composition of the colony's population,
and it indicated that the major problem in both the social and political spheres was the relationship between convict, ex-convict and non-convict. The position of the latter, though small in number, was great, as they held economic, social and political power.

In order to understand Lang's attitude towards transportation, it is necessary to gain some understanding of the social groups the convicts originally came from. F. K. Crowley indicates there were four main groups of convicts transported to the colony before 1821, and classifies them generally as follows: - the town criminals from London and other principal cities of the British Isles: the rural workers who were often compelled by poverty to commit crimes; literate convicts, albeit in small numbers, who had committed such crimes as forgery and embezzlement and were generally from the lower middle classes; and finally those few convicts who were transported for political offences. 

Convicts were employed by the government itself in agriculture, in labouring pursuits, or if the convict was a mechanic (a term used to describe brick layers, carpenters, stone masons and such like trades) he was set to work at whatever his trade. The mechanics, being specialised workmen - and generally few in number - were in greater demand throughout the colony and were able to gain a measure of independence for themselves. This was in contrast to
the more rigorous forms of discipline meted out to the ordinary convict. Living conditions were perhaps one of the worst of the convict experiences, and for those working in the road gangs, both the living and working conditions seem to have been well nigh intolerable. Living conditions were not good in Sydney either, and even Macquarie's construction of the Hyde Park Barracks did little to lessen the evils to which a convict was exposed. These evils sprang not only from poor living areas, but also from the proximity of all types of persons being congregated together regardless of the crimes committed. The position for women convicts was no less pleasant, and it was to the factory at Parramatta (a converted granary) that most of the new arrivals were first sent. Commissioner Bigge reported of his visit in 1819 that the women he saw there were "... disorderly, unruly, and licentious in appearance." 19 An important factor in both the male and female convict systems was the practice of assignment, whereby certain convicts were made the responsibility of pastoralists and other farmers. In the case of the women, many became domestic servants.

It was, however, only in the twenties that the assignment system fully developed. The evils inherent in the assignment system were realised by Macquarie, who, in a letter to Lord Bathurst dated 10th October 1823, wrote:

I have no doubt that many convicts who might have been rendered useful and good men had they been treated
with humane and reasonable control have sunk into
despondence by the unfeeling treatment of such masters. 20

"Such masters" referred to those who used convict labour on their
properties to gain the utmost benefit for the minimum outlay. The
policing of the assignment system in seeing if the minimum government
regulations were being obeyed, e.g. with regard to the supply of
rations, clothing, and for the hours of work, depended not upon any
inspection by a government officer, but upon the convict himself. He
was expected to complain, apparently, if conditions were not satisfactory.

4. Religion

According to Michael Roe: "The religious factor in
European colonisation perhaps reached its nadir in the settlement of
Australia. 21 This appears to be somewhat extraordinary, as the
convict system placed a strong emphasis on regular attendance at church
services.

Despite the great opportunity for missionary work
amongst the convicts, little was done to provide more
than the bare formalities of ritual, public prayers and
exhortation at a distance - except on the scaffolds. 22

But then we must remember that the primary object of the colony was
for penal purposes, and so no matter what personal preferences were
felt by the members of the colonial government, they could see no
immediate usefulness in promoting religion - there were troubles
enough without creating more. However, although the colony undoubtedly
adopted the Church of England as its official, though not established, religion, the first chaplain the Rev. Richard Johnson had "Moravian Methodist" sympathies. The Rev. Samuel Marsden arrived as Johnson's assistant in 1794, and after Johnson's departure in 1800, was the only official chaplain until 1809. The Church in the colony lacked funds, position in society, and undoubtedly men of culture and influence within its own ranks. Consequently, little headway was made until the more enlightened times of Governor Macquarie. As for non-government sponsored religion, this was almost completely absent. Although Roman Catholic priests were present, they were not encouraged, and dissenters were looked at askance by the governing officials. However, there existed within the colony a general apathy towards religion, and it is possible that this very apathy allowed both Roman Catholics and Protestants to live together in reasonable amity, despite the large number of Irish convicts and ex-convicts.

It was, however, from the Roman Catholic faith that the first efforts to minister to the needs of their fellows became apparent. In 1820 from Ireland came Father Therry and Father Connolly - the latter later went to Van Diemen's Land. The arrival of these two Irish Catholic priests "provoked neither anxiety nor dismay", which was surprising considering past outbursts from people such as the Rev. Samuel Marsden and even Governor Macquarie concerning the extension
of Catholic influence in the colony. The arrival of the Rev. J. D. Lang in 1823 was also a mark of the growing awareness of religion as a factor in the growth of the colony - though it is as well to note that those clergymen who arrived in the colony in the name of religion, e.g. Roman Catholic or Presbyterian - were of minority groups; and these groups, because of their strong beliefs, felt the need for pastors of their own persuasion. For the majority of the colony, the unobtrusiveness of the Church of England, linked as it was with the government of the colony, provided religion if, and only if, the inhabitants desired to search for it.

Perhaps the status of the early Anglican clergymen - as chaplains to the convicts in effect - is basically why religion became a feature to be overlooked in later colonial society: "... the practice of religion was an object of ridicule and part of the punishment", and as such it tended to linger for years as a negative force in colonial society. So it was that when free settlers began to arrive in greater numbers - e.g. from Scotland - they tended to bring with them their religious beliefs, and their desire to practice them in the colony. As Russell Ward has pointed out, the fact that the early days of the colony saw Anglican priests serving as magistrates contributed to the general distaste for religion, or as he phrased it "... hostility, or at best, indifference, to organised religion". It was only when the colony saw an increase in its free inhabitants, and a swing from the purely penal nature of its early years, that religion began to play a decisive
role in colonial life.

5. Education

Education, in the early years, was linked very closely to religion - or more particularly, to that of the Church of England. This first link came with the founding of the first three schools in the colony by the Rev. Richard Johnson in 1793. The teachers for these schools were paid by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospels. 27

Four Crown schools, financed by the government, but controlled by the Church of England, were in operation by the early 1800's. Orphan schools were established by the government in 1801, and were supported entirely by government finance, and were both for girls and boys. 28

This was a beginning. F. K. Crowley has assessed that by 1820 there were thirty schools and 844 pupils in the colony - or approximately one in seven children only were attending schools. Many - in fact most - of these schools were run by private persons, and had been since 1804. They provided an education such as, for instance, the following:

In January 1818 T. Florence announced his intention to open a boarding school for young gentlemen at 74 Pitt Street, where they would be instructed in English, Latin, Greek, Reading, Writing, Arithmetic ... Navigation and Nautical Astronomy for a fee of forty pounds per year, with extra charge for French, Italian, Fencing, Dancing, Music, and Drawing." 29

But it was not everyone who could afford to send their child to school for forty pounds a year.

Members of the Catholic faith complained to Commissioner Bigge that they had to send their children to schools (presumably public
or government sponsored schools since Governor King had refused
to let Catholic priests open their own schools as far back as 1800) at which Protestant ministers could and did extol the virtues of their own particular faith. Consequently, many Catholics did not chose to have their children educated. Various religious groups formed systems of schooling, e.g. the Auxiliary Bible Society decided on the establishment of schools for the instruction of those children whose parents could not afford to send them to private schools. In such a way education came to be closely linked with religion, and of course, this meant that religious groups waited to see what educational system the government would promote by its allocation of funds. Apart from the Church and School Corporation of the late twenties, it was not until the late thirties under the governorship of Sir Richard Bourke that a specific school system began to find favour, and to be considered as a practical measure for the benefit of the colony's children (and even this was not without its problems).

Our study of the above five topics is designed to outline the important problems which confronted the colonial authorities at the time Lang arrived. For a person whose position in colonial society obliged him to enter the realm of public affairs, some involvement with the controversy surrounding one or other of these areas was bound to occur. But for a minister of religion, especially from one of the minority religious groups, some conflict with the authorities and from
fellow colonists was almost guaranteed. John Lang within a few years of his arrival, had managed to become deeply involved in two of these areas - political authority and religion - and it was only a short space of time before education, land policy and transportation were subjected to his scrutiny, his comments and his active involvement. His initial involvement in the spheres of religion and political authority came about as a consequence of his zeal to obtain for his Presbyterian bretheren what he felt should be theirs by right - the establishment of their Church. His success with this caused him to interest himself in other colonial problems, but he was not always to be so successful as in his first venture. Born into a staunch Presbyterian family, brought up within the confines of Presbyterian teachings and trained to preach its formidable and uncompromising scriptural message, Lang could not fail to introduce those ideas into all his activities. His continued tenure as a minister of a Presbyterian Church always gave him a platform from which to broadcast his ideas. His arrival in the colony in 1823 to take up what was virtually a self-appointed office began what was to be a remarkable colonial career, and he began it at a propitious time - when the colony itself was undergoing structural changes.
CHAPTER THREE

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF

A PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA

PART I

THE PLANTING OF THE VINE

The vine which the Lord brought from Egypt, is never planted amid the sunshine of the world’s applause.
The Rev. Samuel Marsden in a letter to Lang in 1823 gave his advice on the carrying out of his calling - the ministry. In part he says:

You, my Dear Sir, are but young, just entering upon the work - Attend in time to St. Paul's advice to Timothy - this will do you good - Bear also in mind that in this world the ministers of Christ must suffer persecution . . .

It was to be a good warning from one so familiar with the colonial atmosphere, and a warning which Lang was soon to realise was not given lightly. Marsden knew the vicissitudes which could beset a minister of religion (and a magistrate) in the colony: Lang had yet to find out.

John Dunmore Lang arrived in the colony as a Presbyterian minister with the avowed object of carrying out the duties entailed in his office, and, in the initial years he spent in the colony, he was very active in establishing the forms for the religion to operate in. His early efforts entailed firstly the establishment of a church by gathering together the Presbyterians in the town of Sydney; secondly, the actual building of a church; and thirdly, obtaining recognition of that church by the colonial government. These duties involved Lang, from his first arrival in the colony, directly with the colonial government, with its officials, and with colonial society (especially its Presbyterian members). He was, to all three sections, an intruder. But he was not unwelcome - certainly not amongst those Presbyterians
who realized the need for a minister of their own persuasion. But as a minister, and the first Presbyterian one to arrive in the Sydney colony, his position was difficult. He could have established his church and performed his duties within the confines demanded by the colonial government without any difficulty. But this, as it turned out, would have meant the relegation of his religion to the position of being a second religion (or even a third if we consider the status of the Roman Catholic faith). The Episcopal Church, though never an established church as such in the colony, was in 1823 the most powerful, and in all respects the official church for those who mattered in the colony at that time.

There are many facets of Lang's first few years in the colony: the years from 1823 to 1831 saw his interest being publicly expressed mainly by his religious duties, but towards the late twenties he began to branch out into educational fields. His attitude towards the colony and its inhabitants was as clear and unequivocal in those early years as it was to be throughout his life. Every cause he espoused, he lived until it was achieved, or until he was able to determine a new course for it to follow; and he lived as though his very life depended upon the outcome of the particular cause. From the first, he had no doubts of the need to justify his actions. His establishment of the Presbyterian Church is a fine example of what was typical of his method for obtaining his cherished goals. It is no less significant for being an achievement in what was his vocation in life - the ministry. But as well, it became the forerunner, the pattern even, for the launching of
most of his schemes. It was personal conflict which seemed to predominate and act as a catalytic agent in the development of all his schemes - be they in connection with the church, education, emigration, or the many others he embarked upon in later years.

Soon after his arrival, Lang entered upon his ministerial duties, and as reported in the *Sydney Gazette* he "... unfurled the sacred banner in the old Public School Room." His first goal was the gathering together of a congregation; this in turn would be followed by the erection of the outward sign - a church building. Lang's contacts when he first arrived were by no means lacking in influence. Lang had arranged to stay with Commissary-General Wemyss, who had been instrumental in obtaining a position in the Commissariat for his brother, George. Mr. Wemyss was a leading figure in the colonial government by virtue of his position as Commissary-General, and, until Lang's arrival, was the centre of Presbyterian society in Sydney. It was Wemyss too, who had given every indication that he would support the arrival of a Presbyterian minister in the colony, as apparently this would relieve him of the burden of holding Presbyterian services himself. This, as Lang was soon to discover, was far from the case. Although Lang later indicated that, in a letter to him prior to his arrival, Wemyss had given him no intimation that Sydney was a good place, he had not
objected to what he must have realized was Lang's reason for coming to the colony - the founding of a Presbyterian Church. Therefore, when Wemyss, the leading Presbyterian, refused to lend support for a public meeting which Lang wished to have called to discuss the building of a church, a chasm opened in the way to the attainment of Lang's objective. Lang wrote in his *Narrative of the Settlement of the Scots Church, Sydney* that he proposed to Wemyss that an advertisement be placed in the *Sydney Gazette* to indicate that a public meeting be called to discuss the matter of the founding of a Presbyterian Church. Wemyss refused to support this idea, and Lang indicates in the *Narrative* that Wemyss gave as his reason that the *Gazette* was a "despicable publication", and so they should not be associated with it. Also, according to Lang, Wemyss considered that nothing could be achieved by such a meeting - "meetings[were] not expedient in the Colony." Though what was expedient was not indicated by Wemyss apparently. Thus to follow what steps were taken in the founding of the Church we are forced back to Lang's own writings, and to letters written to others, including such eminent members of colonial society as John Macarthur. It was from Macarthur that the next move towards the holding of a meeting of leading Presbyterians came.

Before considering further the organization of the Presbyterians into an active congregation, it is perhaps necessary
to attempt an understanding of Lang's attitude to what he felt was the place Presbyterianism should occupy in the colony. Even in so short a time in the colony he had, in what was to be a feature of his character throughout his life, already made a decision as to the position the Presbyterians were bound to occupy. He did not see the Anglican Church existing on a higher level; and certainly, considering the fact that the Roman Catholics had been given what amounted to formal recognition by the government when, in 1803 Governor King had allowed a transported priest (James Dixon) to celebrate Mass, the Presbyterians deserved equal recognition. This view was further enforced when in May 1820 two Catholic priests - J. J. Therry and Philip Conolly - with the permission of the government brought an increase in Catholic activity. It was expected that Protestant members of the colony would rebel against this, especially since these two were Irish Catholic priests, but according to Professor Manning Clark, all assistance was given them in their appointed tasks.

Apparently the priests were befriended by Protestants, and some even attended a meeting called to raise funds for the building of a Roman Catholic Chapel. What is more, some even decided to collect funds from fellow Protestants to aid the building appeal. So by the time Lang came to organize the Presbyterians of the colony into forming themselves into a specifically constituted religious body, he expected to receive at least similar recognition of the Presbyterians' place in the community as that accorded by the government to the Roman Catholics.
John Macarthur called a private meeting to discuss the establishment of a Presbyterian Church. The meeting was held in the house of Dr. Bowman, Principal Surgeon for the colony, and Lang believed that Macarthur had called the meeting because he had become aware of the fact that Wemyss was showing only apathy towards the making of such a move. The circumstances were such that even Macarthur would have expected Wemyss to call the initial meeting, because not only was Lang staying with him, but Wemyss's own position in the colony would have dictated it. Macarthur took the lead, and Lang, who as we observed previously had tried to interest Wemyss to make this move, was spared a conflict with the Commissary-General over this issue. But the conflict was only postponed. At the meeting Macarthur made his proposals clear - a salary of £350 for a Presbyterian clergyman (Lang) and a request from the government to contribute towards that salary. Wemyss, who attended the meeting, opposed the motion on the grounds that Lang was "a Young Man of Modish Views", and thus not fit to hold the position of a Presbyterian clergyman in the colony. The reason for such opposition on the part of so influential a man as Wemyss seems to have been caused by his espousal of the beliefs held by the Scottish National Church - in essence, he was a dissenter, and as such he wanted to see any clergyman "... in a state of complete vassalage to his congregation", In the few months acquaintance he had had with Lang, he must have become
aware of the impossibility of that particular demand being fulfilled.

It appears that Wemyss had held quite a different opinion of the place a Presbyterian minister should occupy in the colony. But it was not as though he did not want a minister, because he had been, some years previously, a leading member of the Australian Evangelical Society, whose object was to improve the morals of the colony; and this was to be achieved, in part, by the introduction of three Presbyterian ministers. But apparently that "chimerical institution soon died a natural death", and no Presbyterian minister put in an appearance until Lang arrived. 11

Wemyss's opposition had the effect of postponing indefinitely the request to the government for assistance for a salary for Lang. Consequently, Lang was forced to maintain himself, though strangely, he continued to reside with the Wemyss family. His residence there must have produced some extraordinary complications, since it cannot have been a very satisfactory arrangement. He still continued to conduct religious services, but was forced to move these from the public school room because the Roman Catholics were also using it. 12

He requested the use of the Wesley Chapel from the Wesleyan Society. A member of that Society noted on 10th September 1823, apart from approving the request from Lang, that "... Some of the most respectable persons in the Colony are Presbyterians." And continued, "Liberal
subscriptions are now raising for the erection of a Scotch Kirk." 13
This coincides with an advertisement placed by Lang in the Gazette
(apparently despite Wemyss's objections to that paper) indicating that
subscription papers were available to those "interested in the Erection
of a Presbyterian Church in Sydney." 14 Lang had apparently committed
himself to take on the organization of the church. Others could follow
should they so desire; and apparently they did, for £700 was subscribed
within a few weeks.

Lang came again into conflict with Wemyss when the
Presbyterian community decided on the strength of the £700 having
been raised through voluntary subscriptions, to memorialize the
governor asking for government assistance for the building fund.
Apparently Wemyss was in favour of the memorial, whilst Lang,
according to his own report of the matter, was not. 15 Supporters of
the memorial, however, won the day, and it was prepared and presented.
This memorial had a profound effect, as it was soon seen by members
of the governor's staff as an instrument to be used to further their own
designs. It was possible for them to represent the memorial as
being an impertinent request, and furthermore, to have the governor
himself express this opinion in his verbal reply to the memorialists.
It was through this issue, which is now to be explored, that Lang,
after only five months in the colony, found himself embroiled in a
political situation which involved not only Governor Brisbane, but the
colonial administration at its highest level. He emerged from this encounter triumphant, but it was not without its cost; Lang had made a severe impression on the colonial administration. It would appear that so long as the original goal was reached, no matter what catastrophies occurred, the end had justified the means. So it was with the fate of the memorial. Eventually it was called a triumph for Lang, because it achieved, or aided in the achievement of the Scots Church. Looked at as the first of Lang’s sallies into politics, it set a dangerous precedent, for he saw the benefits to be gained by beginning an attack at the top, in preference to using the regular channels. However, by the use of such a method, he was often to render himself a very vulnerable target - for in aiming for the top, he found he had left himself exposed for the attacks of others. Consequently, when he made an error of judgment, it was plain for all to see. However, in the present situation, as we shall see, Lang was able to make the immediate outcome a successful one - so far as the Presbyterians were concerned - in that he was able to exploit the circumstances arising from the presentation of the memorial. He showed here an ability to play a role in public, and he enjoyed the portrayal of it, although many members of colonial society failed to enjoy the performance.

The political storm gathered over the memorial previously mentioned. This memorial contained a request for assistance in the
building of a church. But, as one correspondent to the *Gazette* saw it, the address by the Presbyterians was an "... ill written, ungrammatical and injudicious production. Under the semblance of an humble address it assumes a dictatorial tone, and rather claims than prays the bounty of the Colonial Government." 16 (Admittedly, the letter was written after Brisbane had given his reply to the memorial, and Lang had made his reply to Brisbane, so the whole effect the memorial had produced was known to the writer). However, it hardly seems as though the memorial could have been regarded as so demanding in tone. The secret of its notoriety lies not in the phraseology and not in its request, but rather in the effect it had in the circles of colonial government, especially in its direct reference to the governor. By no means did the memorial and the numerous documents arising from it mark a milestone in colonial affairs, but the handling of that memorial marked the culmination of a series of incidents which, sooner or later, would have shown the ineptitude of the governor's administration.

It was Governor Brisbane's custom to live at Parramatta and to come to Sydney on one day each week in order to transact official business. Consequently, the Colonial Secretary, Major Frederick Goulburn, became in effect, the Governor's "seeing eye" and, as Brisbane had approved that official correspondence be directed to Goulburn's office first "... his [Goulburn's] grip of the public
business of the colony soon became superior to that of any one else. It was a very easy step for Goulburn from merely examining official correspondence to giving his own approval or disapproval of requests which should have been answerable by the governor alone. Such was to be the fate of the Presbyterian memorial. The memorial, being a Presbyterian document, was associated in the minds of the Colonial Executive with the leading Presbyterians of the colony - such as Commissary-General Wemyss. Even Sir Thomas Brisbane made this association, and recalling it, said to Mrs. Lang soon after her arrival in the colony in 1824:

"... for Lady Brisbane, Major Goulburn and myself have been abused by that family [the Wemyss family] in such a manner that if an Assassin had come behind us to stab us it could not have been worse." 18

If this was an example of the feeling that Wemyss produced, then no wonder that, as a leading member of the Presbyterian community, many of that body's actions were considered by reference to Wemyss. Consequently, being held in such low esteem, it might have been expected that he could become a candidate for political sacrifice by those in the colonial government not sympathetic to him. However, as matters turned out, Wemyss was no longer spokesman for the Presbyterians; Lang had assumed the task. Thus, although the government rebuff to the Presbyterians may have arisen in part because of the feeling against Wemyss, it was Lang who was
now standing in the front rank of the Presbyterians, and who in consequence, suffered the full force of the Colonial Secretary's well aimed political shaft.

The quasi-political, if one may term it such, aspect of the situation in which the Presbyterian memorial appeared seems to be indicated in a letter Lang wrote to Macarthur in 1827, in which he refers to an incident which took place before the memorial was presented. Although Lang does not mention the precise circumstance, he suggests to Macarthur that the character of Dr. Douglass, who was Superintendent of the General Hospital and Female Factory at Parramatta, was called in question; and that Mrs. Wemyss, at her husband's desire, wrote Lady Brisbane to have the governor forbid Douglass to "...come to their table or to appear at their house."¹⁹ As Douglass was a particular friend of Brisbane's, this suggestion was tantamount to telling the governor what friends he could have. In fact, on the part of Wemyss, it indicated a very restricted outlook and an impertinent interference in the governor's affairs. As Wemyss's position was a very senior one in the colonial administration, this episode, no doubt, strengthened the dislike which Brisbane felt toward him, and confirmed Major Goulburn in the opinion he already held of Wemyss and of the Presbyterian society which Goulburn felt he represented. In fact, the political atmosphere in which the
Presbyterians tendered their memorial was not a propitious one at all. But then they did not anticipate the memorial becoming so controversial an issue.

Lang's part is not an easy one to ascertain in the preparation of the memorial; but it appears to have been a minor one. Certainly in his later writings he makes it out to have been so. He does say that the memorial was prepared against his wishes. Notwithstanding this, he certainly became personally involved, and for this reason alone we should examine the basic points made in the memorial. The governor was requested to consider the following:

(i) that the Church of Scotland was an established Church in Scotland and that it had spread throughout the empire;

(ii) that the British Government supported the Church of Scotland even in parts of the Empire where the established church was the Church of England;

(iii) that, in effect, the colonial government should support the Presbyterian Church, as such support could only help the colony develop in a Christian and orderly manner;

(iv) the colonial government has already supported the Roman Catholics.

The memorial was signed, as Lang did not fail to point out in his Narrative of the Settlement of the Scots Church, by a Judge of the Supreme Court; sixteen magistrates: the Naval Officer; the Principal
Surgeon; the Surveyor General, and many others. It was a well attested document, and one which could not be lightly put aside by the government.

If what Lang maintained was true it would appear that the governor was in no way opposed to the building of the church - in fact he had entered his name and that of his family on the subscription list of the building fund for a substantial sum. Lang recorded (in a manuscript which apparently was never published and which appears to have been written after Brisbane’s death) that Sir Thomas:

... who highly approved of the object [of the church building costing £3,000] had determined to promise £1,000 to the memorialists from the Public Treasury on the condition of the raising of a similar amount by private subscription, towards which he himself had subscribed £100.

If these were in fact the circumstances, then Lang could have had no doubt of the successful outcome of the memorial, and would have had no reason later to say it was pursued contrary to his advice.

However, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the attitude taken to the memorial by the colonial secretary determined the official attitude of the governor. Where Lang obtained his information on the specific approval of the scheme is not known - it may have been that Lang took Brisbane’s general interest in the development of a presbyterian community as being one of acceptance of whatever was proposed to further that religion. However, this seems unlikely. Also, what is even as unlikely is that Brisbane, no matter what control he had
relinquished to Goulburn, would make such definite promises to Lang, and then fail to honour them when the memorial was presented. This confusion becomes evident again in the *Morning Chronicle* article referred to earlier, where it is claimed Lang showed the memorial privately to Brisbane, who assured him that the Presbyterians would receive the same liberal support the Roman Catholics had experienced on building their Chapel. 23 Also in the same article, it was claimed Sir Thomas showed Lang a copy of the reply to the memorial and that it bore no relation to the one Sir Thomas uttered publicly. Brisbane, in despatches to Bathurst, denied both these accusations, and Lang did not appear to press the point with either of them.

In fact the whole episode surrounding the memorial became most unpleasant, and the effects spread widely. Brisbane's reply, which so Brisbane himself later admitted, although not written by him, had been prepared under his specific instructions that it was to be framed politely. He says "The Presbyterians were generally thought to have acted most unreasonably[ in their demands in the Memorial] but by no means did I consider them deserving of public rebuke. " 34 As he read Major Goulburn's prepared reply he felt "... regret that it had not been expressed in more conciliatory tones. "25 This, in essence, is the point around which the whole problem of the memorial and the reply revolve. It was the desire of Goulburn and those associated with him to use the memorial to humble the Commissary-
General, and by so doing strike a blow at the "upstart" Presbyterians. What this attitude failed to take cognisance of was the fact that both Brisbane and Lang were fellow countrymen, and in a more limited degree, fellow Presbyterians. What was not expected by either Goulburn or indeed the governor, was the way in which the episode made public the real nature of Brisbane's administration, and in so doing, gave assistance to those who were opposed to him. The memorial thus spread its effects over the political, social and religious spheres of colonial life. Indirectly it lead to Brisbane's recall from office and to Lang assuming a role not only as undoubted leader of the Presbyterians in the colony, but as a public figure in his own right.

Sir Thomas Brisbane regretted the reply he made to the memorial as soon as it was uttered - in fact if reports are to be believed, he regretted it whilst he uttered those words Major Goulburn had prepared for him. For Brisbane could see that whilst the sentiments expressed may have been politic (witness a letter in the Gazette of 23rd October 1823 which was fully in agreement with what he had said) the language and the tone adopted to convey them was insulting. The Presbyterians were, naturally, furious at such a reply, but their leading members were not easily able to comment because most of them were colonial government officials, and to criticise the manner in which the governor had made his reply would have been neither ethical nor wise. Consequently Lang was, as he
said, left to "...bear the consequences of the conduct of others who again were not less ready in their turn to desert the cause with which I was connected and do everything that in them lay for its complete subversion." He was mainly directing his reference here to Wemyss, who at this stage was demanding of the governor a written personal apology for his reply to the memorial.

Lang wrote to the governor in very short terms, which had the effect of angering Brisbane to such an extent that he had his and his families' names publicly removed from the list of subscribers to the fund for the building of the Scots Church. Lang felt he had been completely deserted. He had done all in his power to further the Presbyterian cause, and as a result of the memorial with its repercussions, he found that his congregation had dwindled, and that contributions for the building fund slowed down. He himself was looked upon as having acted in no very gentlemanly fashion over the whole incident. He had reached the point where he felt he could no longer remain in the colony; but, as his parents had sold their properties in Scotland and were on their way out, he could not very well leave. So he stayed. Apparently to his surprise, even Wemyss told him he should at least await the arrival of his parents before making a final decision.

In July 1824 Lang's parents arrived, and Mrs. Lang immediately took Brisbane to task over the treatment given to the
Presbyterians. Mrs. Lang, being a very strong willed and forthright person, had no hesitation in confronting Sir Thomas and requesting that he explain his actions. Sir Thomas told her he regretted his reply to the memorial, but he had left himself no official way in which he could withdraw the remarks he had made; a situation which had become worse as a result of Lang's letter criticising him on the tenor of his reply. Because Mrs. Lang had known the Brisbane family for many years, she seemed able to meet Sir Thomas on equal terms, and being also a very outspoken lady, she apparently took no cognisance of Sir Thomas's position as governor and delivered herself of her opinions on the whole matter. For Brisbane, as we have seen earlier, blamed the extent of Lang's misfortunes upon Wemyss - a person with whom he, Brisbane, would not come to terms. So it would seem that both Lang and Brisbane had been the victims of circumstance; Brisbane, Goulburn and Dr. Douglass ranged against Lang, Wemyss and the Presbyterians. An unfortunate encounter, more political than religious in its nature, and of far wider implication than merely the establishment of a Presbyterian Church. In retrospect it seems as though Lang's insistence in pressing the Presbyterian claims after Brisbane's reply and the subsequent recriminations culminating in the article in the *Morning Chronicle* of 19th August 1824, played an important part in the decision made in London to recall Brisbane and appoint a new governor.
Before discussing that issue, it is interesting to note that Lang made a supreme effort to win Brisbane back to the Presbyterian cause - not that he was forced to try so hard, the difficulty being mainly one of how to reconcile the governor's previous words with those resulting from his changed attitude. For the success of this, we must recognize the influence of Mrs. Lang. It was with the laying of the foundation stone in July 1824 for the Scots Church that the governor officially became reconciled to the aims of the Presbyterians in the colony. But the problem of Commissary-General Wemyss remained. Lang could neither forgive the Commissary his actions during the few years he had been in the colony, nor could he forget them. Wemyss, in the guise of a friend of the Presbyterians, had rendered great disservice to the cause. The precise reasons behind Mr. Wemyss's various actions are rather difficult to determine. In the first place, as we have already discovered, the Wemyss family was "obnoxious to the Colonial Executive", and Brisbane once described him as "an honest man, but full of weakness, caprice and malevolence", and moreover he was one who did not favour a scheme unless it had originated with himself. Consequently, while no doubt wishing to have a Presbyterian minister present in the colony, he did not wish for one of Lang's capabilities; one who, in effect, supplanted him as head of the Presbyterian community. This attitude would account for his harsh treatment of Lang when Lang was in favour with the colonial government, and for the extremely liberal and
sympathetic attitude he adopted when Lang and Sir Thomas were in opposition to each other. It seems that both Sir Thomas and Lang found it difficult to determine precisely what motivated the Commissary-General's actions, but Lang possibly came near to the truth when he considered that it was often Mrs. Wemyss who influenced her husband in these matters, and it appears she was able to enlist the aid of people such as Mr. James Elder, whose Presbyterian beliefs were nearer to those expressed by the Wemyss family than were Lang's. Mr. Elder, once a missionary, was now "useful to the Wemyss family as a collector of colonial scandal," and Lang accused him, after promptings from Mrs. Wemyss, of sowing discord amongst his congregation, and of trying to represent him as an imposter. Lang's feelings towards Wemyss are well expressed in bitter and sarcastic prose in the Narrative (written ostensibly to outline the formation of the Presbyterian Church in Australia, but one suspects it was aimed rather to highlight the actions of one man, Wemyss, as the villain of the piece). Speaking of his success in being able to persuade the governor to attend at the laying of the foundation stone of the Church, Lang points out that Wemyss failed to appear at the ceremony due, so Wemyss indicated, to pressure of business. Lang says, "... He remained in the commissariat office, busily engaged about some trivial concern of provisions or slop clothing for some penal settlement or gaol-gang,
while a hopeful scion from the vine which the Lord brought forth from Egypt was planting on the shores of Australia." The following month Lang left for England on business connected with the new church.
CHAPTER THREE

PART II

THE GROWTH OF THE VINE

And those who should sit under its shadow with the greatest delight are often the first to lay the axe to its roots.
Before his departure, Lang inserted an advertisement in the *Gazette* informing subscribers "that £960 has been subscribed for the Scots Church to date." During 1824 there had been meetings of subscribers to the fund, and in August a Constitution of the Scots Church was approved by the members. So it was that church organisation was well under way by the time that Lang decided to go to England. Lang's ostensible reason for making the trip was to further the cause of a memorial which had been prepared for presentation to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for government assistance for a salary for a Presbyterian minister. This memorial had the full approbation of Sir Thomas Brisbane who, in a despatch of 14th August 1824 urged Lord Bathurst that favourable consideration be given to the Presbyterian memorialists' requests. In part he says "... from my Personal Knowledge of the High respectability of the Rev. John D. Lang and from the impression of Your Lordship's Liberal Consideration for the Roman Catholic Priests..." The mention of the priests harks back to a section of the memorial presented to Sir Thomas by the Presbyterians the previous year. He must have been impressed with the comparison to find it worthy to be used in his own despatch. It was notable of this latter memorial that it did not bear the signature of Commissary-General Wemyss amongst those subscribing to it. In fact, as Lang in the *Narrative* points out, Wemyss would not sign it, though given an opportunity to do so. Apparently Wemyss actually penned a note
to Lang declining to sign, and then put it about that he was not given
the opportunity. So Lang, always ready to defend his own actions,
wrote him on the eve of his departure for England indicating to him
just what had happened in case his memory needed to be refreshed
on certain points.

Although much of the information available for this latter
period of the establishment and building of the Presbyterian Church
comes from Lang's own writings (especially his *Narrative*) it cannot
be said that his view is more than normally one-sided. There is no
doubt that in the *Narrative* he waged a vendetta against Wemyss, but
in all truth he referred only to actual situations. Perhaps it would
have been more Christian of him to have toned down the scale of his
attack. Certainly the establishment of the church was fraught with
extraordinary problems; and Mr. Wemyss was undoubtedly one of the
greatest, having been an original supporter turned critic.

As an indication of the opposition encountered amongst
the Presbyterians of the colony, the following points made in a
letter written by Mr. James Elder will serve as an illustration.
Mr. Elder was a subscriber to the original memorial to Sir Thomas
Brisbane, but had leagued himself with Wemyss - to use Lang's own
terminology, they were both dissenters. Briefly, Mr. Elder's
letter given to Lang upon his going aboard ship to return to England
in August 1824 made the following points: -
(i) that Lang was not properly qualified by education for the office of a Christian minister;
(ii) that he had not been properly ordained;
(iii) that on his return to Scotland he would not be recognized by any university or presbytery. (It is interesting to note that his old university - Glasgow - honoured him with a doctorate at the particular request of Dr. Stevenson Macgill, Glasgow University's Professor of Divinity in 1825);
(iv) that he had been instrumental in drawing up a constitution for the Scots Church which was repugnant to the Church of Scotladd;
(v) that he was a person of mercenary disposition who studied for his own aggrandisement only. 36

Lang did not consider the letter worthy of a reply.

Lang travelled to London not only to represent the memorial to Lord Bathurst, but to endeavour to recruit another minister for the colony. A group of Presbyterians had settled earlier in the century at Portland Head, and had built themselves a church; they now requested that Lang find them a clergyman. In this connection he was successful, and the Rev. John McGarvie was ordained as minister of Portland Head by the Presbytery of Glasgow in September 1825.
Lang succeeded in his mission to Lord Bathurst also.

Upon his arrival in London he wrote to the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Robert Horton, and requested government support to ensure the future of the Scots Church in Sydney. He complained of the unfortunate opposition of the colonial government, indicating that Sir Thomas Brisbane now espoused what he formerly opposed. 37

A reply came from Horton on 25th January 1825, offering a government grant towards the erection of the church, or a salary for its minister. Also a formal regret of the remarks made by Sir Thomas was expressed. 38 Lang replied that he thought Presbyterians would prefer a salary for their minister, and put forward as his reason that the payment of a salary by the government was a pledge of faith in the Presbyterians. 39 Lang was shown by Horton a copy of Bathurst's despatch to Brisbane (dated 16th August 1824) which concerned the Presbyterian memorial. Bathurst directed Brisbane to advance from the Police Fund one-third of the cost of the erection of the Scots Church; he also severely rebuked Brisbane on his handling of the original Presbyterian memorial. Thus, by the time Lang was ready to return to the colony, he found he had achieved all he had hoped - and even more. He could return having been successful in his dealings with the British Government, and having been honoured by his old university. There is no doubt that Lang had become a public figure in the colony by this period, for he had, as leader of the
Presbyterians, confronted the governor and appealed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies; he had caused the governor to show a public change of policy towards the Presbyterians; and he had, as well, been instrumental in causing Bathurst to review the governorship of Sir Thomas Brisbane, and to find it wanting. It must have been with a great sense of achievement that he set sail to return to the colony.

Whilst absent from Sydney, several incidents of interest took place, which were aimed apparently at undermining his influence over the Presbyterians of the colony. Firstly, news of Bathurst's granting of a salary to Lang - news which preceded his return - caused an outburst amongst those desirous of seeing him removed from his office. The Gazette published an article indicating that his congregation was displeased. The inference seems to have been that the money would have been better placed at the disposal of the church building fund. But, as Lang later pointed out, since his relatives had been the only ones who had volunteered to become responsible for the debt on the building "... there was no ground for dissatisfaction on the part of any individual of my congregation". Secondly, the Rev. McArthur came over from Van Diemen's Land whilst Lang was absent, and stayed with the Wemyss family. He preached to Lang's congregation, but apparently Mrs. Wemyss and Mr. Elder (the "renegade missionary" according to Lang, and the same person mentioned earlier who had sent the letter to Lang before his departure for England) were able to exert their influence upon him
against Lang. So powerful was this influence that, although he
preached for some three months to Lang's congregation, he failed
to mention Lang, the work he was doing for the establishment of the
church, or even the actual building of the church at all during the
whole of that period. 41

There was one other incident which occurred during Lang's
absence which appears to have had a most profound effect upon him,
and that was the death of his brother George. It becomes very difficult
to gauge the full extent of the effect of this upon him, but it certainly
occupied a great deal of his thoughts. This is evident from the Narrative,
where he blames Wemyss quite openly for George's death. Apparently
George, to be near his family and to render more active service to
the Scots Church whilst Lang was absent, requested from Wemyss a
transfer from Parramatta (where he was in the Commissariat Office)
to Sydney. Wemyss moved him instead to Windsor. George Lang
tendered his resignation, but Wemyss refused to accept it. It was
then agreed, so John Lang tells us, that George should only stay
some three months at Windsor. But that time came, and passed,
and still no word of a move from Wemyss. George attempted to
resign again in December 1824, but soon after he fell ill, and died
in the following month. 42 John Lang, in a letter to John Macarthur
referred to an unfeeling statement made to him by Mr. Wemyss on the
death of one of their own children, and Lang felt that the Commissary-
General had shown the same attitude in the "case of my late Brother,
whose spirit had been crushed by the petty tyranny of Mr. Wemyss
and whose memory he had endeavoured to load with ungenerous
insinuations by withholding his pay." There is no doubt that the
dearth of his brother affected Lang deeply, and influenced his attitude
to Wemyss. Indirectly, it led to the writing of the Narrative, a work
which sets out to justify his actions concerning the Presbyterian
community from his arrival in the colony. In so doing, he also
successfully persecuted those who had opposed him in any way - unless
they had later repented of their former actions, as had done one notable
example, Sir Thomas Brisbane.

The Narrative, which has been mentioned at various times
in the preceding pages, is worth more than merely a fleeting mention.
It was published in 1828, and marks both the heights and the depths
of Lang's early years in the colony. Unfortunately no credit accrues
him for having written it; yet the vicissitudes he encountered in
endeavouring to establish and build the Scots Church did warrant
general dissemination. The Narrative would have been admirable
had it been merely confined to the latter. However, Lang sought to
discredit all who had opposed him, and especially to condemn Mr.
Wemyss. The following passage is indicative of the theme of
justification on his own part and condemnation of the part played by
others which permeates a work which runs to over one hundred pages.
Lang was accused by Mr. Commissary Moodie (of Van Diemen's Land,
and a staunch Presbyterian) of ingratitude towards Mr. Wemyss, and
answered as follows:—

The author does not deny that he was indebted to Mr. Wemyss
for the salt of his hospitality and the shelter of his roof,
though his residence in that gentleman's family was the origin
of all the difficulties which the Scots Church was doomed to
experience. At the same time in estimating the extent of his
obligation to Mr. Wemyss . . . the author had not come to this
Colony as a mere speculator in land and cattle, in which case
the Commissary's friendship would have been entirely an
affair of personal and private obligation. He[the author]
has uniformly shown that he had no private interests to drive
in the Colony, apart from those of the Scots Church, for although
Sir Thomas Brisbane twice expressed willingness to give a
grant of 2,000 acres . . . he neither would nor did apply; for,
remembering the Scripture declaration, "The Lord is the
inheritance of the house of Levi" he conceived that it would
have been highly inconsistent with his clerical character, to
take advantage of his own favourable circumstances by enriching
himself, while the Lord's House, which he had come hither to
build, continued to lye waste. 44

Interestingly enough, he was granted 1,280 acres of land in 1828! 45

The latter point Lang makes in the above quotation, that of
enriching himself, is interesting inssofar as land so acquired could
conceivably have been used as security for obtaining a loan for the
building of the church. This is not meant to indicate that Lang was
unduly tight-fisted, but where money was concerned, Lang evinced a
total lack of knowledge of the rudiments of finance; yet he was by no
means unaware of the necessity for it! He exhibited an attitude towards
money matters which bordered on the chaotic - he did not wish to appear materialistic, yet he was unable to bring his plans to fulfilment without appearing to desire money. One is conscious of a feeling when he writes that finance should have been available for his every need, and if not, then he finds reason to condemn, in no polite manner, those whom he felt ought to have given freely to his cause.

The Narrative brought Lang again into conflict with authority, and this time it was with Governor Darling. The governor, in a despatch to Sir George Murray in November 1828 had occasion to refer to the Narrative because Mr. Wemyss had gone to England and undoubtedly intended to pursue the matter of the uncomplimentary references Lang made to him. Understandably enough, Darling did not wish to become involved, but he comments that the Narrative

... is written in a spirit very unbecoming to the character of a Minister of Religion and I must say, in the circumstances of the case, appears to me to evince a disposition on the part of Dr. Lang not very creditable to him even as a Man. 46

Darling, in the same despatch, goes on to relate that if he had not been misinformed, Lang arrived originally "... with some Relations, possessing only the slenderest means of support". Darling had been misinformed; which in itself is a certain justification for Lang to feel that he had to write the Narrative to clarify the facts concerning his stewardship of the Presbyterian cause. However, in so doing, it was not wise for him to bring so much emphasis to bear on Mr. Wemyss's public and private life. In doing this Lang may have gained himself a
certain notoriety, but it revealed a dangerous facet of his character to those with whom he was associated, and that was who, if they should offend him, would be next to suffer such treatment.

The *Australian Quarterly Journal* in its review of Lang's Narrative summarizes its findings thus:

In taking leave of the Narrative before us, we cannot but think, that had a veil been thrown over the failings of another . . . our author, we think, might have contented himself with gratefully reflecting on the present comparatively flourishing condition of himself and his Church. To forgive and forget an injury, whether private or public, whether real or suppositional, has in it something most Christian-like and noble. 47

In a despatch from Under Secretary Twiss to Darling in September 1829, the following appears:

Sir George Murray trusts that in future Dr. Lang will confine himself to his proper function of furthering the principles and practices of that peaceful religion of which he has been the chosen Minister. 48

Darling was requested to convey these thoughts to Lang. So ended the foundation period of the Presbyterian Church in Australia. Lang had established and built the church; he had in so doing been intolerant of opposition, and in many respects was as much the sower of discord as was Wemyss whom he had accused of doing just that. Truly, those who should sit under the shadow of the vine are often the first to lay the axe to the roots. 49 Lang, by being so public with his efforts at self-justification, was proving also a threat to the stability of his church.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANG'S INTEREST
IN EDUCATION 1826-1831

AND HIS EMIGRATION VENTURE OF 1831

The time of excitement is always the time for action

PART I

ACTIVITIES IN NEW SOUTH WALES
A Presbyterian education in its broadest sense consisted both of religious instruction and of a formal education conducted under the system of the Parish Schools. Lang had grown up through this educational system, so it was not surprising that one of his ambitions was to establish a similar system to operate in New South Wales. For Lang, education and religion were always closely allied. So, it was not surprising that soon after he commenced the establishment of a Presbyterian Church in the colony, he attempted to develop a basic form of the Parish School. But his educational ventures were not very productive until his Australian College opened its doors in 1831.

Upon his return from England in 1826, Lang found that an institution entitled the Sydney Public Free Grammar School had been planned and formed during his absence. The Chief Justice, Francis Forbes, and John Macarthur were notable members of its committee, and Dr. Halloran was its headmaster. It was Dr. Halloran who had submitted proposals for just such an institution to the governor some time previously, and now he was in control of a school which embodied his educational ideas. He was a person of the utmost respectability, but had forged a franc note for himself and his family in a moment of desperation, and was transported for seven years in 1818. There was no doubt amongst those on the school's committee as to Halloran's ability as an educationalist, but some doubt
was expressed as to the wisdom of appointing him headmaster, 
mainly on the ground of his being an emancipated convict. The 
school closed, however, in the latter part of 1826, and Halloran 
found himself in debtors’ prison. Lang, because he could not 
abide Halloran, described the career of the Sydney Public Free 
Grammar School in his History as being “short and inglorious.”
A few months after the formation of that school, the Church and School 
Corporation was inaugurated. This body proved a great source of 
irritation to Lang; but it provided him with a constant source of 
material for his attacks on the government with the object of promoting 
his own college.

The scheme for the Church and School Corporation was 
developed in 1824 at the Colonial Office and, amongst its aims which 
concerned mainly the Church of England clergy, was that of the 
education of the colonial youth based on the principles of the Church. 
The members of the Corporation were eminent citizens, and included 
the Governor: the Chief Justice: the Archdeacon of New South Wales: 
the members of the Legislative Council and nine senior chaplains. 
The funds to establish and maintain the Corporation were to come from 
a grant of one-seventh in the extent and value of all the lands in each 
county in New South Wales. This method of finance proved to be 
virtually unworkable, as many of the counties were not surveyed. 
Until this was carried out, it was impossible to determine either the 
extent or the value of the lands to be set aside for the maintenance
of the various church and school establishments. Lang, naturally enough, took exception to the favoured position of the Church of England in this venture. That church was not an established church in the colony, though to him this legislation gave the impression that it was to be so regarded.

The appointment of Archdeacon Scott, who had brought the Corporation's Charter with him from England in 1825, was not at all favourably received in the colony. In 1819 he had visited the colony as secretary to Commissioner Bigge, during the latter's investigations into the state of the colony, and was therefore associated with Bigge's report. This report was looked upon by the more radical (emancipist) members of the colony as being detrimental to their avowed aims. So, upon discovering that Scott was to be the colony's first archdeacon, and also that he had masterminded the plan of the Church and School Corporation, this group felt he would doubtless ally himself with such colonial families as the Macarthurs and other wealthy landowners, and would eventually form one of the Governor's supporters. Apart from the emancipist prediction was the effect the appointment had on the Church of England clergy and on the clergy of the other religious groups. It antagonised them all. Perhaps Scott's vocation was for holy orders, but for the Colonial Office to return him to the colony in this guise, when only several years previously he had acted as
secretary to Bigge in a far from popular investigation, was perhaps unwise. As a consequence, Scott encountered many difficulties which possibly would not have arisen under another appointment. The Church and School Corporation was no more enthusiastically received, and although it would never have proved popular, it might have enjoyed greater success had not Scott been both its author and its administrator. Strong objections were made against the Corporation by the Presbyterians and the Roman Catholics, and as spokesman for each, neither Dr. Lang nor Father John Joseph Therry respectively was afraid to speak his mind against the objects of the Corporation, or accept Anglican domination imposed through the existence of such an organisation. In fact Father Therry launched a vicious attack on what he called this "... odious, irreligious and unjust system." So vicious was this attack considered that Darling informed Lord Bathurst that he should be removed, and although dismissed in consequence, Father Therry refused to leave the colony.

Lang agreed wholeheartedly with Father Therry's opinion of the Corporation, but surprisingly, was more circumspect in his criticism. To his obvious delight, the Corporation had failed to achieve its objects by 1829. In fact, by 1828 it was virtually at a standstill, since it had not been placed in possession of any of the lands promised to it. In that year it was on the advice of Chief Justice Forbes that the Corporation's Trustees requested the Governor
to grant some of the lands reserved for the colonial government's own use to the Corporation. This was done, but by May of 1829 Sir George Murray informed Governor Darling that he had advised that the Letters Patent by which the Corporation had been established would be revoked. It was not until 1833 however, that the Corporation was formally dissolved.

In the various editions of his History, Lang makes some very fair criticisms of the Corporation. For example, he believed the main reason for the formation of the Corporation was to relieve the government of the burden of supporting the Anglican Church and the Church Schools. However, what actually happened was that the Corporation was supported mainly by Treasury grants. This came about because the lands supposedly set aside for the Corporation's use could not be satisfactorily determined, and hence no revenue accrued to the Corporation. The effect of the scheme - as Lang delighted to point out to his readers - was that the colony was burdened by the need to make annual grants to enable the Corporation to carry out its projects; and as well, the colony had to pay the costs associated with the Corporation's management. Altogether, Lang maintained, the costs far exceeded those of the previous system, and little of lasting benefit was obvious to the colonists. In fact, Lang charged the Corporation with having had more harmful effects upon the colony than would have resulted had it not been formed. The
harm done, according to Lang, can be summarized as follows:

(i) the Corporation identified the Episcopal clergy with secular pursuits;

(ii) it caused dissatisfaction amongst immigrants who, because of the Corporation's claims to land, were forced into the interior of the colony to find land for settlement. This fact was aggravated even further when it became clear that most of the land which the Corporation did claim remained unused;

(iii) it excited a spirit of dissatisfaction in the native born youth of the colony, and perhaps sowed the seeds of future rebellion. 10

It seems as though Lang could hardly say a good word for the Corporation. This is not surprising, for the system was not only badly based financially, but was imposed by the Colonial Office without any reference to the colonial government. In theory, it could have been of great assistance in the development of education, but unfortunately the practical needs both of the colony and for the administration of the Corporation itself had been badly estimated.

The particular efforts Lang made on his own behalf for the establishment of educational institutions began, as we have mentioned, in 1826 upon his return to Sydney after his first voyage home. Lang's school, based on the parish schools of Scotland, was to be called The Caledonian Academy and according to the prospectus Grammar Lang issued, was not to be confused with the Sydney Public Free/School.
The Academy was a primary school, but unfortunately the colony was not at that time ready to sustain a school based upon Scottish academies in which "... each of the more important branches of education [was] taught in a separate classroom by a different master." Also, the Bible was to be read daily and lessons were to commence and close with prayers. Despite these requirements, Lang was at pains to indicate that no attempt was to be made to proselytise any Protestant catechism would be taught at a parent's request! The Academy did not last for long. Perhaps its aims were too ambitious, and also at this time Lang was still very much involved with the problems arising from the establishment of the Presbyterian Church. To implement fully his aims for the academy needed a considerable amount of free time, and this was not available to him. But he had at least made known to the colony his interest in education.

In 1826 an attempt was made to revive Dr. Halloran's Sydney Free Grammar School under the name of the Sydney College by Dr. William Bland, an ex-convict, a leading colonial liberal and medical practitioner, who enlisted the aid of the Chief Justice for the project. Shares of £50 each were to be offered to those interested. However, due to the financial situation in the colony caused by a serious drought the previous year, the proposal was left in abeyance for a later public meeting, which did not eventuate until 14th January 1830. Lang, naturally, was very interested in the proposal and decided to act upon it. He states in his History that,
because of the proposed secular nature of the Sydney College he, as a minister of the Presbyterian Church, would rather join with the Episcopal Church in any educational venture than with the sponsors of the Sydney College. Consequently, he approached Archdeacon Broughton (who had arrived in the colony in September 1829 to succeed Archdeacon Scott) to see whether he intended to follow any particular plan regarding colonial education. As it happened, Broughton did have some ideas based on fair and liberal principles. Broughton believed that religion should form the basis of all education, and with this in mind, he drew up a plan for a day school in Sydney, and a similar school to operate in Parramatta for boarders. The schools were to be called King's Schools, and, as Professor Manning Clark has pointed out, Broughton hoped that those who attended these schools would be sons of the wealthy members of colonial society as the schools were to charge fees. If this was the case, then the finished pupil would be fit scholastically (as well as economically) to occupy a position of importance in the colony.

Lang, though he spoke with Broughton on educational matters, was not told details of the plan for these schools; Broughton merely indicated to him that he had an idea which he hoped the government would finance. Having been told only that, Lang considered that the educational situation was not a promising one, and that there was no real guarantee that the Presbyterians would be allowed to unite with the Episcopalians on equal terms in an educational venture. This
was borne out when the King's School proposals were announced, and they were, as Lang phrased it, "thoroughly and exclusively Episcopalian". Throughout these various attempts to join with others in educational ventures, Lang showed unusual restraint and co-operation, especially when it is realised that education was one of his major interests, probably ranking next to his involvement with the Presbyterian religion. When one has read even a small amount of Lang's writings, one becomes aware that when he exercises restraint there must be a good practical reason, and in the present instance that reason appears to have been finance. His church was in debt, and he also as a consequence. No money was available to finance a school on the principles he required, and so, if he was to be connected with the promotion of high educational standards, the only way seemed to be to join with others who exhibited similar feelings towards the importance of education.

Although Archdeacon Broughton did not announce his plans for the King's School either publicly, or to Lang, he apparently was under the impression that Lang would support whatever proposals he put forward. However, whilst Broughton was under this delusion, Lang had already arrived at the conclusion that if he was to promote education he could not join with any other body than the group of colonists who wished to establish the Sydney College. The problem of co-operation in this venture for Lang was one of religious teachings, and he apparently thought he could use his influence more effectively
to gain his own ends through the non-denominational membership of the Sydney College supporters than he could hope to influence the Archdeacon. But ever hopeful of obtaining his own institution, and as a last attempt before having to join with others in forming a school, he and some Presbyterian friends decided to memorialise General Darling with the following proposals:

(i) that he and his friends desired to form an Academical Institution to be conducted on the principles of Higher Schools and Colleges of Scotland;

(ii) that to do this they requested an allotment for the Academy's building;

(iii) should an allotment be granted then Lang and his family would guarantee £1,000 towards the buildings.

The Governor's reply was swift, and very explicit. No such allotment would be granted; the reason seemed to be that Darling thought the Presbyterians had already received enough aid from the government. 15 After this rejection, Lang felt he had investigated all possibilities, and the only avenue remaining in which he had a chance to use his influence was with the Sydney College. So he attended its meeting set down for 14th January 1830, and duly became a shareholder after payment of his £50.

Although he undoubtedly had misgivings as to the wisdom of joining with the Sydney College, once the decision had been made,
Lang entered enthusiastically into the undertaking. This attitude towards various causes and activities was to become typical of him in later years; it seemed as though whatever cause he sponsored, he had to make his own point of view public knowledge, and if possible ensure it became a policy to be implemented. So it was with regard to the Sydney College. He suggested changes in the college constitution at the first meeting he attended, and these were accepted. He was also elected to its standing committee. The effect the knowledge of Lang's interest in this college had upon Archdeacon Broughton was immediate.

In a letter to Lang of 16th January 1830 he complained that he had already discussed with Lang the fact that he was devising a system based on true religious principles; principles with which Lang had indicated were indispensable for a Christian education. Broughton maintains he could not understand how Lang could lend his support to an institution in which the Bible was to be used without comment, and in which no religious instruction was to be given. However, Lang had apparently discovered that the organisation of the Sydney College was of such a nature that he would be in a more favourable position to exercise his influence, perhaps even to dominate, than would have been the case in the scheme Archdeacon Broughton was about to propose.

Imbued with enthusiasm, Lang and the other members of the Sydney College committee wasted no time in launching their venture upon the not untroubled waters of colonial society. They arranged for
Chief Justice Forbes to officially lay the foundation stone for the college buildings on 26th January 1830 - a date which was becoming a notable one in the colonial calendar. The Chief Justice made a "neat, pithy, brief and appropriate speech", and then Dr. Lang "delivered with much natural fervency and pathos, a rather lengthy invocation for the blessing of Providence on the infant institution." Lang then set about the acquiring of plans so that the college could be built as soon as possible. He even engaged a Scottish architect for the purpose, and referred to members of his own family for advice. In fact, at a building committee meeting in April, Mr. Samuel Terry and Mr. Simeon Lord suggested to Lang that his father should be invited to attend the next meeting. Unfortunately, as circumstances dictated, Mr. Lang was not able to attend. He had been living with Dr. Lang's brother, Andrew, in the Hunter Valley (where both brothers had received land grants from the government) and had set sail from Newcastle to attend the meeting, but the boat on which he was a passenger was lost, together with all aboard, in a gale which sprang up. This misfortune altered Lang's attitude towards the Sydney College, and it also changed his plans for co-operation with others in matters educational.

Lang and his relations "... considered this calamitous event (the death of Mr. Lang, senior) as divine intimation that my connection with the Sydney College ... was in some way not pleasing to Almighty God." Archibald Gilchrist points out that Lang often made it a
habit to hide behind God when guilty of indefensible decisions: and the circumstances surrounding his departure from the committee for the Sydney College were not easily explained. So far as can be ascertained, his withdrawal seems to have been influenced by the funds which became available as a result of his father's death. This knowledge, together with his known preference for establishing his own educational organization, caused him to consider forming his own college without any outside help. It should be noted that he did not withdraw immediately from the Sydney College, but rather he gave up leadership of those who were anxious to have the buildings commenced. With his departure, the other members of the college committee seemed to lose their desire for action, and as they were not prepared to exert themselves, very little was done to promote the college, by either completing the buildings or by beginning an educational programme.

Despite the fact that the Almighty was displeased, Lang continued to attend meetings of the college committee, but he was gradually withdrawing from that association altogether. He had consulted John McGarvie (his only fellow minister) and other friends who, he says, were of the opinion he should abandon the Sydney College and form his own. It was with this object in mind, and with the excuse for the necessity to settle his father's affairs, that he obtained leave of absence from Governor Darling. He left for England on 14th August 1830.
CHAPTER FOUR

PART II

ACTIVITIES IN ENGLAND
Lang was a very dedicated educationalist, and when he realized it was possible for him to form his own college, he took great care to secure the maximum benefits available for it. This meant he had to be sure of receiving approval for the college on his own terms, and he knew this would be impossible if he had to present them to Governor Darling, as this had already been tried with the petition of 1828. So he departed from Sydney with the object of personally submitting his proposals for a college to the Secretary of State for the Colonies - Sir George Murray. However, by the time of his arrival in England Wellington's government had fallen, being replaced by Earl Grey as Prime Minister, and Viscount Goderich became Secretary of State for the Colonies. This was indeed fortunate for Lang as it had been Sir George Murray who, acting upon Darling's advice, had refused to accede to the educational proposals in Lang's memorial of 1828. Lord Goderich apparently took a different view, for not only did he give approval for Lang's educational scheme, but also for an emigrational experiment as well. These proposals revealed two quite separate interests on the part of John Lang, those of education, and the then little known one of emigration. However, in this instance they were indicative of his increasing involvement, perhaps unwittingly, in the public affairs of the colony, though at this time he probably had little idea how much further he was bound to pursue these emigrational ideas. With this, as with many of his undertakings, he developed
numerous variations of the original idea until eventually they accumulated, and often swept him unprepared, into treacherous waters. In this instance the waters were not as yet so treacherous, and the request made of Lord Goderich was his first attempt to act on his own behalf outside the colony, and outside of his ministerial duties. This instance also demonstrates how Lang was able to consolidate his ideas and arrive at a course of action; and is especially interesting since it appears that when he left Sydney his only goal was to enlist support (either private or government) for his college. It was during the voyage that he formulated his emigrational scheme, circumstances which were to be repeated several times over the following ten years, since it appears to have been during these various journeys to England that he was able to determine his aims and ideas, and produce sufficient material to assist his numerous projects.

Lang approached Lord Goderich firstly with his proposals for education, which outlined the nature of the instruction to be given and the teaching staff and buildings which the Australian College would require. Secondly he set out his ideas with respect to emigration, which briefly suggested that the government sponsor the emigration of mechanics to the colony. These mechanics would, in the first instance, find work in the building of the Australian College. It seems to have been for this purpose that Lang conceived the whole emigrational
scheme — in the first instance, at least. Upon the arrival of the mechanics in Sydney a loan of £6,000 was to be advanced by the Colonial Treasury to assist the building of the college.  

Lord Goderich seems to have wholeheartedly supported the Australian College proposals, seeing by them an independent effort being made to educate the colonial youth. In fact, it must have appeared as a ray of hope, for what with the fiasco of the Church and School Corporation, Lord Goderich must have been wondering what educational systems existed within the colony, and who was responsible (or would accept responsibility for) them. For this reason, perhaps, Lang received better treatment than would normally have been accorded one in his position. However, Goderich declined to offer the government as a sponsor for the emigration of mechanics, but had no objection to this being carried out by some interested organisation, if Lang could locate such a body. Also, he thought the Colonial Treasury may have difficulty if it was forced to bear the whole of the £6,000 loan for the college. Therefore he authorised that payment of £3,500 be made forthwith to Lang in London, the remainder to be granted by the Colonial Treasury. Lang, having achieved his objectives in London, set off for Scotland to recruit masters for the new college. These he obtained on the advice of Dr. Chalmers and several other interested people.

Unfortunately he was unable to interest anyone or any organisation
in the sponsoring of his emigration scheme, though he tried in Scotland, and in London as well. Eventually he found it necessary to take the responsibility for the project upon himself. He discovered that Alan Ker & Co. of Greenock would make all arrangements for him, and that a vessel, the Stirling Castle was available for charter. It was also necessary to obtain Lord Goderich's approval for this revised plan - approval which was freely given. This meant that not only did Lang have all the organizational matters of the Australian College to attend to, but as well those which now arose as a consequence of undertaking the emigration of the mechanics himself. This involved him in the problem of the financial arrangements of both undertakings, and finance was an area in which he was prone to be very disorganized, and though undoubtedly scrupulously honest, he often failed to keep satisfactory records to prove this honesty with the money entrusted to him by others.

It is interesting to note that, although much emphasis has been placed on Lang's sponsorship of emigration, this first effort of his was not an original idea. Robert Horton (who was Under Secretary of State for the Colonies) in a letter to Lang in April 1831 referred him to the Report of the Emigration Committee of 1826-27, at which proposals were put forward containing the same elements as Lang's later plan. However, Horton lamented the fact that the proposals had been neglected. Also in the same letter, Horton asked Lang's advice on several questions concerning the disposal of colonial
lands, with particular reference to the quick rent system, whereby the grantee paid 5% interest on the value of the land acquired by him as opposed to what was then the current system of selling land outright at a minimum price of 5/- per acre. Horton indicated a preference for the former system, as it gave the purchaser some capital to employ in developing his land. Of course the real issue which arose here was the British Government's attitude towards the colonial land system, and Lord Goderich was at that time endeavouring to formulate his own views on these matters. Lang just happened to be in London at the time, and what was more, he was advocating the implementation of a scheme of emigration which approximated closely to Lord Goderich's own ideas. In fact, Lord Goderich's attitude to colonial waste lands was influenced by two factors. Firstly, he was to some extent converted to the Wakefieldian principle which dictated the sale of such lands in preference to their being granted. Sale meant an increase in revenue which could be used to foster the emigration of labourers (the Wakefieldian principle stipulated this). Secondly, there was the question of the Church and School Corporation; this had become an example of how the alienation of colonial lands could be made so unproductive under the control of such a body. Whilst this body continued under official sanction, new settlers were forced to go further out into more inaccessible areas in order to acquire land. 28 So it was that Lang, although his ideas were by no means original, found himself consulted
by members of the English government on the problems concerning emigration and the disposal of Crown Lands. For this, and the achievement of his educational and emigration proposals, this voyage probably represented the most successful of all the journeys he made back to England in the thirties. He gained approval for his college: approval to recruit two more Presbyterian ministers; approval to undertake an experiment in emigration, and as well, was asked for his opinion on certain important colonial issues - issues which indicated that the English government was concerned with the growth of the colony as a free community with a future other than merely that accorded to a penal settlement.

The working relationship which Lang appeared to have established with Lord Goderich was further extended after he had had conversations with Lord Howick. Lang apparently proposed to Howick that the colony could afford to promote extensive emigration, especially if revenue could be derived from the sale of Crown allotments in Sydney, and by the utilization or sale of the Church and School Corporation's preserves. The government in fact, did make use of the latter of these suggestions some years later, and Lang modestly admitted he really did not know whether or not his ideas were the cause.

The importance of Lang's emigrational venture of the Stirling Castle so far as our present study is concerned, was that
he preferred to take Scottish emigrants. Perhaps this was natural, but it was also intentional, as by so doing, the number of Presbyterians in the colony would be increased. David Macmillan gives several reasons:

"Lang was prompted to try this experiment by the lack of craftsmen in the colony and by the distress prevailing in Scotland. It is possible, too, that his fears of an Irish Catholic predominance in the colony were partly responsible..." 31

The available facts bear out the first and second points in Mr. Macmillan's comment. 32 The third is quite probable, for Lang had an undeniable fear of this happening, as he considered the majority of convicts who arrived in the colony were of Irish Catholic persuasion. These, as emancipated convicts, would later form the basic work force of the colony. Therefore, an attempt to import a better quality workman, and non-Catholic besides, was an opportunity not to be missed. Although it is possible this idea suggested itself to Lang, there is no evidence to suggest that it was his reason, at this time, for undertaking the project.

Lang had good reason to feel that his voyage home had been an outstanding success. He had achieved all his objectives with regard to the Australian College, and his emigration proposals had been well received, even though it had been necessary for him to bear the responsibility of arranging and financing the shipment of mechanics and free settlers to the colony in the Stirling Castle. His dealings with
the British government had been harmonious, and the results very satisfactory for both. So much so, that Lord Goderich, in a despatch to General Darling on 12th January 1831, indicated that he had acceded to Lang’s proposal for a college (and he here included a copy of the relevant Prospectus and an outline of the extent of the college for the Governor’s information) and also to Lang’s request for extra Presbyterian ministers. This request for ministers was originally put to Lord Goderich as a proposal by Lang that if settlers in a particular district should contribute £40 to £100 per annum towards the salary of a minister, the government should equal the amount.

This request was complied with. However, Lord Goderich indicated that for the present it was to extend to no more than two extra ministers. The governor was also instructed to advance £3,500 to Lang over eighteen months for the college buildings. In another despatch on 29th March 1831 the above amount was altered, and the governor was directed to pay Lang £1,500 immediately upon the arrival of the Stirling Castle. This was pursuant to arrangements Lang had made for the emigrants on board that vessel; arrangements which Lord Goderich had agreed to. In the same despatch for General Darling’s information, was enclosed a letter from Lang to Lord Goderich, dated 15th March 1831, in which Lang set out his comments on the situation of mechanics in Scotland, and how their position could be alleviated by emigration to New South Wales. It was in such a
manner that all Lang's arrangements for the college, for emigration and for the extra Presbyterian ministers were made directly through the Colonial Office in London, General Darling being informed by despatch of the outcome. And the outcome was a triumphant one for Lang, especially when it is considered that his proposals were so readily accepted. If made to General Darling, these proposals could have met with his approval, but even so, the time which would have elapsed before they could have been implemented undoubtedly would have caused Lang to lose interest in them, or what was most likely, to have taken upon himself actions which would have prejudiced a successful outcome. Following on his success with the government at home, Lang, to some degree, considered he had received personal approval from that government for his plans, certainly those concerning the college and his emigration schemes, and this attitude enabled him to speak more authoritatively and act more confidently in the promotion of his various causes, even though the British Government may not have been advised of all of them.
CHAPTER FOUR

PART III

THE RETURN TO NEW SOUTH WALES
Dr. Lang left England on board the **Stirling Castle** together with the emigrants he had assembled for the voyage: the masters he had recruited for the Australian College; two new Presbyterian ministers and various items of equipment for the college. Also aboard was his cousin, Wilhelmina Mackie, whom he married on the voyage. As well as this latter event, the voyage was apparently not without its other incidents. Agnes Thomson, who was travelling out with her brother, one of the ministers, related several of these incidents in her *Memoirs*. Two are worth recounting, as they highlight certain characteristics in John Lang. Firstly, Agnes Thomson tells how a Sydney newspaper was found wrapped around Mrs. McGarvie's shoes (she was the mother of the Rev. John McGarvie whom Lang had recruited as minister at Portland Head on a previous voyage), and in it was found an account of Dr. Lang's speech at the laying of the foundation stone of the Sydney College. This account was read by the masters for the Australian College (or Professors, as Lang termed them) who were very concerned. Messrs. Carmichael, Pinkerton and Anderson then tackled Lang on the issue, as he had apparently informed them that there was "no high class school in the colony fit for the sons of the better sort of people." Agnes Thomson then tells that Lang tried to smooth the matter over, but was not successful, and when the ship did arrive in the colony, the three school masters found themselves masters to "... classes of mixed and backward boys instead of Professors to the body of students they had expected
and pictured. 37 This illustration is interesting because, although of itself it cannot be verified, it is typical of the attitude shown by Lang in his approach to his own plan. Assured in his own mind of the correctness of his cause, he would pursue it unflinchingly. In this particular instance, there can be no doubt that he saw the Australian College as an institution which deserved the best qualified personnel, and needed such masters in order to become an accredited college in the eyes of the colony. However, in giving details of the educational bodies already in the colony to the applicants for the Australian College positions, he probably ignored what he did not like, or considered to be of no account, in the colony's educational set-up. By so doing, and by his failure to indicate his own previous connection with the Sydney College, he failed to gain the wholehearted support of his college staff: a very necessary first step in the establishment of a new enterprise. It is not unlikely that this episode had an important effect upon Henry Carmichael, who was to be the headmaster. Within three years Carmichael was to leave after "... Having been disappointed with regard to the nature of the Establishment founded by Dr. Lang...". 38

Although the incident just related could not have been exactly an auspicious beginning for the voyage, or for the college for that matter, Lang did not appear to have been concerned by it. He had achieved his objectives, and the schoolmasters were on their way
with him to found the college. It was unlikely they would desert him, as there were no other teaching positions readily available in Sydney. To impute this attitude to Lang may seem rather unkind, but it was of his nature, and he revealed it again in later enterprises. It was as though he regarded his schemes as inviolable, and any doubt or dissention expressed by those privileged to work with him was regarded by him as unreasoning criticism, or as a form of jealousy generated by the inspired nature of his undertaking. The knowledge, on his part, that whatever scheme he undertook was bound to be successful was often the only compulsion which forced him to pursue an undertaking to its conclusion. This attitude was undoubtedly connected with his religious beliefs, and also with his own personality, which seemed to be able to tackle the most difficult situations only when the odds appeared to be weighted against him. One can almost sense his feelings towards the three schoolmasters insofar as he, John Lang, had convinced the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies of the need for the Australian College, and for the emigrational experiment; how then could the enterprise be threatened by doubts expressed by schoolmasters who knew nothing of colonial politics.

Agnes Thomson relates with interest the second important episode which occurred on this voyage. This was the marriage between Lang and his cousin, who apparently, was on the way out to stay with Lang's brother Andrew on the Hunter River. She and Lang were
married on board the ship at the Cape of Good Hope. What actually prompted Lang to take this step remains as rather a mystery. Perhaps he thought he needed to appear in colonial society (especially colonial Presbyterian Society) as a respectable married man. Also he was thirty one years old, and had reached a very successful point in his career, which was being extended into fields other than merely that of a Presbyterian minister. He had committed himself to being a public figure within the colony, in what was now his adopted country. Before him lay the growth of his church and the development of his college, both of which were of his own making and which no doubt he thought would continue in his control. He had just launched a successful emigration project as a result of proposals made to the British government. It could be said he felt at peace with the world. But when he actually decided to marry, and how he persuaded his cousin remains somewhat of a mystery. Agnes Thomson says of the marriage, "No one knew anything about it except the minister Mr. Cleland, and Mr. Ferguson and Captain Frayer." 40 Having made up his mind to marry, and deciding upon his cousin as his bride, it is possible that Lang feared a reaction from his mother if they waited until Sydney was reached before being married. Lang's mother exercised a powerful influence over him, and, being aware of this, he probably conjectured that she would object to the match - in fact he knew she would object no matter whom he married. His mother was dedicated to his welfare, but saw herself as the means of guiding him on the path
he was to follow. In his memorial sermon on her death, Lang referred to her dedication of him "... from my earliest infancy to the Church and service of God." 41 In the matter of his marriage he must have decided to present her with an accomplished fact, and to suffer any objections, knowing that eventually she would accept what had happened, though she may never really approve. To quote Agnes Thomson yet again, she relates that Mr. Lang was intensely angry at hearing of her son's marriage:

'He did weel' she said 'to marry her before he came here - weel he kent I woulna' have let him if he had brought her out first - And she the dochter o' my worst enemy',

She was a bitter old person - what the Scotch would call 'unca door'. 42

The Stirling Castle with John Lang and his wife aboard, arrived in Sydney in October 1831, some few days before Governor Darling set sail for England after having been recalled at the conclusion of a six year term of office. Darling left, feeling that he had been disgraced in the eyes of the colony over issues concerning "gross calumnies" that Edward Smith Hall, sometime editor of the Monitor had published against him. Whereas, in fact, it was brought to Darling's attention in 1828 by Sir George Murray that the governor of a colony should retire at the end of a six year term of office, unless some special reason should arise which would keep him there. 43

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, in this instance, had decided that there was no such reason, and that General Darling should leave at the expiration of his term of office. Despite this official reason,
Darling departed the colony feeling that he had not achieved all that he could have done, for he was a very conscientious man. In contrast, Lang returned to be greeted with the approbation of the colony. The Sydney Gazette hailed his emigration undertaking as the boldest effort ever made by an individual to "Advance Australia." The Sydney Herald thought "... Dr. Lang deserves a degree of commendation for his diligence and enterprise." Great interest was generated by this venture into private sponsorship of emigration, and by Lang's efforts on behalf of education in the colony.

Although the public clamour at his arrival and the words of praise for his efforts were welcome to Lang, he could not rest upon them. The college had to be established, and the goodwill shown him on his arrival home had to be harnessed to serve this end, for not only did he have several schoolmasters who needed pupils, but he had also guaranteed work for the mechanics brought with him in the Stirling Castle.

His aim in London had been to employ these men upon the Australian College buildings, and so he set about obtaining the requisite permission from the government to proceed with the buildings upon land adjoining the Scots Church.

Unfortunately, before the college was under way, Lang had again placed himself in the public arena through controversy which arose over his publication in Glasgow before his departure, of a pamphlet in which he criticised the Church of Scotland's attitude
towards colonial Presbyterian churches. This was entitled The
Present Aspects and Prospects of the Church, with a Plain Statement
of the Case of the Church of Scotland and the British Colonies.

Naturally this criticism was not well received by the leaders of the
church in Scotland, and their attitude soon filtered out to New South
Wales, where those who felt John Lang took too much upon himself
were anxious to see if action would be taken against him. As well
as leaving this pamphlet behind him in Scotland, before he disembarked
from the Stirling Castle in Sydney he wrote another, giving an account
of his proceedings in England regarding the establishment of the
Australian College and his emigration venture. This was published
in Sydney before the close of 1831, and when it appeared caused a
commotion, especially amongst those connected with the Church and
School Corporation. Thus peace did not reign for long after Dr. Lang's
return.

As it was, Lang had returned to the colony a public figure
in his own right. It was well known that he had made arrangements
with the British government which the colonial administration was
bound to accept. Consequently, any conflicts in which Lang now
indulged in were bound to involve more than merely Presbyterian
matters, as had been the case in the past. Lang was still the leader
of the Presbyterian community, but now he had taken and accepted
responsibility in education and emigration spheres. He had placed
himself in a difficult position, for, with his characteristic failing for
issuing wholesale condemnation of actions which were objectionable
in his sight, he was now bound to involve not only himself but his
various causes whenever he indulged in this critical pastime.
Without the exercise of a certain amount of circumspection, serious
damage to his projects could result - and he was about to discover
this over the matter of the two pamphlets mentioned above.
CHAPTER FIVE

LANG'S NEW ROLE IN COLONIAL AFFAIRS -
AND HIS DIFFICULTY TO UPHOLD IT, 1831-2

For he that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing bringing his sheaves with him.
Lang's return from England in October 1831 marks the beginning of his new role in the affairs of the colony. No longer was he just a Presbyterian minister fighting, as he had been in the twenties, to establish his church and obtain official recognition for it. That church was now well established, and although Lang continued to promote its expansion and take an excessively active role in its day to day affairs, other interests were claiming his attention. The church was growing throughout the colony, which meant more ministers were preaching to an increasing number of congregations. This, in turn, meant more work for Dr. Lang, as he still held himself responsible for the activities of the colonial Presbyterian community. However, as he was also interested in matters of education and emigration, it meant that his time available for church affairs became somewhat limited. As a result, his relationship with those in the Presbyterian churches - be they fellow ministers or elders or members of the various congregations - became increasingly dictatorial. The two pamphlets mentioned in the previous chapter form the evidence for the widening of his interests, and since they are important milestones in the course of Lang's development, it might be best to consider them separately.

The first of these, entitled *The Present Aspects and Prospects of the Church, with a Plain Statement of the Case of the Church of Scotland and the British Colonies* was published, as has been noted,
in Glasgow just after his departure in the Stirling Castle. In it he commits himself wholeheartedly to a view of the Church of Scotland as seen by a colonial churchman. He poses the question which he felt the Church of Scotland had not seriously thought about, and that was: "What is the spiritual condition of the dispersed of our nation in foreign lands, and what can be done for their spiritual welfare?" 1

The effect of the church's failure to ask this question has been that "... the Church of Scotland has uniformly regarded the British Colonies, and the myriads of Scotsmen that inhabit them, with heartless neglect." 2 As if this charge were not criticism enough, he continued with another indicating that the clergy of the Church:

... have given extensive countenance and currency to the mischievous and scandalous idea, that every licentiate of the Church of Scotland who embarks for the colonies, thereby acknowledges himself a "weak brother", who despairs of a living at home, through some palpable defect of interest or talents, or popularity." 3

He concludes his criticisms by saying that the emigration of ministers "... has been uniformly and systematically discouraged and repressed." 4

It was not to be expected that these comments would be readily overlooked by the church, and of course, so far as Lang was concerned, they were not made to gain notoriety, but rather because he had discovered a genuine lack of support amongst the church hierarchy for his colonial ventures. In a note to the pamphlet Lang gives three examples of the reasons put forward (or the cloak behind which the church hides) for the church not wishing to extend its influence into the colonial sphere.
These he cleverly describes as the "Colonial cloak, the Government cloak and the Episcopal cloak". It is interesting to examine these cloaks because, unlike most of Lang's more blatant critical broadsides, this is a well reasoned and legitimate criticism of the attitudes prevalent in the Presbyterian Church at the time; attitudes which Lang saw would eventually cripple the church - and which in many respects had helped to delay the development of Presbyterianism in the colonies already. His three cloaks are detailed as follows:

**The Colonial Cloak**

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had adopted a policy towards the colonial Presbyterian communities whereby, when a church had been built and endowed, a minister would be provided by the Church of Scotland.

**The Government Cloak**

Lang thought that the Presbyterian clergy in the General Assembly were afraid of giving offence to the British Government by actively promoting Presbyterianism throughout the colonies. This attitude, said Lang, was not valid, and he quotes his own case where he made appeals to the British Government, on behalf of the colonial Presbyterian church, and for the college he wished to establish. In his own case, he says he has ". . . experienced the utmost liberality from His Majesty's government, and the utmost beneficence." However, as we are aware, Lang had to fight strongly for what he felt were the rights which should be accorded him and his religion, but the British
government did eventually acknowledge that the Presbyterians had the right to practice their particular religion. But this acknowledgment came through no intercession on the part of the Church of Scotland.

**The Episcopal Cloak**

In this instance Lang maintained that the General Assembly neglected the rights and privileges of the Scottish nation and consequently had fallen into error by considering that Episcopacy was the established religion of the British colonies, and that therefore it would be impertinent for the Presbyterian church to interfere. ⁵

Lang's criticisms appear to be, and probably are, somewhat harsh. However, they were basically true in the sense that the Presbyterian church was not very outward looking in its attitude. In fact, it was only in 1796 that a motion was put forward in the General Assembly which proposed that the church should sponsor missionary activity abroad. This motion was sponsored by the Rev. James Erskine, and after a memorable debate, it was lost. ⁶ However, after this the church became more aware of the role it should take, but even so, it was still very concerned with its own internal problems. Lang, writing in his *History*, makes an issue of the neglect by the Church of Scotland of Presbyterian churches in the colonies, in which he demonstrates the extent to which the law of patronage had made the church insular in its outlook. ⁷ In this pamphlet he claims also that the neglect followed as a direct consequence of this law of patronage.
whereby the Scottish people were robbed of their rights to elect their own pastors. Consequently, as appointments fell mainly into the hands of the Scottish aristocracy, the clergy tended to promote policies which were of benefit to the church in Scotland as viewed by these patrons. Hence there was no benefit in Scotland for outward thinking ministers, for they would not rate for appointments at home. Any minister who wished to consider Presbyterian matters outside Scotland had to be very independent, and Lang quotes his own case, and that of the Rev. Macarthur of Van Diemen’s Land, as being ex-samples of two independent thinking ministers. In the last two editions of his History Lang condemned the lack of missionary seal on the part of the church, and because of this lack, he found the ministers he was able to recruit for the colony in these early years were so lacking in it themselves that they accepted a colonial posting as a last resource. ³

By making such accusations, Lang placed himself in opposition to the policies of the General Assembly. However, although by no means in favour of such criticisms, there were members of the church who basically agreed with Lang, at least on the question of dealings with the Presbyterian churches throughout the colonies. In 1833 the Church made what was its first official move to set up spiritual machinery to regularise its relationships with the colonial churches.

This was the so-called Declaratory Act, which defined what the attitude
towards these churches should be. It authorized the colonial church to set up Presbyteries, but still claimed jurisdiction over them. Furthermore, it failed to offer to these churches any material aid.

The Act, whilst evidence of a changing attitude, was anachronistic, and had the unfortunate result of causing a division amongst the colonial church that it was designed to control. In fact, the entire legislation was unwise, as the type of control envisaged by the Church of Scotland could not be successfully exercised because of the distances involved. Whether the criticisms made by Lang in this pamphlet resulted in the enactment of the Declaratory Act is difficult to determine. Probably his comments only had the effect of making public some of the dis-satisfactions already felt by members of the church, and consequently could have hastened the activities of the General Assembly in their desire to ensure control over the increasing number of churches forming within the colonies. So, if that was the case, Lang's pamphlet was harmful in its effects; but it is doubtful if the church could have made any move towards control of colonial churches which would have been effective. After having failed to support them in the first place, it could not justifiably seek to control their activities after they had become established.

These criticisms which Lang made of the Church of Scotland's colonial policy are important not only as an indictment of that policy, but as an indication of Lang's own attitude towards the church, both in Scotland and in the colony. By publishing his criticisms
he was giving notice that the Presbyterian church in the colonies owed very little to the church at home in the way of allegiance. As well, it demonstrated Lang's own commitment to the colonial Presbyterian church; after this, there could be no turning back. He had now assumed the role of spokesman for Presbyterians in Australia, and had claimed a degree of autonomy for the colonial churches. As will be evidenced later on, not all the Presbyterian ministers in the colony agreed wholeheartedly with his actions, but at this period, in 1831, there was general acceptance by them that he had acted correctly. It was only with the promulgation of the Declaratory Act that opinions began to diverge. From this period, on, Lang's role in the church began to change, as with the growth of the church, various challenges were made which disputed his right to speak for all the colonial Presbyterians. And the main conflict arose over whether or not the colonial church should accept its mandate from the Church of Scotland.

The first of the 1831 pamphlets may have antagonized those within the Presbyterian church at home, but the second, without doubt, irritated and enraged many influential colonial citizens who, had Lang been more circumspect in his comments, might have supported him in his educational scheme. This pamphlet, which gave an account of the various steps he had taken in England to secure the establishment of the Australian College and promote emigration, was written on board
the Stirling Castle before he landed in Sydney on 13th October 1831, and was printed shortly afterwards. It gave an account of the two activities - his educational efforts, and his demonstration of the practicability of emigration of "the Industrious Classes"; and also contains some suggestions concerning practical methods of raising revenue to subsidize further emigration. His proposals on this aspect were probably the most important to come out of this pamphlet, and also caused a great deal of criticism. We should, perhaps, examine these proposals first.

In particular he suggested that vacant ground in Sydney belonging to the Crown should be sold instantly, terms of sale being payment over twenty years at 10% interest, and security to be taken over the land and any improvements. He indicated certain areas which he thought would fetch £200,000, and even interest on that figure, he was certain, would help to bring out a few worthy settlers. The Sydney Herald of 14th November 1831 thought the plan worthy of recommendation, not only because of its excellence, but by its simplicity and extreme economy. The Herald also suggested that when implementing the scheme, two factors were necessary for its success. Firstly, the aid of the government would be essential for the scheme to operate (which was perhaps self-evident anyway); and secondly, proof would be needed of the uprightness and disinterested motives of those who would be operating the scheme. Because of
this the Herald ruled out the possibility of the scheme being operated by a government agent. Despite the fact that the Sydney Herald was in favour of Lang’s scheme - and it was not alone in its opinion - the pamphlet caused an uproar. This was because Lang, unable to remain content with the success of his mission to England and with making positive suggestions for the raising of revenue to support future emigration of free settlers, had to deliver judgment upon the effectiveness of the Church and School Corporation, a body whose demise was imminent, and whose lands were marked by Lang to be used for raising finance for emigration. His comments on the contributions of this organisation towards colonial development concluded with the following words:

... instead of proving a benefit...[the Corporation] has lain as a dead weight on the colony for the last five years, repressing emigration, discouraging improvement, secularising the episcopal clergy and thereby lowering the standard of morals and religion throughout the territory. 12

The effect of this, and other comments, upon the Episcopal clergy is not difficult to imagine, and Bishop Broughton considered the remarks to be a personal indictment of his stewardship of the Episcopal church in the colony. Speculation as to why Lang was so often to make such devastating statements is, unfortunately, fraught with pitfalls. It would be so much easier if this propensity could be traced to some simple physical reason, such as spasmodic attacks of acute indigestion. However, this does not appear to have been the
case, and as he so often made such drastic accusations, some attempt to evaluate the reason seems necessary. The following appear to be some of the main combinations of characteristics responsible:

His complete confidence as to the correctness of his own actions; with the inevitable result that any opposition, in his opinion, had to be demonstrated to be absolutely false, and so much at variance with his own actions or proposals that such opposition would be negated. Hence his often merciless and acrimonious diatribes. 13

Coupled with this was his arrogance in assuming the mantle of Presbyteriansim, and using its teachings, as he understood them, to justify his every action. For example, Archibald Gilchrist believes that, to understand many of Lang's actions throughout his long life, it is necessary to:

... accept the notion that John Dummore Lang had created Jehovah in his own image and viewed the Almighty as his own private God, concerned primarily with justifying the doughty doctor's every action and opinion, punishing all who thwarted his projects. Strangely enough, the numerous set-backs and disasters which Lang and his immediate family encountered ... are attributable to the "good providence of God ... and for the inscrutable purposes of a loving God"; but similar afflictions suffered by his personal enemies are without scruple set down to the punitive action of the vigilant and just ruler of the affairs of men. 14

His natural inclination was to lead and not to follow. This, together with an inability to delegate, often resulted in severe differences of opinion with those who had to work with him. Examples of this characteristic are to be found in his relationships with the masters of the Australian College (especially with the Rev. Carmichael,
the first headmaster); in his break with the Rev. John McGarvie
(although in this instance there was also the question of the position
of the colonial Presbyterian church relative to the Church of Scotland,
as well as severe personal differences). His relationship with his
fellow ministers provides an excellent example of the dictatorial
aspect of his character.

One of his recruits [a Presbyterian minister] wrote
... that Lang wanted to be recognised as a little
Pope, but when he found that his ministerial brethern
were not willing to become his inferior clergy he
abused them one by one in unmeasured terms. 15

Perhaps the most devastating of his attributes was his
intolerance, which became apparent when he considered some moral,
religious or social code had been breached, and his outspoken, and
often outlandish, methods of bringing what he regarded as evil out into
the public view. One may, in this regard, question his methods, but
his motives were always clear. This particular aspect of his nature
appeared to many to be extreme self-righteousness, and perhaps it
was. But, as Lang did not believe in compromise over matters
where he held such strong beliefs, it became necessary for others
to endeavour to understand why he was so immovable under certain
circumstances. Naturally, because of the manner in which he expressed
his beliefs, not too many of his contemporaries were prepared to try
and understand him - especially when it became obvious that compromise
was not part of his nature.

Lang was a prolific writer - it was the best way in which
he could make known his various points of view. But it must be remembered that most of these writings were the product of a present purpose, and were not always based on meticulous research. His *History*, for example, written during a journey home in 1834, was a well-informed and readable work. But it had severe flaws; descriptive passages of the countryside were often borrowed from explorers’ journals; he was prone to generalise about particular facts, which, had he been writing a true history, he would have owed it to his readers to have researched such areas first; his great attention to detail is apparent only in the periods in which he himself forms part of the action. This style prompted Sir Roger Therry (who became Commissioner of the Court of Requests) to write of the *History*:

... he [Lang] deals with opinions opposed to his own, and persons adverse to his schemes, in a tone of unmerited censure, in which truth and charity do not always predominate. 16

The missionary zeal with which he entered into most of his projects had one great disadvantage, and that was a tendency to disregard associated factors and concentrate only upon the ultimate goal. Witness the discovery by the Australian College masters of the apparent existence of the Sydney College, as described in the previous chapter. Other instances of such omissions occur regularly with Lang, and imposed a great threat to the success of the many schemes of his. It was not only the burden in terms of disillusionment
for those who suffered as a result, but Lang himself suffered, since nothing served to reduce the enthusiasm of others more than the discovery that what he had indicated was not, in fact, the case. He laid himself open to the charge of being labelled a fraud. 17

The aspects of his personality related so far seem to be far from favourable ones. What must be borne in mind, however, is that in most circumstances he exhibited the above qualities, and, despite them, he was able to achieve many of his objectives. So, perhaps these characteristics could be regarded as both his strength and his weakness, depending upon the particular matters concerned, and the persons involved with that current enterprise. Because he held such strong views, and would not compromise, he was able, for example, to maintain his struggle for equality of religious observance. Had he compromised, he would have surrendered his most important asset, and would probably not have been able to fight with such tenacity for other causes in the future. 18 Similarly, with his stand on moral questions (for example a strict observance of the Sabbath); although from our point of view today some of these attitudes seem to have been given greater prominence by Lang than they warranted, the effect of his insistence that they were important was to raise the standard of the social life of the colony. 19

No matter how unfavourable an opinion may be obtained from the foregoing points, it has been an attempt to categorize the main elements of his character as they were made evident in the first
twenty years of his life in the colony, and as they appeared to those who came into contact with him in the carrying out of his duties duties both by virtue of his office, and those he imposed upon himself. These comments could be contrasted with a verbal sketch which appeared, among others, in a series of political portraits of some members of the Parliament of New South Wales, which was printed in 1863 and dedicated to Lang by its author David Buchanan. Buchanan would have us believe that Lang was all that is good, and as a contrast he cites W. C. Wentworth as being a self-seeking personality, and one who ought to be forgotten by historians. Also, one gathers the opinion that Lang had never been wrong, and had never made mistakes. It would appear that the opinion which Lang's contemporaries held of him was one that was governed mainly by the type of relationship they had with him. Consequently, it can truly be said that one could find as many opinions of Lang as there were people who had had dealings with him. With this realisation in mind, we must continue our examination of the situation Lang created within the colony in late 1831, and examine his attitude towards the Church and School Corporation, and to Archdeacon Broughton, its administrator and head of the Episcopal Church in Australia.

The pamphlet entitled *An Account of Steps Taken* which so enraged Archdeacon Broughton and the Episcopal clergy, was designed not so much as a criticism of the Episcopal Church or the Church and
School Corporation, but rather to highlight Lang's own exertions made on behalf of education and emigration. The criticism which he made of the Corporation came mainly from his desire to further emigration by suggesting a means of raising revenue to sponsor it — and the unproductive lands of the Corporation were an obvious choice. It becomes apparent also that Lang was anxious to explain his earlier connections with the Sydney College, and to do so in terms which would counteract accusations then current that he had deserted that organization in favour of setting up one of his own. Unfortunately, this latter accusation which he tried to disprove, seems to have been very close to the truth, and this fact, together with the other designated objects of the pamphlet, caused him to try and cover too much ground. It necessitated too many explanations on his part, which in turn, created a deal of disenchantment in certain quarters, especially amongst the Episcopal clergy and those colonists connected with the Sydney College.

Archdeacon Broughton had already experienced a disappointment when Lang made his decision earlier to join with those citizens who supported the Sydney College rather than aid him in his then undisclosed educational scheme. So it can be realized that the Archdeacon was in no way well disposed towards Lang and his schemes by 1831. For Lang to hold the Church and School Corporation so much to blame for the present state of the clergy, and for the lowering of
religious and moral standards, was more than the Archdeacon could bear. So he spoke out against the accusations he felt Lang had made. As he was one who was very concerned for the power and prestige of the Episcopal Church, he was especially troubled by the passages in Lang's pamphlet which quoted from a letter Lang had written to Lord Goderich; passages which impugned him, as they referred to the management of the Corporation, and its failure to carry out effectively its avowed objects. It was for this reason that Broughton addressed a letter to Lord Goderich, in which he denied the charges made by Lang against the clergy and the Corporation, and suggested that it was up to Lang to substantiate his charge that the standard of public morals and religion had been lowered by the setting up of the Corporation, and that the clergymen who were members of the Corporation's committee were involved in secular pursuits beyond those of other members of the clergy. Broughton gave his letter to Acting Governor Lindesay, who despatched it to London on 18th November 1831. Also included with the despatches of this date was a letter from the Commissioners of the Church and School Corporation, setting out a reply in answer to Lang's charges against the Corporation. This letter concluded:

With reference to Dr. Lang himself ... he has expressed himself without due regard to accuracy. Embarked in an undertaking in which he felt it impossible to succeed without degrading the Established Church in His Lordship's estimation, he has preferred charges against the Corporation in that loose style which bespeaks a man resolved at any rate to injure the object of his envy and dislike with the blind animosity of a political partisan, rather than with the
scrupulous attention to truth and candour, becoming one who claims to bear a reverend and Sacred character. 24

This letter bore the signature of Archdeacon Broughton as Chairman and First Commissioner of the Church and Schools Corporation. Lindesay added his comments on the matter in the despatch, and these were indicative of his complete disapproval of Lang's proceedings. 25

Dr. Lang was not sent a copy of Archdeacon Broughton's letter until four days after the ship carrying Lindesay's despatches had left the colony, 26 an action which he had no hesitation in condemning as lacking in etiquette, and which probably confirmed him in the opinion he already held of the Archdeacon. The matter was not allowed to rest, however, as in the Sydney Herald of 12th December 1831 a letter was published to the editor, subscribed by one Inquisitor, who claimed that the Corporation ought to answer the claims made of it by Lang if untrue, but remain silent if the facts were true. But no answer appeared, the Archdeacon apparently being of the opinion his letter to Lord Goderich was sufficient, and that a reply through the columns of the press was unwarranted.

The accusations which Lang made against the Corporation and the clergy appear difficult to substantiate. The pamphlet couched them in general terms, when specific examples would have been preferable in order to prove the charges. It was well known at the time that the Corporation had not achieved its aims for education, and the unwieldy nature of its structure and organization were factors which
ruled against efficient operation from its inception. By 1829 a
decision had been made to abandon it, but what had to be resolved
was the precise nature of the organization to take over its assets -
mainly concerning the land held that had been granted it in 1828.
Lang's derogatory remarks to Lord Goderich on the effects of the
Corporation and on the clergy concerned were perhaps not warranted,
though it would appear that his reason for making them was to give
added support for his own proposals for education, and for the
financing of emigration. These were his aims, and, having regard
to our comments on his character detailed earlier in this chapter,
it can be understood that he was using what ammunition he could find
to aid his own forces. But, once challenged on the accuracy of his
accusations, it would not have been within his nature for him to admit
that his criticisms had been a general condemnation of the Corporation
only. Quite the reverse. He now looked to find further and stronger
grounds for his earlier criticisms, and built upon these until the issue
became one which concerned matters of principle to both himself and
to the Archdeacon.

Lang soon drafted a reply to the letters which had gone to
London in Lindesay's despatches, and sent this off to the new governor,
Major General Richard Bourke. Apart from justifying his stand on
the matters objected to by Archdeacon Broughton, Lang, towards the
end of the letter, dwelt upon what he felt had become the real issue
between the Archdeacon and himself. This was the belief that Lang's
hostility towards the Corporation had been regarded by the Archdeacon as applying to the Episcopal Church as a whole, which, as Lang explained, was not the case. 27 Broughton regarded the Church of England in the colony as being the established church, whereas this was certainly not so. But, as head of that church in New South Wales, the Archdeacon occupied a privileged position. He had political authority as a member of the Legislative Council and he was also First Commissioner of the Church and School Corporation. It was as the holder of these colonial offices that Broughton contemplated the seriousness of the claims made by Lang. And he viewed them very seriously. It was no small matter to have a young Presbyterian minister criticize the administration of his church, and the Corporation for which he was responsible.

The effects this incident were to have upon Lang were indeed serious. Lord Goderich sent a despatch to Governor Bourke in which he expressed surprise that Lang should, in the first instance, have published a letter which had been addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and that he should have done so without at least seeking permission. Interestingly enough, Goderich makes apologies for his previous failure to observe the seriousness of Lang's criticisms of the Church and School Corporation and of the clergy, but excuses himself by stating that as he read them originally, they were vague and wanting in accuracy. More serious, though, was Lord Goderich's
comment that, had he known that Lang would publish the letter, he would have withheld his consent to the application for the loan for the Australian College. Without wishing to mitigate the lack of wisdom shown by the criticisms made in Lang's pamphlet, Lord Goderich's remarks were bound to be made. Had he upheld Lang's criticisms, then the position of the Archdeacon in the colony would have been untenable - as would have been that of his church. Lang was sacrificed, but it was of his own making. Lord Goderich required Governor Bourke to:

... acquaint Dr. Lang that the cause of religious peace and the efficacy of religious feeling ... cannot be successfully promoted, if those whose duty it is to inculcate the former, and to cherish the latter, are unmindful of the sacred obligations which that duty imposes upon them of speaking charitably of their neighbours.

However, before this despatch was received in the colony, another more serious development took place which had severe effects upon Lang's position. Before examining this development, we must first trace briefly through some of the events which had taken place since Lang's return to the colony in October 1831.

Lang's immediate concern upon his arrival had been the commencement of building operations for the Australian College. This task, as well as the organising of the school's temporary premises and the recruiting of the support amongst the colonists for the undertaking occupied him for some time. By early 1832 the buildings were so
advanced and the funds subscribed by supporters of the college were sufficient for him to petition the colonial government for a further grant on behalf of the college as set out in his agreement with Lord Goderich. The amount Lang required was £2,000, and it was necessary for the Legislative Council to approve the grant. Unfortunately for Lang, Archdeacon Broughton took the opportunity presented by this request to call for a vote of censure to be passed on Lang by the Council, and he was successful in having the motion passed. But, as Lang later remarked, this was carried out in the absence of the governor and several other members of the Council. The Council resolved:

That His Excellency the Governor be requested to communicate to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State the opinion of this Council that the Charges against the Protestant Episcopal Clergy of the Colony contained in the letter aforesaid by Dr. Lang to Viscount Goderich were uninformed and unwarrantable and that the publication of the same was a highly improper and censurable act.

Upon hearing of this, Lang immediately entered the contest with a letter to the editor of the Sydney Herald which was published soon after publication had been made of all details of the Council's censure motion. In his letter, Lang offered to lay before the public all the documents he possessed on the matters in question. However, of more immediate importance was his letter to Governor Bourke, which he requested should be submitted to Lord Goderich. In this letter he outlined some very pertinent points in support of his cause. As an
example of his ability to detect arguments favourable to his own position, it is worth noting what these were:

(i) the censure motion, he states, was highly improper, since the Archdeacon, the Solicitor General and the Auditor General were already parties to the case by virtue of their letter to Lord Goderich (as Commissioners of the Corporation). Thus, they should not have participated in the censure motion;

(ii) the motion did not mention what statements were "unfounded or unwarranteable . . . vague, and general and unjust."

(iii) the Council should have resorted to an inquiry before issuing its condemnation;

(iv) Lang questioned the right of the members of the Council to "erect themselves into a Court of Inquisition and to sit in judgment on the moral character and veracity of a private individual."

(v) He indicated also that his original letter to Lord Goderich did not contain a charge against the Episcopal clergy, but against the Church and School Corporation. The clergy, however, was unfortunately involved with that body. The very nature of the Church and School Corporation and the administration of it by the clergy was, he considered, unfortunate and "... no church, whether Popish or Protestant, has ever yet withstood the corrupting influence of extensive possessions."

He then points out that the government appeared to have realised the shortcomings of the Corporation and
its organization, because recently it had its constitution remodelled and control was vested in the Archdeacon and certain lay commissioners.

Such was the manner in which Lang set out his case, and the arguments typify his approach to the whole situation since Archdeacon Broughton first took exception to his pamphlet. It is unlikely that Lang wrote to Lord Goderich originally with a specific intention to cause mischief. Rather, he was using the example of the Corporation as an indication of inefficiency; inefficiency so far as the satisfactory sponsorship of education was concerned, and similarly with respect to its land holdings, which were not of benefit to the future development of the colony, and might, as Lang saw it, be placed to better use to realize funds for the support of free emigration.

Naturally, the emphasis he gave to both these points was to assist his own educational institution, and to aid his emigration ideas. However, as with many of Lang's undertakings which commenced auspiciously, criticism of them arose, usually springing from his own actions. He was then obliged to defend his cause, which often meant defending previous statements he had made, and these so often contained few facts but were very definite in their implication. For instance, the episode concerning Archdeacon Broughton just quoted. Here his original criticism was couched in very general terms, without the benefit of an example being given to show how the Corporation had
lowered standards and corrupted the clergy. His purpose was to discredit the Corporation, in the eyes of Lord Goderich, and so obtain the Corporation's assets for use in the promotion of emigration. He always wrote for a purpose, and the inevitable result seems to have been that someone was invariably annoyed or aggravated as a result; also, there appears to be little doubt that it was on the basis of these writings that many of his contemporaries judged him, and so his supporters were mainly to be found amongst those who had not suffered from the wrath of his pen or his oratory.

We have traced the difficulties which arose through Lang's desire to establish his own educational institution. The series of incidents which attended the foundation of the college, and included the emigrational experiment, culminated in the censure motion from the Legislative Council. Not all the blame can be attributed to Lang, and, although where criticism was concerned he showed an inability to separate personalities from organisations, he came across an unexpected opponent in Archdeacon Broughton. This very failure was made evident when he accused the Archdeacon of regarding the criticisms made of the Corporation as being directed towards the Episcopal clergy. Lang had actually made the criticism - though in very general terms - but throughout the whole argument which followed his publication of the letter to Lord Goderich containing this criticism, Lang had to bring the Archdeacon to the forefront of an argument which
could have been fought on the reasons why the Corporation was unable to function satisfactorily. Instead he chose to indict personalities, with the result that those more influential than himself were ranged against him and, in the eyes of the colony, he received a severe reprimand.

Lang complained bitterly of the effects on his life from the censure motion, and there can be no doubt that he did suffer, both in his personal relationships and through the projects he sponsored. But he was not one to endure such treatment in silence. He maintained he was not given a chance to defend himself, since proceedings of the Legislative Council were not open to the public, and the first intimation he had had of the Council's action was a public release to a newspaper. He was thus condemned without a hearing; a most humiliating situation, especially for a man who believed in publicizing the reasons for his every action. He complained that his good name had been ruined throughout the colony, and since he had used his name to secure loans for his college and to pay the artisans he brought out in the Stirling Castle to work on the college buildings, he found that his creditors were anxious for an early settlement. This he found virtually impossible, and to settle his debts it was necessary for him to sell property he owned. The organization of the Australian College was also effected, since Lang's
ability to run the college in conjunction with the College Council
was questioned. So much so that Archibald Gilchrist quotes Lang
as saying that the Archdeacon even made an offer to the college
council that he would be willing to head the institution if Lang could
be removed altogether.

During the course of the years 1829 to 1832, Lang had
made a substantial contribution to the progress of the colony, and in
the process had achieved perhaps more than his share of notoriety.
This, as we have seen, came not only from his education and emigration
ventures, but also from his defence of the principles on which he had
based them. This demonstrated the fundamental weakness in Lang's
nature. Instead of being content to await public reaction to his
schemes which, when he returned to Sydney in 1831, seemed to be
most favourable, he seemed to believe he had to anticipate criticism.
If not to anticipate, then at least to publicize his actions to gain
public following. It was the action of a man who wished to mould
situations and control events. In this he failed, and the failure was
unfortunate because it jeopardized the success of the Australian
College, and of the ideas behind his emigration experiment. He
was so sure of his actions that any criticism received was bound,
in his estimation, to be unfounded. As he wrote:

In any undertaking in which I may be engaged in future
for the glory of God or the benefit of Man I shall esteem
opposition and discouragement in the outset as the best
earnest of prosperity in the end; "for he that goeth forth
and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him". 37

Despite criticism and his own failings, Lang had shown that an individual could withstand the vicissitudes of colonial politics and society, and still achieve his goal.
CHAPTER SIX

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COLONY

The history of Dr. Lang is part and parcel of the history of the Australian colonies ... he was always identified with some movement for their moral, social, political or religious advancement. It was not in his nature to acquiesce in what he considered wrong for the sake of peace, or comfort or competence.

PART I

EDUCATION
In the thirties Lang's involvement in various public projects becomes somewhat confusing, as he interested himself in so many different activities, usually simultaneously. For our present purpose it seems more advantageous to consider the three important activities which brought him into public view individually, rather than to endeavour to follow his career in chronological sequence.

Immediately upon his return to the colony in October 1831, Lang set about canvassing support for his "academical institution", in spite of the controversy which soon surrounded this venture, and which we have already examined, Lang proceeded to make all arrangements for the construction of the college buildings, and for students to be enrolled immediately for the commencement of classes. These were minor matters when placed alongside the need to gain acceptance in the colony for the college, and also the enlisting of the necessary financial aid to enable the college to progress beyond its initial phase. Lang was very much aware of the need for support from influential colonists, and soon set about contacting leading Presbyterians and other well known colonists, requesting their patronage and assistance in order to carry out his plans for the institution. He refused to convene a public meeting for, in a letter to John Macarthur, he claimed that such meetings achieved nothing. He requested that Macarthur form one of seven gentlemen whom he was asking to become members of a council to control the management of the college in the
first instance. Also on Lang's list of eligible councillors were the
Chief Justice - Francis Forbes, and Mr. Manning (presumably John
Edye Manning, Registrar of the Supreme Court):

... who both belong to the Sydney College, as it is not
improbable that under discreet management the whole
of the supporters of that Institution might be induced
to fall in with my scheme, which I consider would be
beneficial to the Colony. 2

Unfortunately Macarthur was in ill-health and regretted he would
be unable to take part in the "splendid undertaking which you have
commenced." 3 W. C. Wentworth was another recipient of a
pamphlet and prospectus which requested him to take shares in
the institution. 4 Lang also placed advertisements in the Sydney
Herald 5 and that same paper published a review of his pamphlet
on education and emigration (An Account of Steps Taken) and praised
his efforts in both fields. 6 Lang's advertisement for the college
indicated that it was to be called the Australian College, and was
to be available to students of all religious denominations. Generally,
it appears that the advent of the college was well received, and Lang
seems to have been able to form the college council without much
difficulty. This council consisted of seven members, of which Lang
constituted himself a member ex-officio, as he was to be the council's
secretary, and the Principal of the college (the position was unpaid).
Eventually, when the organization was sufficiently advanced, the
shareholders would elect the council, excluding Lang, who would
remain ex-officio a member.

Meanwhile the mechanics from the Stirling Castle were being employed on the construction of the buildings of the college, which were to adjoin the Scots Church, fronting what is now Jamison Street. Lang was anxious to have this land transferred from the Trustees of the Scots Church to the new Trustees for the college, and to accomplish this, addressed a letter to the Acting Governor, requesting that this be permitted. But it was not so simple. An Act of Council, so the Crown law officials decided, was necessary before the Trustees could transfer the land, or give security on it for the government loan to the Australian College. This took over a year to accomplish. At a meeting of the college council on 27th December 1831 the various professors (as Long liked to call them) who had come out with him in the Stirling Castle were confirmed in their appointments with the college. The Rev. Carmichael was to be headmaster and Professor of Greek and Latin. The Rev. John McGarvie who had come from Scotland in 1826 as minister to Portland Head, took over the Mercantile department of the college for one year. Despite the contentious issues which at this time began to build up around Lang's activities whilst in England and concerning the pamphlet published after his return, the college apparently was able to commence in an atmosphere free from internal strife.
But this was not to last for long. The council of the college soon asked Lang to explain the reasons behind an article which had appeared in the *Sydney Gazette* referring to a union between the Australian and Sydney Colleges. Lang, at a meeting of the council, explained that it resulted from a memorandum he had left with the Chief Justice, and it only referred to the possibility of some combination of effort for the attainment of general objects, and did not imply a union of management or funds. This attitude, as expressed by Lang, agrees with a Sydney College report of 26th January 1832 which mentioned Lang's proposal. This apparently had been a suggestion that the Australian College teach classics, arithmetic and other elementary branches of learning, whilst the Sydney College should concentrate upon the mathematical and physical departments. The report indicated that the Trustees of the Sydney College could see no great merit in this, and so it was not implemented. Also, the Trustees indicated that the two colleges should be able to exist together as the demand for education was expected to grow. The motive behind this move by Lang was is difficult to determine. It could have been that he feared his college would not be able to continue if the attacks on him by Archdeacon Broughton increased; by joining with the as yet inoperative Sydney College some extra support might be obtained from its Trustees and shareholders. In fact, Lang probably thought support from this quarter could be valuable, since the Archdeacon was not in favour of the Sydney College
either. Whatever the reason, the proposal was rejected, in effect, by both institutions.

Dr. Lang claimed that he lost much of the support for his college through the censure motion the Legislative Council passed against him. Certainly, the number of subscribers for shares in the new college did not come up to expectations, but to what extent it was due to the Legislative Council's criticism is difficult to determine. Not everyone looked upon the Australian College with the same confidence as did its founder. Certainly, Lang was, or seemed to have been, forced to dispose of much of his property in the colony to raise funds to continue the college buildings and pay the mechanics working there. Even after this, he claimed, he was still in debt. It seems that he was placed in difficult circumstances, and that his name was now not sufficient surety for borrowings he wished to make. But the whole of the blame for this situation cannot easily be explained by outside influences. He was having trouble with the college council over the buildings for the college, and although he wished in the first instance to have a council, presumably to give the college the benefit of a wise policy, and secondly to safeguard the shareholders' interests, he was apparently not prepared to let it override his plans. In essence, the council was for effect only. The present difficulties arose over priorities for the college buildings. These had been commenced soon after Lang's
return from England in October 1831, mainly to give the mechanics work, and to fulfil the terms of Lord Goderich's grant of funds for the new college. Mr. Thomas Barker, an original member of the college council, later explained the difficulties over the buildings. He indicated that the council were of the opinion that a hall in the first instance would be preferable to lodging houses, but Lang insisted on the houses, and the council gave way. Next, Lang insisted on building four houses, when the original agreement had been to build only two. Four were built. Thomas Barker gave these details in reply to a question by Dr. Lang in a Legislative Assembly investigation in 1862, and he went on to indicate that the main reason for the rift between Lang and the council was due to Lang not acting in his position of secretary to that body and principal of the college. 13

It can easily be imagined that Lang was determined to exercise full control over the whole college organization: but he needed the council, not only for policy reasons, but because of the image which it was necessary to present in order to attract both pupils and shareholders. Another complaint enumerated by Mr. Barker was that Lang rendered no accounts to show how the money subscribed for the college from the shareholders was spent. He indicated that the council had no doubt that the money was expended upon the college buildings, but that Lang's assurances that this was so were, under the circumstances, not really good enough. 14
There can be little doubt that Lang experienced many difficulties in trying to launch into the colony, and in ensuring that it operated satisfactorily, both educationally and financially. However, despite the fact that educational standards in the colony were important to him, and that he was particularly interested in education itself as a means to the improvement of the status of man, in his History he makes more of the problems he had to overcome, and the obstacles purposely placed in the way of the establishment of the college, than he does of the educational achievement itself. One is forced to the conclusion that, important as the educational aspect was, he found greater stimuli in relating his own difficulties and the struggles incurred in overcoming them. When he does refer to the educational attainments of the college, it is in a rather lofty style, as for example, when he praised the management of the King's School and the Sydney College, but indicates that these were only Grammar Schools, whilst the Australian College was a much higher educational institution, being the only one "... offering a regular course of academical education." 15 Apparently the college did reach a high standard, as it was commended by Sir William Burton in 1838 in his The State of Religion and Education in New South Wales. 16

The college did not easily overcome the troubles which it experienced in its early years, but apparently managed to educate the sons of colonial gentlemen to a satisfactory level. Lang tells
us in his History that there were many in the colony who were
against its formation, and who did everything possible to undermine
its development. Apparently the most active were:

... certain parties connected with the Sydney College,
who took every possible opportunity to see that
derogatory remarks against the Australian College
were fully reported in the press. 17

When it became apparent that these remarks were not having the
desired effect, Lang indicated that attempts were made to subvert
the college from within. Such actions as shareholders excusing
themselves from paying; and the college council resolving not to
continue with the building on the ground that the government would
not approve the necessary finance until the building had reached a
certain stage of completion were, he maintained, the results of
this subversive element. 18 It was because of the council's failure
to pursue a forward policy in relation to the college buildings that
Lang found it necessary to sell his Sydney property to raise the
finance needed. 19 It appears from his writings that Lang makes such
an issue out of these events, attributing them to the machinations
of his opponents, whereas it could be contended that they arose
primarily through his own lack of experience and his temperament,
as manifested in his dealings with both his own college council and
with others outside the college also interested in educational matters.
It cannot be denied that there was opposition to him, and to his
schemes, and that he was forced to make personal sacrifices to
keep the college in operation in the manner he envisaged. But it
cannot be denied that he magnified the extent of this opposition, and used it as a form of advertisement for his own actions. In truth, it could be said that he encouraged such opposition, and enjoyed the battle for supremacy.

In spite of the difficulties which arose over the Australian College, its establishment marked another decisive step in Lang's involvement in colonial affairs, and too in his own development. In the present conflict Lang showed a greater ability in promoting his own ideas than he had done previously during the years when he was fighting to establish the Presbyterian Church. But, in 1831 he was no longer the young man of adventure fresh from Scotland; he had returned from England as a married Presbyterian minister, and had been a resident of the colony for some eight years. Moreover, he had, during that time, made two voyages back to England and had returned as the promoter of emigration and of a new educational institution. He had even discussed the formation and aims of the latter with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, receiving his approval without any prior reference being made to the New South Wales Governor. By most standards Lang's achievements were substantial, and they were so regarded by many in the colony upon his return. But he was not a person who could be modest about his achievements, especially when he viewed them with the aspect of an over-zealous missionary. It was perhaps this attitude, together
with his youth (he was in his early thirties) and the success which surrounded him that helped arouse so much opposition. For example, Archdeacon Broughton was most offended that Lang's scheme for education had received Colonial Office approval ahead of his own King's School plan. The Archdeacon's plan had been drawn up before Lang had presented his for approval, and Lord Goderich found that he had to reassure the Archdeacon that the only reason Lang's scheme received official approval first was that Lang had been in London and was able to outline his proposals in person.

Lang now found that there were people whom he had supposedly maligned as a result of the publication of his pamphlet An Account of Steps Taken and about whom he probably had had little thought when writing it. Just such a person was Archdeacon Scott, Broughton's predecessor. In the Sydney Herald of 27th March 1833 was published a letter in which the late Archdeacon of New South Wales indicated that during his proceedings in London Lang "... has calumniated me very grossly." (Scott was referring to the letter which Lang wrote to Lord Goderich, the publication of which seemed to have been Lang's major indiscretion). Lang, in a reply considered this charge "... most unfounded and an injurious imputation". He then proceeded to repeat all he originally wrote to Lord Goderich concerning the Church and School Corporation and concluded his letter by indicating that allegations he made in that letter to Lord Goderich (which he could prove if necessary) were not directed against
any person, but, as Scott was a founder of the Corporation, "hence his peculiar sensitiveness on the subject: hence his utterly unfounded charge against myself". Scott's letter and Lang's reply created further correspondence which appeared in the same paper: some favouring Scott and others upholding the stand taken by Lang. It appeared as though the issue was not to be allowed to rest. Certainly, Lang did not allow it to do so.

It is interesting to note that A. C. Child has claimed Lang probably misread the criticisms appearing in the papers of his college undertaking; criticisms which, in most instances, were fair comment on the college, or more likely, on the manner in which Lang had presented it to the colony. Throughout the various debates which ensured, Lang became very possessive - in fact, he was so sensitive that a hint of criticism was sufficient to call forth a lengthy vindication of his actions. This attitude lasted for years, and in 1836 in the Colonist, the justification was still being made.

... the three emancipist journals, the Sydney Gazette, the Australian and the Monitor fell open-mouthed upon the Australian College, or rather upon Dr. Lang, with whose character and reputation it was almost entirely identified." 24

When he returned to the colony in October 1831, these journals had praised his initiative and fore-sightedness, and their subsequent turning against him is attributable in large measure to his own self-righteous efforts at justifying his own actions at the expense of others.
Dr. Lang journeyed to England again, departing from Sydney on 4th July 1833. The principal reasons he gave for the undertaking of this third voyage home were for matters concerning the Australian College, and for the general affairs of the Presbyterian Church. In a letter to the Australian College Council dated 3rd July 1833, he indicated reasons which prompted him to again go to England on the college's behalf. The major reason seems to have been his concern for a feeling of discontent which had arisen over the actions of certain Presbyterians connected with the Church and the College. In particular, he refers to the Rev. John McGarvie's refusal "to co-operate with the other clergymen of the Church of Scotland ... in the ordination of the Rev. Mr. Pinkerton", who was to leave the Australian College and take up duties as Presbyterian minister at Maitland. This refusal on the part of McGarvie had meant that Pinkerton had to resume his college duties. Lang's tone in the letter was one of extreme annoyance; "the ill-advised procedure of my friend and brother Mr. McGarvie" and he indicated that the effect of McGarvie's lack of co-operation was to disrupt the plans of the clerical body (Maitland of necessity being left vacant) and it made the carrying on of college business difficult. 25 This letter seems to be concerned with pointing out the difficulties caused by McGarvie's actions, though precisely what he is being accused of is obscure. The college council also gains its measure of criticism from Lang, when he reminds that body that he was going to bring out
another qualified English master in Pinkerton's place. However, it seems as though the council intended to fill the vacancy if Pinkerton went to Maitland, and so Lang, in characteristic manner, pointed out that he had foregone compensation for Pinkerton's passage money to Sydney in 1831, providing he remained at the college. Lang then claimed that although the council considered his claim for passage money cancelled, he should have the right to appoint a replacement master, or bring out another Presbyterian minister in lieu, and presumably the college was to bear this expense. 26

Governor Bourke granted Lang leave of absence, but in a despatch received from E. G. Stanley (who had replaced Lord Goderich as Secretary of State for the Colonies) in March 1834, the latter regretted that Bourke should have allowed Lang to leave the colony again so soon after his previous voyage, as the objects which Lang had put forward as the reasons for leaving the colony were not sufficient, in Stanley's view, to justify "... his absenting himself from his Religious duties". 27 Before Lang departed the colony he sent Governor Bourke a memorial which he requested be forwarded on to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. This concerned a request for a grant of land as a reward for his bringing out the mechanics in 1831, and as a means of relieving his financial obligations which had arisen as a result of that venture, and of the establishment of the Australian College. Bourke forwarded the memorial as requested, and although he indicated in a despatch to
the Colonial Secretary that Lang's services to the colony had been most valuable, he stated that he did not believe the grant should be given. The reply from Stanley contained a definite refusal, and pointed to the terms under which the mechanics had been brought to the colony, and these gave Lang no claim whatever to any compensation. It was probably the reply Lang expected, but was worth the attempt to obtain, for had it been successful, he would have been in a much more favourable financial situation.

It seems not unlikely that, although Lang's ostensible reasons for this third journey home concerned college and church matters, he could have had in mind the state of his own financial affairs, and the debts he owed in respect of the charter of the Stirling Castle in 1831. Whatever the precise reasons, it turned out to be a momentous voyage, for during it he wrote his *Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales*. This was published in England after his arrival in 1834, and extended into two volumes. The work evoked much comment, both in England and later in New South Wales, and its importance so far as this study is concerned will become apparent in a later chapter.

Another outcome of this voyage was to be his entry into the field of journalism. This venture arose out of the many criticisms levelled at him after his return to the colony in 1831, and because the pages of the local press had printed most of these, they had, he felt, done him much harm; and he felt himself powerless to reply. He decided to become a newspaper proprietor, but - so he said - he undertook this
venture only on the advice of his friends in England. 31

Whilst Lang was absent from the colony, Governor Bourke put forward his own educational proposals. Since the formal ending of the Church and School Corporation by an order in Council issued on 14th February 1833, Bourke was convinced that the educational structure in the colony had to be as clearly defined as possible. The fate of the various lands granted to the Corporation was a matter for concern, and Chief Justice Forbes and his colleagues were of the opinion that "... upon the dissolution of the Corporation, the lands ...[did] not revert to the Crown ... but that all such land [continued] liable to the trusts therein mentioned." 32 Archdeacon Broughton maintained the revenue from those lands should be applied to maintain and support Episcopal ministers, churches and the schools. But, as Dr. Currey points out, all that was implied in the Corporation's Charter in respect of a dissolution was that a trust was created upon that land, and His Majesty was free to use the proceeds "in such manner as to him seemed 'most conducive to the maintenance' of religion and the education of youth in the colony." 33 This interpretation, which was upheld by Lord Glenelg, who had become Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1835, opened the way for Bourke to promulgate in 1836 educational aims which he had developed in 1833. His proposals were twofold:

(i) that the State should not prefer one religious body to another. This meant that in the colony the Anglicans, Presbyterians
and the Roman Catholics should share in the support to be given to education;

(ii) that because of the scattered nature of the population, there should be schools for general education, which would be supported by the government and regulated after the manner of the Irish Schools which had been established in Ireland by Lord Stanley when he was Chief Secretary for Ireland in September 1831. In such schools, children would be given religious instruction through the medium of their text books, which were Christian in context but free of dogma. A veritable storm of protest blew up immediately around this issue, at the centre of which the Sydney Herald was, and Archdeacon Broughton. The Archdeacon and his clergy were of the opinion that the whole of Bourke's educational ideas menaced their privileged position.

Bourke was in a strong position to impose this system, as he had the support of the Colonial Office, the Legislative Council, and a substantial number of colonists. But in spite of this support, there was considerable opposition, and Lord Glenelg had once warned him that the government had no wish to impose upon the colonial inhabitants any system which might be opposed by the general body of the population. The opposition was well organised, and developed over a period of time. Lang, on this occasion did not lead, but was won over to the opposition ranks by Archdeacon Broughton. It was not until the middle of 1836 that Bourke submitted concrete proposals to the Legislative Council for the establishment of National schools, and by this time, Lang was making
arrangements to leave the colony on yet another voyage to England. However, his opposition to the education system favoured by Bourke seems to have been governed to a great extent by the almost fanatical opposition expressed by the Archdeacon. This cleric called public meetings and formed a Committee to organise the opposition, and even persuaded Lang to join him on that committee. A. G. Austin maintains that Lang imperfectly understood the system he was opposing, but was carried along by the Archdeacon who had appealed to his bigotry and had emphasised that Bourke's scheme was in reality a Romish plot, as evidenced by the acceptance of the system by the Roman Catholic clergy. A notable point has been made by J. W. Metcalfe on Bourke's proposals, when he suggests that had Bourke approached Lang and other liberal Protestants before he actually brought forward his proposals in the Legislative Council, he may have got the essentials of his educational ideas into operation. Also, had the rather irrelevant fact that the scheme had been adopted in Ireland, and the implication that he wished to improve the poor position of the shabbily treated Irish Catholics in the colony not been publicised, the proposals would perhaps not have met with such vehement opposition on the Irish Catholic ground alone. The connotations attached to the words Irish Catholic and Popish were perfect catch cries for the rounding up of opposition, and the Archdeacon exploited them to their fullest extent.

Lang made the columns of his newspaper The Colonist available for the campaign. As previously mentioned, this venture
into journalism was a result of his journey to England in 1833-4, and
was designed as a means whereby he could answer his critics, and so
avoid the situation which arose after his return to the colony in 1831.
It was specifically referred to by him as having been set up to defend
the Australian College from its critics, and so on this basis, its
establishment was a direct result of his education interests. However,
as events turned out, it became another medium through which Dr. Lang
could make known his views of colonial and other affairs. For the
moment our concern with The Colonist is only to the extent that Lang
used it to speak out against Bourke's educational proposals. Appearing
in the paper was one of Lang's verses of comical form but sarcastic in
nature on Bourke's proposals entitled The Irish Stew. In this Lang
cleverly linked the proposals with Irish Catholicism and what he regarded
as its attendant evils. In the 1837 edition of his History, Lang reproduces
this verse, and indicated he was sure its publication in The Colonist
had done more to settle the public mind than a whole series of arguments.38
Interestingly enough, we now come upon a change of heart on Lang's part
with regard to Bourke's educational system, but unfortunately it arrived
too late to save the system from extention. In the 1852 edition of the
History Lang indicates the grounds upon which opposition to Bourke's
proposals was based. "It originated ... in some measure in misapprehensive
to the real character and tendency of the Irish system, which
was almost universally regarded at the time as an antichristian and
infidel system ..." He continued, indicating that it was a generally
held colonial Protestant belief at the time "that a system analogous
to that of the British and Foreign Society, under which the Holy
Scriptures . . . of the authorized version should be used in the
Schools..." And, finally, he thinks that the opposition also originated
"... in a want of experience in regard to the inefficiency and extravagance
of the Denominational system." 39

This episode evidences one of the few admissions by Lang
that he had adopted a wrong policy, but he does excuse himself on the
ground that many others were of the same opinion as himself, and that
their views had arisen from lack of experience rather than from a desire
to oppose for the sake of opposition. In the 1852 edition of the History,
as well as admitting he should not have opposed the system, he freely
admitted that on a visit to Dublin in 1837 he fully investigated the so-called
Irish system, and was amazed to find it very comprehensive in its
educational scope. He also admitted that with such a large Roman
Catholic population in the colony, it was not practicable to have the
schools established on a purely Protestant basis, and that the one of
common Christianity used in the Irish National Schools was the ideal
basis. This comment was written after he had been able to observe
the working of the Denominational system as it developed in the colony,
where the various religious bodies competed for public funds. He sums
up that system thus:

Education, instead of being pursued for its own sake, and
for that of the benefits . . . it would . . . [impart] to the youth
of the colony, became a mere matter of clerical patronage,
and a means of reducing the public instructors of youth to a condition of abject servility under the clergy of the different religious denominations.

Admittedly this comment was given after he had decided that any form of state aid for religion was not acceptable - his embracing of the principle of voluntarism, which he advocated for churches and church schools. This principle had interested him for many years, but it was only upon his return from a visit to the United States of America in 1840 that he embraced it fully in practice himself, though he had advertised it widely for several years prior to adopting it.

Whilst the type of educational system proposed for the colony as a whole had been in dispute, Lang's Australian College had continued its growth, but this was as difficult and eventful as were its formative years. The headmaster, the Rev. Mr. Carmichael, left the college and at the beginning of 1835 formed his own school, the Normal Institution. The resultant recriminations taken by Carmichael and Lang against each other spread over many months and took the form of numerous articles and letters in the press, as well as by public speeches. The incident is a most unsavoury one, as it seems to reveal a very vicious side of Lang's character, especially in circumstances where people failed to act out the roles he had cast for them. Carmichael's departure from the college, together with some of its pupils, must have had a detrimental effect upon its status in the colony, and also upon its educational standard, as the remaining staff had to cope with the increased burden of teaching. Lang had returned from England with
two new masters in 1834, but was faced with the prospect of locating a new headmaster. It is to his credit that the college did continue, and that its standards improved over the succeeding years, despite the Carmichael debacle, the details of which continued to appear in the columns of the colonial press for some time afterwards.

The exact circumstances of Mr. Carmichael's departure need not concern us in this present instance, but it is illuminating to dwell for the moment on the manner in which Lang dealt with Carmichael's defection, and how it was he never forgot the incident or hesitated to condemn Carmichael's actions in the years which followed. The reasons Carmichael gave for his desire to leave the Australian College were published in the *Sydney Herald*, and were basically:

(i) that he believed the college would never attract public support or be freed from a sectarian constitution until Dr. Lang's private interests, personal feelings and individual views were subordinated to the welfare of the college; and

(ii) the terms of his employment, which included a free passage to England within three years if he was not desirous of remaining, had not been complied with.

However, Lang apparently pointed out to him that the free return passage had only been offered him if the college should prove a failure, and whilst it might not have proved a success in Carmichael's view, it certainly did not rate as a failure. *The Colonist* entered the dispute,
publishing letters from both Lang and Carmichael, and adding its own pertinent comments, no doubt composed by Dr. Lang. The issue was not as clear as Carmichael made out, and what first aroused Lang's suspicions was that Carmichael indicated he would be satisfied with the cost of the fare to England in lieu of the passage being booked. Lang explained the situation in the *History* (1852 edition) thus:

> Mr. Carmichael had acknowledged from the first that he had no intention to go to England at all; and this rendered his procedure at the time somewhat mysterious and unaccountable.

Lang also drew some conclusions, and stated that at that particular time Governor Bourke was in daily expectation of receiving a favourable reply to his despatch of 1833 concerning the colony's churches and schools:

> ... and presuming that he would have it within his power to establish the National System ... he had given Mr. Carmichael some reason to expect the appointment of General Superintendent of schools.  

This may well have been the case, but Lang does not indicate where he obtained his information, nor does it excuse him for the manner in which he destroyed the character of Mr. Carmichael. This latter action was done in several ways, one of which appeared in *The Colonist* of 5th March 1835 where Lang stated that a reason for Carmichael's departure was that he had not been made head of the Australian College, and by leaving, hoped that the college would founder. Lang concludes his dissertation on Mr. Carmichael in the *History* as follows:
But of all the instances of downright ingratitude I have hitherto experienced in my Colonial career - and I confess they have neither been few in number, nor slightly aggravated - there has been none so thoroughly heartless, so inexpressibly contemptible, as that of the Rev. Henry Carmichael, A.M., Assistant Government Surveyor for Dungog and Manning River Districts in New South Wales. 45.

This comment, designed to show how Carmichael had not profited by his dealings since leaving the Australian College, is really indicative of Lang's malevolent, unchristian and thoroughly petty attitude to those who whilst once working with him, had dared to consider that their own future might lie outside of his plans.

There can be little doubt that the departure of Mr. Carmichael from the college did disturb the running of that institution. But it disturbed the plans of Dr. Lang even more. It further tarnished his image as a public figure in connection with the college, and if he is to be believed, destroyed his original plan for the editorship of The Colonist. This position, so he mentioned at a later date, was to be offered to Carmichael. If this was so, no wonder Lang was somewhat bitter over Carmichael's defection; if it was not so, then Lang was able to appear to have been very badly treated by one in whom he reposed so much trust.

To have placed an educationalist as editor of his newspaper would have pleased Lang, for he saw himself as a pioneer of quality education in the colony. This emphasis is evident from an editorial which appeared in The Colonist of 30th April 1835 on High Schools, Colleges and Universities. The view which this editorial tried to present was that
in many instances the present form of colonial education was the best available, but that the best available was not good enough. For example, it quoted the case of Mr. Cape, Principal of the Sydney College, who had not had the benefits of a university education; therefore how could it be expected that his standards would be high. What does emerge from the editorial is that the Australian College could be classed as the only college in the colony founded to promote an academical education and staffed by educated persons. In this sense it presents Lang's highest achievement. But we must be aware that a high standard of education was inherent in his upbringing, and great importance was attached to it in Scotland. On many occasions Lang emphasized that one of the reasons for the founding of The Colonist was to revive and re-establish the Australian College. Consequently, it was not to be expected that the college would be compared to anything likely to detract from its image in the pages of that newspaper.

Whether by choice or accident the whole of the early years of the Australian College were acted out upon the public stage. Perhaps it was a combination of both, and this because of the personality of Dr. Lang. His ideas and intentions may have been unimpeachable, but his methods often jeopardized the educational system he was promoting. The Australian College was born out of Lang's association with the Sydney College, and in such a manner that it appeared to many that he cared not for education, but rather for education only if promoted
under his own auspices. He exhibited extreme opportunism in educational matters where his own college was concerned, but never hesitated to condemn, as vehemently as possible, the same trait when it appeared in others and conflicted with his own interests. Witness the ill-fated Mr. Henry Carmichael. Religion entered strongly into the framework of his educational ideas. Although he wished the Australian College to be non-denominational in character, its predominant religious attitude was naturally that of Presbyterianism, though surprisingly in rather a liberal and non-dogmatic form. Perhaps this, in some measure, reflected his genuine concern with religion and education; but it could also be attributed to a desire to educate as many of the sons of important colonial families as possible. Lang was not averse to the idea of attracting influential people. It would seem that through education Lang was seeking to improve the social and intellectual standard of the young colonists, be they Presbyterians or not. In the latter case, perhaps he saw himself in the role of a crusader, spreading a liberal idea. Perhaps for Lang:

the ultimate and legitimate object of all education [was] the formation of a moral and religious character, and not merely the advancement of the human intellect in literature, philosophy and science.
CHAPTER SIX

PART II

EMIGRATION
We have made reference earlier to Dr. Lang's emigrational venture with the Stirling Castle in 1831, which was directly linked to his founding of the Australian College. Having so far dealt with the college and its relationship to Lang's position in the colony, we are bound to include in our discussion its relationship to his emigrational ideas, and the progress of these during the thirties. A typical characteristic of Dr. Lang was the manner in which he combined his particular interests, so that any one scheme almost invariably became involved with another. This was particularly so with education and emigration, so far as their initial development was concerned at least; then later, emigration became closely linked with his ideas on transportation.

The success, especially the success in terms of praise, which greeted Lang upon his return from England in 1831 with a ship load of emigrants, was to him justification enough for having decided to sponsor the venture, and it encouraged him to contemplate further action in the field of free emigration. Never a modest man when he had a role to play, and when important issues were concerned, Lang now considered himself a prime mover in the campaign to promote further free settlers to come to the colony. However, enthusiastic though he undoubtedly was, many of the proposals he put forward in his pamphlet An Account of Steps Taken had been foreshadowed by the findings of the Select Committee on Emigration from the United Kingdom in 1826-7. This
is pointed out, not to deride Lang's dissemination of these ideas, but
to indicate that he was not the author of advanced ideas for colonial
settlement. Rather, his contribution was a very practical one - he
carried these ideas into effect. However, not merely content with the
activity concerned with the emigrants on the Stirling Castle, Lang had
to write and put forward his own theories behind the voyage, and develop
various proposals for the disposal of land to encourage future emigration.
Although he wrote giving the appearance of presenting these ideas as
original, and advanced, they had already been made manifest in the
minds of those at the Colonial Office for some time; both for colonial
land policy, and emigration. But it was to be the year 1831 which saw
them come to fruition.

The momentous regulations which changed colonial land
policy in 1831, and to which Lang would lay claim to having helped
foster, were due to Lord Goderich's particular conversion to Edward
Gibbon Wakefield's theory of systematic colonisation. The acceptance
of that theory can be traced to the changes which were wrought in the
attitude and outlook of the Colonial Office by Lord Bathurst during his
long tenure of office, a period in which it might truly be said that the
Colonial Office, and not the British Parliament, was the final arbiter
of colonial problems and policies. The principles of Wakefield's
theory of systematic colonisation are worth enumerating briefly, as
a guide to the understanding of Lang's attitudes towards colonial land policies. They are as follows:

(i) the prosperity of new colonies was dependent mainly upon the abundance of labour at the command of capitalists in proportion to the extent of territory occupied;

(ii) this abundance was to be secured by introducing labourers from the outside, and keeping them in the condition of labourers on wages for a considerable time;

(iii) the revenue derived from the sale of new land was to be used to set up a fund to bear the cost of introducing those labourers;

(iv) by selling land at a sufficiently high price, labourers would be prevented from rising in the community too rapidly to become independent landholders;

(v) the entire proceeds of the land sales should be devoted to the obtaining of immigrants - the aim being to keep the equilibrium between land, labour and capital;

(vi) land was to be sold at a fixed uniform price per acre, and not by auction;

(vii) the results of such a system were designed to concentrate the population and check inconvenient dispersion over the countryside.

This then was the theory, but even Lord Goderich was not entirely convinced of the practicality of this in its totality. The scheme which
came into operation in 1832 decreed that no land was to be alienated by the Crown except by public auction, with a minimum price of 5/- per acre, and then only portion of the proceeds of such sale was to be used for immigration. Thus, from its inception, the new regulations, whilst professing to follow the new ideas current in progressive circles, was only adopting portion of them. But, perhaps the most important aspect was that colonial land policy now became linked with immigration policy. The basic Wakefieldian idea that the sale of Crown land rather than the offering of free grants, and the promotion of immigration, was being implemented.

Lang had addressed a memorandum to the governor, prior to the coming into force of these regulations, which outlined his own suggestions for promoting "an extensive emigration of the industrious classes" to New South Wales. In this he envisaged the establishment of a Board of Education, consisting of "gentlemen of extensive practical experience", including the governor, who would devote part of their time in the furtherance of various emigration matters. These concerned such details as what class of person would be of primary importance to the colony; to what extent it would be possible to settle such people with benefit to themselves and to the community, and whether they should be settled in the town or the country; the most economic manner in which emigration could be sponsored. To finance the scheme initially, Lang thought money could be borrowed in London
at low interest. An emigration board could be set up in London to handle matters at that end, and also select the emigrants. This was to be the general policy of the emigration scheme. He then continued by outlining for the governor the various classes of persons which should be encouraged:

(i) persons of small capital, of the middle and industrious classes;

(ii) mechanics of all descriptions (and he then quotes the success of the Stirling Castle venture); and

(iii) agricultural labourers.

He also emphasizes that whole families, or even groups of families, could be brought out and settled together, and as an example, he cites the early Presbyterian settlers of Portland Head who had formed themselves into a community which had maintained high social and moral standards since their arrival there in 1820. Lang was of the opinion that should the governor think the idea acceptable, then such areas as Emu Plains and Bathurst would prove suitable for settlement in that way. Should such a plan be implemented, it would be preferable if the people who were to occupy such a settlement came from the same vicinity "in the mother country" as this would ensure that the same "moral restraints" would operate. Perhaps it was in this document to Governor Bourke that Lang expressed his true desires for the type of emigration he felt would be ideal for the colony, and would ensure its growth as a prosperous and free community. There can be little
doubt in our minds that the area in the "Mother Country" from which these emigrants should come was Scotland. In fact, what Lang was advocating was government support for Presbyterian emigration, as opposed to his continuance of other ventures based on the Stirling Castle experiment.

Lang's proposals to the governor seemed to remain just that, as it was during 1832 that Lord Goderich's regulations were implemented, and they envisaged a scheme of emigration based on an appointed commissioner in London who was to encourage emigration and protect and advise those who decided to venture out to the colony. There is, however, no doubt that Lang saw the implementation of the system as being of benefit to the colony. To him, any proposal which negated the wholesale granting of land was to be commended. Although he did not wholeheartedly embrace Wakefieldian principles, either at that time or later, he wrote a very fitting tribute to Wakefield in the 1852 edition of his History, and classes Wakefield's principles as being "one of the most important discoveries of modern times." 7

Perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of Lang's attitude towards emigration was that, though he was not always original in the ideas he promoted, he did take the initiative, and made a practical demonstration which opened the way for the government to follow. In the Stirling Castle venture, he put into practice what the home government had been theorizing about for some years, and in
this respect he could be said to have led the government into its measures to promote emigration. But in spite of this auspicious beginning, Lang isolated himself by trying to limit the scheme for emigration to fit what he considered was the ideal mould - that of encouraging industrious Scottish Presbyterian families to emigrate.

This could well be considered too much of a generalization, and it may be so, but others in his own time saw him this way. For example, Sir Roger Therry in his Reminiscences praises Lang for his very valuable services to emigration, but states:

Un fortunately, Dr. Lang has always taken action on the question of emigration in a sectarian spirit, and apparently with a view of making the colony a plantation of Presbyterians from Scotland.

The government’s emigration proposals became a reality in London when in June 1831 a Board of Commissioners of Emigration was formed to collect information on the subject of emigration to all British possession, and to assist persons wishing to emigrate. In October, the first regulation was issued, and this concerned a government payment of £8 towards the passage money of selected females between the ages of fifteen and thirty who wished to travel to New South Wales or Van Diemen’s Land. Preference was to be given to women travelling with their families, to those who could act as servants in agricultural districts, and to those prepared to pay a large portion of their passage money. It was a beginning, but not one which satisfied many in the colony, and of those dissatisfied, John Lang was a vehement spokesman.
In the years 1832, 1833 and 1834 emigration to New South Wales had been conducted exclusively under the auspices of the Female Emigration Board, in London; but in so exceptional a manner that in the year 1835, the streets of Sydney and the public houses of the colony were actually swarming with free immigrant prostitutes from the cities of London, Dublin and Cork, the expense of whose passage out had been defrayed from the land revenues of the colony.

This was strong condemnation, but when one considers the particular benefits Lang expected would be achieved from emigration, then even his rather outspoken statement becomes valid criticism.

Lang's first public expression of his emigration aims was made at a lecture given on 9th May 1833, and this lecture was subsequently printed as a pamphlet. Lang took as the basis for any form of immigration to the colony the colonists' own attitude, and insisted that it should be their responsibility to see that the funds from the sale of Crown lands were used for proper immigrational purposes, and administered properly. Also, it was the colonists' own responsibility to ensure that the emigrants chosen for the colony were those whose value to the colony could not be questioned. In this same lecture he suggested that there was a need for some 10,000 to 20,000 agricultural labourers, and also for more mechanics, but the latter he felt should have to repay the amount of passage money advanced to them, as it was unjust to those already in the colony who had had to pay for their passages. (It would appear that he had in mind those mechanics already in the colony who had arrived in the Stirling Castle and who had to pay, out of their colonial earnings, their passage money. And they had to pay it to Dr. Lang). He accused the Board of Emigration in London of
bad selection, since in many cases the £20 presently advanced to each married mechanic by way of loan was seldom repaid. Without wishing to dwell in too great a detail on the proposals and comments Lang made in this lecture, a short summary of the main points will help to relate these ideas with those we have already examined in his letter to Governor Bourke, and also those which he later expressed, especially through the pages of The Colonist. The main points to arise in his lecture were as follows:

(i) the gradual sale of land (in the country) and town allotments on credit. This would result in the gradual building up of a fund, and would encourage colonists to purchase;

(ii) on the security of that capital, the colonial government could borrow in London at a low rate of interest; this money could then be used to defray the expenses of agricultural emigration;

(iii) a committee of gentlemen connected with the commerce of the colony should superintend the selection of the emigrants in England;

(iv) a board should be set up to select the location for the settlement of the immigrants upon their arrival in the colony. The Sydney Gazette was in attendance at the lecture, and although they regretted that "they were not at the moment possessed of the means of taking notes" they thoroughly approved of the subject matter; felt that Lang had proved the feasibility of the scheme; and recommended that the lecture be published, especially in London. It would seem that the lecture - or the publication of it - did have some effect. For
on Lang's next visit to England (he left the colony in July 1833) the Secretary of State for the Colonies in April 1834 granted funds for the assistance of free agricultural settlers, to the extent of £20 to each approved family, and Lang was given the task of selecting the first sixty families who, he decided, would settle in the Illawarra district.

It was, however, only after his return from England in 1834 with the means to establish a weekly newspaper, The Colonist, that Lang found a perfect medium for launching his criticisms of various public and private issues, and the problems associated with emigration were to be well documented. In fact, in the second edition, which appeared on 8th January 1835 there appeared a rather fierce comment on female emigration to New South Wales, which criticised the Emigration Board in London who had appointed a Mr. John Marshall as agent. Marshall, said Lang, had been bankrupt some four years previously to the extent of about £30,000, and was now retrieving his fortunes at the expense of the colonies. He criticised the Secretary of State for making an order giving a £12 bounty to those females who should emigrate from London in vessels taken for that purpose by the Board, which thus confined immigrants to the London area and excluded families from other areas, or seaport towns, who would have brought out unmarried female relations. One may read into this the implication that there was no direct encouragement being given to Scottish emigration. It was by means of such an article that Lang began to set the tone of his
journal, and to distribute to a much wider audience the opinions he held.

John Marshall replied to Lang's accusations against him in a pamphlet entitled *A Refutation of the Slanders and Wilful Misrepresentations* published at Sydney by Dr. Lang, and denied that vessels sailing directly from Scottish ports would aid bounty emigration from that country. He quoted an example where the Board had advertised such a sailing from Leith or the Clyde, and the response was so poor that the venture had to be abandoned.  

Marshall wrote to Messrs. William Walker & Co., of Sydney, in reply to a letter of Lang's which had been published in the *Sydney Monitor* of 13th December 1834. Lang's letter, like the article appearing in *The Colonist* of January 1835, was severely critical of the Boards for Emigration in London, and claimed that the colonists themselves should have control of the funds from the sale of Crown Lands.  

Marshall, in this reply, seemed to express a certain amazement at the attitude taken by Lang in his letter as, from conversations he had had with Lang in London, he knew Lang had expressed his approbation of the services the Emigration Committee rendered to the colonies. So far as he was aware, Lang's only stipulation had been that more emphasis should be placed on family emigration. Lang, of course, could not help but reply to this, and again accused Marshall of dissembling. The unpleasantness of the whole issue has been well expressed by Mr. David Macmillan, who says:
In this controversy it appears that Lang, typically, overstated the case for direct sailings from Scotland, and went too far in his personal attack on Marshall . . . and the statements in Marshall's Refutation should probably be treated with as much reserve as Lang's fulminations against Marshall and his exaggeration of the willingness of Scots working class people to go out to Australia.

There can be no doubt that Lang's desire to promote emigration, especially from Scotland, was a genuine one, and that the efforts he made, both in the colony and in England, to have the emigration system placed on a sound basis were motivated by a desire to benefit the colony, and those who immigrated to it. However, as happened with other causes he espoused, his own nature and the manner and subject matter of his propaganda left him vulnerable to attack. This can be evidenced from his particular desire to promote emigration from Scotland, and from the manner in which his opponents were able to make such effective use of this to destroy his other ideas - ideas which were of practical use. For example, he saw in the female emigration situation the likelihood of an excessive influx of immigrants from the London area, whereas, his emphasis on Scotland as a source of better class emigration was taken by many to be as extreme a view as those who favoured only English or Irish emigration. Lang's emphasis on emigration from Scotland tends to be somewhat misleading, as from his own writings one gains the impression that his was the sole voice raised in its support. However, Lang was only trying to stimulate what had, in fact, been a steady stream of Scottish emigration to Australia over the previous
twenty years. As well as emigration, there had been various Scottish commerical ventures during the same period, and so Australia was well-known to the Scottish commercial houses. There was one factor which Lang was keen to advertise in praise of the Scottish emigrant, and that concerned his educational attainments, and the high standard of family life which generally prevailed. Certainly, most of the Scottish settlers who had come out to Australia by the mid thirties were proof enough of this claim. Of all the areas in the United Kingdom, Scotland appears to have had a better and more universal educational system, and this together with the influence exerted by the Presbyterian Church, brought a higher standard of life generally amongst most classes. Emigration from Scotland had been directed towards New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land since the second decade of the 19th century; and in the twenties, ships operated by the Australian Company from Leith brought out settlers as well as goods for trade. It appears as though several hundred Scottish mechanics (or artisans) emigrated in this fashion with their families. These mechanics, though perhaps few in number, certainly outnumbered English emigrants of the same class. The major reason for the small number of Scottish emigrants seems to be that the bounty system, controlled by the Emigration Boards in London, did not begin to operate for Scottish emigrants to Australia until 1837. Correspondingly, this meant that those who did emigrate prior to that year were probably a more enterprising type of settler. But it also highlights the problem insofar as Lang was concerned, for
he wished to see control of emigration vested in colonial hands, and this, he hoped, would enable him to influence the selection of emigrants to whom bounties or assisted passages might be given. And, of course, his sympathies lay with Scotland; and in Scotland with the agricultural and artisan classes rather than the commercial classes. So, whilst he was campaigning for better controls over emigration selection and for colonial land revenues to be used to assist emigration, he unfortunately made the usual errors to which he was prone - he made it quite obvious he supported Scottish emigration in preference to English and Irish, and he had no hesitation in using all means at his disposal to accomplish that aim.

Lang, as we have observed, was not the first to promote Scottish emigration, though he was the first to bring out mechanics with the approval of the British Government and for a specific purpose. But the colonial authorities had not been idle in the matter of emigration, for with the changing nature of the colony, the question of what form of labour force would eventually replace the convicts had to be solved. During the thirties the question of the future for transportation exercised many minds, and the gradual building up of the free population with labourers, domestic servants and others of skilled trades was essential. Also, men outnumbered women in the ratio of about three to one, and somehow this had to be rectified. The land regulations of 1831 earmarked land sale revenue for immigational purposes, and in the same year, Lord Goderich organized the sailing to the colony of a shipload
of women from the Foundling Hospital at Cork. Later that year unemployed agricultural labourers in England were also sent to New South Wales. Finance for these emigrants was to be obtained from the colonial land revenues. A Board of Commissioners was established in London to assist emigrants and organise their transport. Government responsibility for emigration to Australia continued on these lines until by 1835 12,187 immigrants had arrived in the colony. But in the colony there was much dissatisfaction with the operation of the system, as the Emigration Commission had been replaced by a voluntary body, the Emigration Committee, who were seemingly not so thorough in their choice of emigrants, and it was in his criticism of this body that Lang had been so very outspoken.

In May of 1835 Governor Bourke appointed a Committee of the Legislative Council to enquire into the whole emigrational system, Chief Justice Forbes being chairman. This committee enumerated several serious weaknesses in the system as it was then operating; indicating that there appeared to be insufficient care in the selection of emigrants; that there was a conflict of interests between the Agent (Mr. David Marshall) and the Emigration Committee; and several other matters as well, all of which had been among Lang's criticisms made in the columns of The Colonist. The Chief Justice and his colleagues indicated that they were very much aware of the services rendered by Dr. Lang in his efforts to increase the number of emigrants, but it
was "their decided opinion that to establish an immediate and effective scheme of immigration, the Government should take the lead." 24

This was not meant to indicate that private ventures were to be discouraged, but rather, that to be effective the whole emigrational system had to be placed upon a well organized and dependable basis.

There appears little doubt that although Lang was very critical, both of the manner in which emigration was controlled and operated from London and of the type of immigrant arriving in the colony, others were equally dissatisfied. This general criticism culminated in the recommendations of Chief Justice Forbes and his Committees in 1835. Lang, whilst making many valid criticisms of the emigration system and of its effects, was openly advocating that the ideal immigrant was to be found in Scotland. As we have discussed, it was this fact which was interpreted by so many as being Presbyterian bias on his part. But, looking back, it is obvious that Scotland was neglected as a source of immigration until about 1837, when T. F. Elliot was appointed Agent-General for Emigration, and was able to secure the co-operation of Dr. Boyter, a naval surgeon, who had been appointed Colonial Emigration Agent in Scotland by Sir Richard Bourke. 25 It was Dr. Boyter's commission to operate a new colonial bounty scheme which had been approved by the New South Wales authorities in October 1835. The fact that the Colonial Government had become aware of the need for some form of representation in Scotland, and had instituted an active
bounty scheme for that country was in some measure due to the success of Lang's own efforts on behalf of emigration, and of course to his constant propaganda on the value of Scottish emigration.

Lang did not seek to abandon his own private emigration ventures simply because the authorities had extended official recognition to Scotland as a source of prospective immigrants. On his fourth journey back to England in 1836, he again organized further groups of emigrants. On this occasion he had obtained authority from Governor Bourke for his brother Andrew Lang "to import one hundred families" from Southern Europe. In a letter to Lang, Lord Glenelg indicated he was by no means in favour of this enterprise, as the proceeds of the sale of Crown lands could not really be used to promote foreign emigration. However, since Bourke's permission had been obtained, Glenelg decided to sanction the enterprise, but restricted the number of families to be included. But this venture proved a fiasco, as the German emigrants forced the captain of the ship carrying them to New South Wales to re-land them at Rio de Janeiro. Lang, in his History, comments that they would have made excellent settlers. At least, he was well able to say so, as it was impossible to put this to the test. During this same visit to England, he successfully persuaded Lord Glenelg to provide him with facilities for establishing a mission to the aborigines to be organized with German Protestants at Moreton Bay. He was able to recruit Lutheran ministers and twelve lay missionaries.
It is surprising to note that Lang nearly always achieved distinct success in his dealings with the Colonial Office when in London — much more so than had he first placed his proposals before the colonial governor. Direct negotiation with those in ultimate authority appears to have been method for achieving a successful outcome for his plans.

The Lutheran missionaries sailed on board the Minerva, a ship which Lang had chartered on behalf of a resident landholder in New South Wales to carry out agricultural and other emigrants for him. It appears that other ships, probably organized by Lang, also set out at this time. This is evident from a letter received by Lang from John Ker of Greenock, who had acted as Lang's agent since the Stirling Castle venture in 1831. In the same letter, John Ker mentions to Lang that it must have been very satisfactory for him to see that all his labours with "... the Gentlemen of the Colonial Office have been crowned with so much success." Ker also observed that the government was "acting well on emigration" in Scotland, and it was his opinion that they had adopted every one of Lang's suggestions. So much so, that "a new era in the history of emigration appears to have begun and I have no doubt in a great measure through your instrumentality." Certainly, in Scotland it would appear that Lang had done a great deal to promote organized emigration, but even so, the work of others generally in the field of emigration probably exceeded his. This is not to deride the contribution Lang made towards emigration both
for Scottish emigration, and in relation to the entire emigration
system. The times were changing, and Lang was a spokesman for
change. Consequently, the changes he advocated were in part
achieved through his own efforts, and partly through the sympathetic
attitudes of both the colonial and home governments.
CHAPTER SIX

PART III

TRANSPORTATION
It was transportation which had been productive of both the colony's growth in material terms, and of the many evils which appeared in that society. It had been part of colonial life from the foundation of the colony, and although its faults were apparent to many, so also were its advantages. But, as free immigration increased, and the number of emancipated convicts became larger, the question of the future of the colony as a place for transported felons began to be discussed. Strangely, efforts to improve the situation of the convict seemed to have concerned only a few well-intentioned people until, with the increase of free immigration, a reappraisal of the whole system was forced upon the colony. Perhaps one of the most extraordinary aspects of the transportation system was the manner in which it evoked so little condemnation from the churches who, it seemed, regarded the presence of the convict in the colony as no more remarkable than other natural phenomena peculiar to the Australian scene. The convict was part of the colonial way of life, and consequently, any actions designed to remove this were greeted in many quarters by strong disapproval. This attitude existed until the mid-thirties, at least, and was in some measure due to the prevailing belief that "Christianity spoke to man's eternal soul, not his temporal welfare". This was reflected in the idea that punishment led to reform, and hence the emphasis in the convict system of compulsory religious observances.

Insofar as the attitude of the Presbyterian church in the colony
was concerned, it might have been expected that, being a church of high moral standards and one to which a large percentage of the free and more industrious settlers belonged, it would have displayed some positive efforts to aid the plight of the convict. But it does not appear to have registered very much concern, and because of this it has been suggested that Lang himself gave tacit approval for transportation. ²

But, if he gave tacit approval for the system, so then did the other churches, and in particular the Church of England which, as the senior church, should have set the standard. In his History, the first edition of which was published in 1834, Lang expressed considerable concern for the evils resulting from the convict system. He lamented that a greater volume of free settlers was not introduced at an earlier date, as had been recommended by Governor Phillip. ³ But as we have already observed, Lang at this time was industriously publicizing, and taking steps to remedy, this situation. He chose to outline in the History the evils associated with transportation, and observed that the indiscriminate collecting together of criminals reduced all to the same level of iniquity. This, he maintained, tended to blunt any moral sense they may have had, with the result that there arose a morbid sympathy on the part of the free population for those convicts whose crime was less than others but whose punishment was similar. In reality the convict found his position, because of this attitude, being considered rather as one of misfortune than as arising from his own misconduct. ⁴ This reinforces the opinions Lang expressed later in the
same chapter, where he quotes a notable and outspoken opponent of
the transportation system, Archbishop Whatley of Dublin, as saying,
"The transportation of felons is an experiment whose failure has been
decisely proved". But Lang doubted if the system had been properly
tried, and indicated that the experiment was a noble one, and that had
the system been properly operated, the Archbishop's requisites for a
penal system to be humane, corrective, cheap and formidable would
have been fulfilled. Lang maintained that the whole transportation
system was entrusted to chance and to ignorance; too much power was
entrusted to the governor when what was required for the operation of
a penal establishment was a government appointed council of men
experienced in the management of criminals. But it was necessary
for these men to be enlightened as well. Also, there was a primary
need for a strong and efficient police force to support and enforce the
decisions of the council. The failure of the transportation system as
it had existed was not due to the system itself, but rather to the manner
in which it had been administered.

In many respects, Lang's attitude to the transportation system
has its origin in his background. For example, this becomes evident
in his dislike of emancipists, and especially of those who had become
successful in business, the professions or politics. He did not appear
to regard them as fellow beings who had erred, paid the penalty for their
crime, and then by exercise of their own talents (perhaps) had risen to
a position of respectability in the world. He certainly viewed them, in theory, in a charitable manner, but if this attitude was to be maintained towards them, it was necessary for them to conform to certain rules, and it was in this respect that Lang brought his theology to bear upon the matter. These rules, if they may be so termed, he set out in the 1837 edition of the History, and are worth noting. Briefly, they are as follows:

(i) if an individual who had been a convict became thoroughly reformed, then he should exhibit a retiring disposition, and not endeavour to thrust himself on to, or in to, society in any way. He should, in fact, prefer a life of obscurity;

(ii) but if he is obtrusive and thrusts himself on to society (who says Lang, still regards him with aversion and suspicion) then it is a moral certainty of his not being reformed at all. 6

As an example of this he quotes Governor Macquarie's reformed convicts as being of the latter type. What is most interesting is that Lang did not include these principles in the first edition of the History, but they did appear in the 1837 edition. It seems almost as though the problems and discussions which arose over emigration and transportation between 1834 and 1837 set his mind to work, and he formulated what had been his attitude to the transportation system and to emancipated convicts over the years. Also, the years 1835 and 1836 saw his newspaper The Colonist in print, and he had had some severe clashes with what he
termed the "convict press" which would only have confirmed him in his inherent dislike of the "obtrusive" emancipist. But, despite the attitudes he held, it was not the position one would have expected from a minister of religion. It was quite uncompromising, and in truth, almost political in its intensity of expression.

Despite the rigorous point of view taken by Lang towards the emancipated convict, and his unyielding insistence that those who had committed offences should suffer a just punishment, it is not to be thought that he condoned the practice of cruelty or inhumanity which was so often the lot of the convict. Brutal treatment was suffered by many a convict, especially the assigned convict who had lost the lottery and drawn a harsh master; a master who saw in his assigned convict an instrument for gain, a piece of property to be worked as hard and as long as possible. Perhaps it was the evil which resulted from the assignment system, more than any other aspect of transportation, which brought the question of a replacement for convict labour into general discussion. And the replacement was the free immigrant who came out from England with little or no capital, and who was prepared to work for wages. Certainly for the employer this would cost more, but the benefits would be greater as the immigrant would be sure to be a conscientious worker. However, not all who possessed assigned convicts felt that the immigrant would be a satisfactory replacement for the convict. It was to them simply a matter of economics, and for almost nothing in outlay, they could have as many assigned convicts
as they required. To risk the unknown and take on only free immigrant
labour, apart from the costs involved, was foolhardy and most impractical.

Again, the position of the assigned convict varied. Not all masters
were avaricious and heartless, and as Lang notes in the History, the
estate of Colonel Dumaresq was governed by "the law of kindness". He
mentions that divine service was performed at midday every Sabbath,
with a result that might have been expected - "the men [assigned
convicts] are sober, industrious and contented". He regretted generally
that there was a lack of interest by most masters of assigned convicts
in the spiritual welfare of those in their charge. 8 He might also have
mentioned the lack of practical support shown by the churches in
ministering to the spiritual and other needs of the convicts.

There was a desire for the change within the colony, and this
grew steadily during the early thirties as the number of convicts
arriving in the colony steadily increased. Certainly, under the assign-
ment system this meant an increase in the numbers available for those
who needed assistance on their properties, or for domestic purposes.
But, with the English legal reforms of the twenties and early thirties
making transportation a punishment for serious crimes only, the type
of convict arriving was less likely to include the better educated
convict, or the poorer type of agricultural worker who had previously
been transported for what were relatively minor offences. The
Molesworth Report of 1837/38 described the convicts being sent to the
colony in the thirties as "the very dregs of society". This meant that the convicts, whether still serving a sentence, holding tickets-of-leave, or freed, were beginning to set the tone for the colony. In many instances they were lowering the standards set by the free settler, who, unlike the transported convict, had invested his capital in the colony and had much to lose through any reduction in the tone of the colony. This, in itself, is one reason for Lang's championing of the cause of Scottish emigration, for he saw the Scottish people acting as a bulwark against the corrupting influence of the transported class.

Lang's interest in the transportation system does not appear to have become of public importance until his writing of the History, and the establishment of his newspaper. Prior to this he seems to have confined his statements on transportation to comments upon the predominance of Irish Catholics among those arriving as convicts. He was never favourably inclined towards the obtrusive emancipist, but it does not appear to have become an important matter with him until the transportation issue became a subject of general discussion and concern among the colonists, and until he himself had come into conflict with a few of this class. Then, his whole approach to transportation as a colonial political issue appeared to be formed by his dislike and distrust of the emancipated convict. His railings against the "convict press" of Sydney, which appeared in his newspaper from 1835 onwards are notable instances of this attitude. In various articles
he gave examples of the harm done by such a paper as the *Sydney Gazette* whilst it was under the joint management of an emancipated convict and a ticket-of-leave man. As a result of this, he was forced to endure the perils of a libel suit brought by Edward O'Shaughnessy (the emancipated convict). Actually, Lang rather welcomed the case as an opportunity to demonstrate the importance of his theory on the place an emancipated convict should occupy in society. But it was not only from Lang that criticism of the convict element permeating society came. The *Sydney Herald* began to mount an intense campaign during the early months of 1835, as rumours became current that the colony would have to pay for the maintenance of the convicts, and that the money would have to be drawn from the funds from the sale of Crown lands - those very funds which were designed to help immigrants to the colony. As well as this unpalatable news, the same paper pointed out the present lawlessness of the convicts, and of the influence they were obtaining in Sydney. Also the *Sydney Herald* pointed to the new system which was operating for the hearing of criminal cases, that of trial by jury. The new jury qualifications gave the emancipist who had certain property qualifications the right to be a member of the jury. The *Sydney Herald* was not the only opponent of this. Lang was quite vehement in his condemnation of the system, and he set down his objections, surprisingly in this instance, in a most logical manner. These appear in the 1837 edition of the *History*, and he indicated clearly the reasons why he
objected to such a liberalizing move on the part of the colonial
government; he felt the question was most important as an instance
relative to the future of the transportation system. He thought it
quite right to allow emancipists to serve on juries, but only in Great
Britain. This was so since in that country the ratio of ex-convicts
to the total population was low, whereas in New South Wales it was
extremely high. Consequently he maintained it would be possible for
those emancipists on a colonial jury to have been transported for the
very charge they were sitting in judgment upon. He quotes an instance
similar to this which happened before Mr. Justice Burton, and he
indicated that it was not the only circumstance known. Lang concluded
this section by stating that the principle "a man shall be tried by his
peers" was an interesting one, because if a free man is tried by
emancipist jurors, then it is in their interest to reduce him to their
level.

... Such sentiments ... imply a low opinion of human nature;
but such an opinion ... is the one which experience and
observation coincide with divine revelation in inducing us
to form". 13

How valid an argument this may have been does not really concern us,
but there can be no doubt that it reflected the opinions of many of his
fellow colonists. For what the real issue concerned was not so much
the principles which Lang tried to show were operating, but the fact
that many of the emancipated convicts, even though they may have owned
property, were not fit to sit in judgment on anybody. It was in
circumstances such as these that the free colonist was forced to consider his own position in the colony, and that of his labour force. Though that labour may have been free to him as opposed to the costs of employing immigrant labour, unless some efforts were made to slow down the flow of convicts, he would soon find himself swamped by an increasing number of ex-convicts.

We have made reference previously to the findings of the Committee of the Legislative Council chaired by Chief Justice Forbes which were given in September 1835, and which dealt mainly with the need to promote further immigration to the colony. One of the reasons behind the formation of this committee was the fear of excessive dominance by the convict elements in the colony, as more and more freedom was being granted the convict in his punishment. For example, punishment such as working in chains had recently been dispensed with, and although this may have been a good thing, there was a constant fear among many of the colonists that unless more free men could be persuaded to come to the colony, the situation could only become worse. Lang gave evidence before this committee but it would seem his role in the colony at this time was more that of a catalyst than that of an originator of new policies insofar as transportation was concerned. He mirrored the opinions of many colonists, and was able to express these in his newspaper and through other writings. By no means did he stand forth as a leader in either the emigration or the transportation
issues. Rather, he developed his own ideas and put them into practice where and when possible. The colony was divided. Governor Bourke had introduced new assignment regulations in which he hoped a strict business routine would be substituted for the old methods, whereby the superintendent of convicts made the various assignments. In this matter, he had the Chief Justice to assist him to integrate free settler, ex-convict and colonial born, and produce a coherent and workable labour force for the colony. But, although Bourke and Forbes were trying to mould a strong working class out of the varied elements available within the colony, the large landholders and the conservative colonists whose causes were promulgated by the conservative newspaper, the Sydney Herald, saw the problem differently. They interpreted Bourke's policy as one which was aimed at uniting the ex-convict and the free settler, and in this they suspected a threat to their own interests.

The colony had divided itself into various factions. There were the conservatives, who had exercised power in the colony for many years, and included many of the old and well-established families engaged in agriculture, commerce and in the government. Men such as James Macarthur (son of John Macarthur), the extremely aggressive James Mudie, Robert Campbell (the Scottish Merchant) and Alexander McLeay (Colonial Secretary) were amongst its supporters. On the other hand, there were the liberals - the Whigs - of whom the Governor, because of his tendency to consider the best interests of the colony rather than those of a certain class, was considered one. Chief Justice
Francis Forbes and Sir John Jamison were also classified as Whigs. W. C. Wentworth was at this period also regarded as a liberal, and was professing similar principles to those which motivated Governor Bourke. The liberals were a patriotic group, and contained many who were members of the Australian Patriotic Association. The opinions of emancipists were considered, and in general the group favoured liberal institutions for the colony's future political structure. It was from these two groups - the conservatives and the liberals - that most of the discussion and contention over the transportation and immigration systems arose. Wentworth was leader of the Patriotic Association, and James Macarthur the leader of what was called Rowell's Club, the exclusives faction.

These two institutions vied with each other in the absurdity and extravagance of their proceedings, and in a very short time fell into oblivion, although the antagonistic principles ... continued to distract the colony during this, and portion of the next, administration."

Various petitions by both groups were taken up, and the liberals, it seemed, were in the majority. Lang's precise position in relation to these factions is not extremely clear, except that he disagreed with many of the matters the liberals considered essential, such as trial by jury and the granting of a representative legislature, because it would mean that the emancipated convicts would gain more at the expense of the free settler due to their ever increasing numbers. However, it was not his policy either to agree fully with the conservative doctrines of the exclusives.
the Tories. To his mind they were not progressive, and did not consider the interests of the small free settler or the small landholder. Perhaps his position in relation to these groups was not clear to himself, either. In the 1837 edition of the History, he said he had attached himself to neither party. He drew the conclusion that if the colonial liberals achieved their avowed aim of a representative legislature, then few emancipists would be elected. He no doubt hoped for an expression of good sense on the part of his fellow colonists, but he could not be sure, as in his own words, the Whig element "... comprises all the liberals of the colony, including the whole body of emancipists, with many free persons of questionable character and doubtful respectability." His prediction, should the conservatives be successful, was that they would find it necessary to make provision for the good government of the colony, and that because "Sir Richard Bourke has already secured the general welfare of the colonists in the grand interests of general education and religious instruction." Thus, by implication, the conservatives could do little damage. He followed up these comments with a prediction that since the character of the colony was changing so quickly, some reconciliation or accommodation between the two factions would have to be made. Once this was done, he foresaw that some seven years later the colony might be fit for "a Representative Legislature." \(^16\) In this respect, time shows him to have seen history in progress more clearly than those of either faction.\(^17\)
enabled him again to apply to the Governor for leave of absence, and he departed the colony in July 1836, on board the *Abel Gower*. It was this ship which also was taking James Macarthur, together with the two *Sydney Herald* sponsored petitions, to London.  

Macarthur was representing the Men of Property; Lang, as yet, was representing no party at all. James Mudie had left the colony the previous March to make representations in London concerning the lack of support he had received over the incident involving an uprising of convicts on his property in the Hunter River district. Chief Justice Forbes had sailed in April, having been granted leave of absence for twelve months by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. So it was to be quite a colonial assembly in England. Meanwhile, in London during 1836 the matter of transportation had been raised in the House of Commons, and a Select Committee had been appointed to enquire into "...its efficacy as a punishment, its influence on the moral state of society in the penal colonies and how far it [was] susceptible of improvement."  

The issue of the moment in the minds of the men in the colony and of those in government in England seemed to be concerned with the future for transportation.

Lang, ever active, wrote another work on the voyage, and this time it was very topical.  

Entitled *Transportation and Colonisation* the special bias of the work is revealed in the secondary title:
"... or the causes of the comparative failure of the Transportation System in the Australian Colonies, with suggestions for ending its future efficacy in subservency to extensive colonisation."

The work was published in London in 1837. It appears to be an elaboration of the ideas he had already expressed through the pages of The Colonist, in the History of 1834, and in speeches he had made on similar subjects. He described the system, showing how effective it could be as a means of punishment, and yet despite its potential it had failed in New South Wales. And the basic reasons for its failure, says Lang, were the lack of sufficient free immigrants arriving in the colony; "the unlimited importation and consumption of ardent spirits"; the gradual relaxation of penal discipline and the facilities available in the colony for the emancipated convict to acquire influence and wealth. 21

He suggested various measures to remedy the system, the most important being the discontinuance of the assignment system, with the corresponding need to increase immigration of labourers from England to the colony to serve as replacements. But he does not appear to have favoured the abolition of transportation, as another of his proposals was for convicts to be used as the labour force for government projects. He concluded the work with a chapter on the prospects for emigration to the colony, and how it should be further encouraged as it was essential for the colony's continued growth. It is emigration which appears to be his favourite theme in this work - emigration in sufficient numbers
would mean that transportation could continue, providing it was regarded only as a means of punishment for the offenders, and not extended into a system for providing the colony with free labour. It is interesting to note that he places part of the responsibility for the failure of the transportation system to the policies pursued by Governor Macquarie:

By an injudicious and unwarrantable extension of the system of granting free pardons, conditional pardons and tickets of leave... numerous convicts were from time to time thrown loose upon the colony before they had acquired industrious habits... 22

Many of those convicts to whom grants had been made, says Lang, soon sold their lands to dealers in "ardent spirits", and drifted into the towns. In these towns, Governor Macquarie is accused of having spent an excessive amount of British money in "the erection of inferior buildings", which encouraged large emancipist and convict populations in such towns; this created a shortage of free labour, which in turn meant that the free labour available could command a high price. From this, says Lang, it was a short step to the opening of numerous public houses. 23 To complete the debacle, Lang points out that most of the public houses became little more than receptacles for stolen goods. This was hardly a pleasant picture of colonial life, but it was one which Lang must have decided would be sufficient to condemn the transportation system as it then operated, and which would demonstrate the need for free emigration which in turn would counteract the low standards brought about by an excess of convicts and ex-convicts. I fear the motive behind this work is somewhat suspect, because Lang was prepared to label instances of what were undoubtedly unfortunate consequences of
the transportation system as being general circumstances to be met with throughout the colony. But then, as always, he wrote for a purpose, and so whilst facts were not distorted, they were presented to give the desired effect, which in this case was to demonstrate the failure of transportation in its present form.

Throughout his many writings, and even in Transportation and Colonisation, Lang makes little direct mention of the ill-treatment suffered by convicts. But he does make a passing reference to it in this work, where he indicates that treatment of a convict under the assignment system depended on the character of the master, "and in particular instances, they the assigned convicts are subject to enormous tyranny". He also refers to the common method used to punish convicts, and suggests that "the brutalising punishment of flogging might in great measure be dispensed with". But rather than dwell on physical ill-treatment, Lang seemed to prefer to emphasise the ill-effects the convict and ex-convict had on colonial life. He also suggested that those who had levelled criticisms at Sir Richard Bourke for his "relaxed" systems used in dealing with the convicts - criticisms which claimed the only noticeable effect of the system had been an increase in crime - should look back, as the increase was due to the accumulated evils of the system; and these evils were attributable to the previous Tory governors who "completely neglected the spiritual welfare of the convict".
This work was not received favourably by all interested in
the issue at this time. One reviewer noted the manner in which Lang,
condemned the so-called vices stemming from the system and accused
him of exhibiting all too openly Scotch Bigotry, since he did not
hesitate to indicate that the majority of convicts who arrived in the
colony were Irish Catholics. Not content with this, he then pointed
out that even as free settlers the Irish Catholics were liable to threaten
the peace of the colony. The same reviewer, H. Reeve, noted also
that the comments which Lang made were those:

... of a man whose opinions are certainly not unworthy of
attention, although they are evidently influenced by a sense
of the profits of convict labour and by a curious mixture of
the prejudices of a Scotch priest and an Australian planter.

It was a curious fact of Lang's writings that he always managed to
reveal his basic nature, no matter what it was he wrote about. His
works, valuable as they were at the time, were completely subjective.
This made it very difficult to separate the genuinely constructive
criticisms and suggestions from what were his own preconceived ideas
and arguments, most of which were based upon his theological background
and training. Consequently, he was more often than not misunderstood,
and his Transportation and Colonisation was no exception. Amongst
the well worn prejudices and inflammatory phraseology there lurked some
very constructive ideas, and he did have the good fortune to arrive in
England with these ideas at a time when the future of transportation
was under review by the British Government.
Sir William Molesworth, Chairman of the Select Committee on Transportation which had been set up by the House of Commons in 1837, wrote to Lang in April of that year, asking him to give evidence before that Committee. It is doubtful if at that stage Molesworth had read Lang's work *Transportation and Colonisation*, but Lang's views on this subject were doubtless well-known to him. It cannot be doubted that he read the work before Lang gave evidence. This Committee was basically interested in hearing evidence which would be sufficient to secure the abolition of transportation, at least in the form in which it then operated. The consequence of this attitude was that the evidence apparently required was only that which would support this view. Satisfactory evidence in this regard was obtained from Sir Francis Forbes, James Macarthur, Major James Mudie and John Dunmore Lang. All these gentlemen when questioned as to the effects of transportation on the social structure of the colony could not help but describe the detrimental state to which the town of Sydney had been reduced as a result of the presence of convicts, ex-convicts and a poor system of emigration. The latter was instanced by the evils which attended the arrival of poorly selected females in the colony.

Lang's evidence before the Committee, given in May and June of 1837, virtually amounted to a restatement of the ideas he had put forward in his *Transportation and Colonisation*. The main theme of his evidence was that, in spite of the advantages to be gained by convict
labour (even if confined exclusively to government works) there still existed a moral danger in keeping the system.

The employment of convicts at public works exclusively, within the present colonial limits of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, must necessarily imply the maintenance and perpetuation of a system of demoralization in these colonies.  

It would appear that, to Lang, the moral ground with which the transportation system was now linked made the system untenable, and far outweighed any advantage to be gained from the cheapness and availability of convict labour. The only possibility for continuing transportation - and let us remember that Lang did believe, if properly managed, that the system could be a reformatory one - would be to begin again at a different settlement. He even gave the Committee the rules to be followed in setting up such a new system.  

Lang was asked again and again by Molesworth what he really believed should be done with regard to transportation to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, and Lang, as a consequence of the nature of his evidence, was constrained to reply that it must cease. It was what the Committee wished to hear, and it was the only answer he could give, having condemned the present system as being beyond reconstruction.

Although Lang was very active in the question of the future of transportation for the colony, he was only one of many leading colonial figures who saw in the decision on this matter the future of the colony. But unlike most of the others, Lang was not committed to any party or group within the colony. His views were his own, and
he fearlessly and relentlessly preached them whenever the opportunity arose. He would not be intimidated, and had no vested interests to protect - unless one counts his own conscience as coming within that category. He saw the effects of transportation as a blight upon the colony; he was not so interested in the economic position of those who employed convict labour. For many in this category feared the cessation of transportation as it could mean the end of a cheap and plentiful labour force. Yet, even these feared the consequences if the system was to be allowed to continue without some changes. The line between the benefits and the evils attributable to the system was difficult to determine for many in the colony at that time.

The evidence given before the Select Committee produced "a very considerable sensation" when it became known in the colony. The social and moral conditions had been misrepresented by the witnesses, it was alleged, and many colonists decided to circulate a memorial, which was presented to the Governor, Sir George Gipps, in June 1838. This requested that a Committee of the Legislative Council should be appointed to enquire into the system of transportation and assignment to try and counteract the impression of the social and moral condition of the colony which prevailed in England. No committee was formed, but the Council decided to present its views in a series of twelve resolutions. Those of particular important were "... no system of penal discipline ... will be found at once so cheap, so effective and
so reformatory as that of well regulated assignment"; and "The sudden discontinuance of transportation and assignment, by depriving the colonists of convict labour must necessarily curtail the means of purchasing Crown Lands, and consequently, the supply of funds for the purposes of immigration"; and "the continuance of immigration in any extended form must, therefore, necessarily depend upon the continuance of the assignment of convicts". 35 Even Lang would not have agreed with the basis upon which the Council made these resolutions. He understood better than they the real nature of transportation, that it was a punishment, and hopefully, designed as a reformatory measure. But colonists generally had ceased to realize this. They only saw felons arriving in the colony to work out their sentences, and in so doing, could best be employed as a cheap labour force. It was not that the colonists - or many of them - really objected to immigrants, but immigrant labour was not cheap. And so the objections and arguments continued.

Lang maintained that to use, or rather to exploit transportation as a means of providing the colony with a labour force for settlers could not continue indefinitely. Consequently, the promotion of a certain type of free settler would obviate the need to use the convict. This was the basis for all his arguments for a change in the nature of transportation, and for better and increased immigration. In many respects, this was the effect of the House of Commons Select Committee's decision on the future of transportation. But its findings were somewhat
anticipated by Lord Glenelg who, whilst the Committee was still
hearing evidence, sent a despatch to Governor Bourke in May 1837,
requiring him to suggest means whereby the discontinuance of assigned
convicts to settlers could be best effected. Also, Bourke was asked
to induce settlers to look to immigration as the source of their labour
force. Bourke replied to this despatch in November 1837, and
indicated that it would be for the benefit of the free settlers to dispense
with convict labour altogether, but, also in the interests of the settlers,
he suggested the assignment system be abolished gradually. 36

It was perhaps Lang's greatest wish that he would be able
to use the transportation issue, and the evils which had resulted from
it, to convince the authorities that:

a free and emigrant population of such character as the
Highlanders and Islanders of Scotland is, both morally
and politically speaking, the kind of population which is
peculiarly required in the present circumstances and
condition of the colony of New South Wales. 38

Surprisingly, he was not alone in this view. James Macarthur had
written in his book, published in London in 1837, and designed as an
exposition of the various political and social problems in the colony,
the following comments on the Highlands of Scotland:

A considerable portion of the population is at this moment
in a state of unparalleled misery ... the people, from their
moral character, their frugal, patient, orderly and
industrious habits ... appear to be precisely of the
description most required in the colony. 39
Lang was not the only one in New South Wales who had the welfare of the colony, and of the Scottish people, at heart, and saw in these people a substitute for the labour force presently supplied by the transported convict.
CHAPTER SEVEN

LANG'S LITERARY CONTRIBUTIONS

THEIR IMPACT AND IMPORTANCE TO THE COLONY AND AS ACHIEVEMENTS IN THEIR OWN RIGHT

But if it should be represented as inconsistent with the character of a minister of religion, who it will doubtless be alleged, ought to be always meek and lowly, like his Master, to assume the vindication of the public and the claims of virtue... I beg to observe that there are occasions on which the mild and gentle demeanour is as unbefitting a minister of religion as an opposite demeanour is on all others.
In considering Lang's participation in the colony's public affairs there is one aspect of his contribution which cannot be overlooked, and that concerns his literary achievements. These tend to be neglected, or at least regarded as purely subservient to particular issues which may have been the reason for their production. But his literary activities were wider in their scope than merely adjuncts to his other activities, although it is very difficult to dissociate them in most instances. There is no doubt that his various writings had important effects, both in the colony, in England, and even in other countries as well. Consequently these should be examined to indicate not only their effect in terms of literary merit and public reaction, but as an integral part of the manner in which Lang became further involved in the affairs of the colony. In examining Lang's various literary endeavours, the most satisfactory manner in which to approach them seems to be chronological. This tends to highlight the manner in which he became involved in public issues, since it appears to be in times of relative quiet where public issues were concerned that he was able to pursue other subjects which interested him. This should become apparent as we continue. Also, with Lang, much of what he wrote was topical, and so the events of one day often became the foundation for his activities on the next.

The earliest of Lang's printed works to appear in the colony,
apart from his inaugural sermon, was a book of poems entitled
Aurora Australis which was published in Sydney in 1826. In an
advertisement, apparently an introduction to the work, Lang wrote:
"Poetry, however excellent, is valuable only as it is subservient to
the cause of virtue and progress of truth". The poetry contained in
this volume is not particularly remarkable of itself, and certainly not
so in the poems which deal in conventional imagery, but is pleasant
enough. Lang did not include in this volume all the poems he wrote
before 1826. In 1873 he produced another book of poetry, and added
in some of those poems written before 1826 but not previously published.
It is apparent from some of these that their tenor and style was a fore-
runner to the more pertinent types of social and political verse satire
he was to indulge in, in later years. In one entitled Colonial Nomen-
clature dated 1824 (but not printed until 1873) he lampoons the choice
of names in the colony in the following manner:

"Macquarie" for a name is all the go:
The old Scotch Governor was fond of fame,
Macquarie Street, Place, Port, Fort, Town, Lake, River;
"Lachlan Macquarie, Esquire, Governor", for ever! 2

Perhaps it was just as well this was not published in 1826, as Macquarie's
name was a hallowed one in the colony then. But he allows his genuine
interest in things Australian to creep in, when later in the same poem he
expresses his approval of the use of native names: Parramatta, Illawarra,
Woolloomooloo. Unfortunately the poem has a message which, amongst
the host of images brought before our gaze, appears to be the need to
uphold Freedom and Liberty, and it is at this point that it loses all
cohesion, and becomes no longer convincing; the poem concludes
with the thought that:

... When built on vice, fair maid,
Thy temple's base is quicksand; on the rock
Of virtue reared, it braves the whirlwind's shock. 3

This, like many of Lang's poems, is overburdened with images, which
results in a loss of clarity for the reader. Truly, his most successful
poems are those which deal with personalities; poems in which he does
not have to endeavour to uphold the role of poet and refer to conventional
images - to Greece, Rome and to the various poets and their attributes.

One gains the impression that he feels obliged to stock those poems
written in more academic vein with the type of allusions befitting one
who had undergone training in classical scholarship. These are academic
exercises, no more. Lang may not have been aware of this, but it
is quite evident from the ease with which his images and comment in
what might be called his poems on current events flow. There are
other examples of his facility with current events, and one which might
illustrate this rather well is his poem on that legal identity and poet,
Judge Barron Field, and was written in 1824. The second verse begins:

"Tis strange to see a Justice turning poet
And writing doggerel verse! 'Tis passing strange!
'Tis wondrous pitiful, Judge Field! I'll show it
From some quotations! ...
... When once the mange
Of rhyming doth infect a Judge's skin,
He'll scratch for ever if he once begin. 4

Later on this poem uses more conventional imagery, but it is attuned
to the subject matter, and does not appear to be in the least out of place.
There can be little doubt that his ability to draw such verbal sketches was developed, both in further verse forms, and into his normal prose style.

Some of his poems in the *Aurora Australis* selection are basically religious poetry, and these do convey very genuine spiritual and philosophical beliefs. Strangely, though, the two most powerful of these were written on board the *Medway* whilst returning to New South Wales from his first visit home. The poems are entitled *The Voyage to Heaven* and *The Voyage of Life*, and both make forceful use of imagery concerning the sea voyages in the unfolding of their spiritual message. It was almost as though he had realized the troublesome times ahead for himself and, because he had chosen the career of a Presbyterian minister, he had to press on regardless of the shoals and hidden dangers which he was bound to strike in the troubled waters of the colony of New South Wales. As he concluded *The Voyage to Heaven*:

> ... storms and tempests, sorrow and care, Beset the heavenly way; 'Tis only the weary whose barks are there Securely moored for ay!  

And John Dunmore Lang would not classify himself among the weary.

The religious poems may give an insight into the depths of his feelings at this time, but some of the other verses in the collection give an even greater indication of the vivid and shocking phrase which was to be a feature of his journalism in later years. For example, referring to supporters of Liberty in the past, he lists several together
with particular qualities they each expressed: - Brutus "brave";
Marvell "incorrupt"; Milton "like thee" (Milton was all that could
be desired in Lang's estimation); and then continued: -

A recreant race woos now and digs her [Liberty's] grave;
Byron their leader, whose high-lineaged muse
Walks a vile pimp and caters for the stews'.

No lover of the Romantic poets was the good Doctor. But in these
poems, varied in subject matter and treatment as they are, one can
find all the now well-known Lang qualities in a curious mixture of
religious fervour, classical allusion, humour, and invective, juxtaposed
with current events and overlaid with biting sarcasm. Lang's poetry
has not received the notoriety accorded to his contemporary Australian
poets, such as Barron Field, and W. C. Wentworth. But then, Field
is remembered rather for the absurdity of his doggerel than for any
merit of sentiment or style, and Wentworth's poem Australasia was
classed by G. B. Barton as having no merit of thought or versification.
But this critic did say of Lang's work that it contained evidence
of a versatile talent, and that he "could write a Hymn book or
Comic Song book with equal facility".

Another facet of Lang's wide interests is revealed in Aurora
Australis where two paraphrases of Aboriginal songs appear. These
are included to show that no matter how "degraded they [the Aboriginals]
may seem in the scale of humanity, the black natives are not totally
destitute of the fine feelings and the high capabilities of man". This
shows Lang's genuine interest in the natives, and is an attempt to
understand the culture and traditions associated with the various tribes. This interest is also evidenced by the quantity of vocabulary he collected of various native dialects. These he must have accumulated during his many journeys around the settled areas of the colony. He demonstrated throughout his life a very real concern for his adopted country, and the welfare of the natives was an integral part of his interest. Although he found that other activities left him little time to follow through missionary efforts for the aborigines, there were occasions when he was able to devote time to this aspect of his interests.

It is difficult to gauge the effect of the publication of Lang's poems had on the colony, but for those interested in literary pursuits, it must have been a notable event. However, considering the nature of the colonial inhabitants in 1826, it is doubtful if sales would have been extensive. It was poetry which was written in the English style, for Englishmen in Australia. It was not typically Australian, but then neither were the inhabitants of the colony. George Nadel points out that the European eye did not see beauty in the Australian environment and consequently though Australian imagery appears in early Australian poetry, the literary style used by the poets remained detached and formal. Perhaps it was symptomatic of these poems that they were not reprinted until 1873, when they appeared under the title of Poems Sacred and Secular - written chiefly at sea. In this publication Lang added poems written after 1826, and as previously mentioned, some written before that date but which were not included
in *Aurora Australis*. He also included some of his political satire such as *The Irish Stew*. It could be contended that Lang's poems might be related to that part of colonial literature which was regarded by many as "... a social remedy in a materially occupied society; to prevent colonists ... from being atheists in their social relations." 12

Lang's more public writings comprised to a great extent pamphlets which were written for specific purposes, and many of these we have already examined in connection with the establishment of the Scots Church, the Australian College, transportation and emigration. Those written specifically to highlight and comment on the problems associated with the growth of the Presbyterian Church will be discussed in the next chapter. But his major pamphlet, or what was his extension of the pamphlet form, was his *Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales*. The precise reason behind this two volumed work, written during his voyage to England in 1833 and published in London in 1834, is difficult to determine. In the final edition of the work, printed in 1875, he explains the reason thus:

For having, unfortunately, had to spend a large portion of his life at sea, the author has found it expedient and necessary, independently altogether of other and higher objects, to carve out beforehand sufficient literary labour for each successive voyage, to redeem that portion of his life from the mere blank that it might otherwise present ... 13

This is one undoubted reason. Another was given by the *Westminster Review* when it reviewed the first appearance of the work, and described
it as "... a history of Dr. Lang to which is added a history of New South Wales". This was also the opinion of the Sydney Gazette although it did not quite regard the matter with as humorous a tone as did the Westminster Review. Lang, so said the Sydney Gazette, had not been impartial, and this was the duty of every historian. Too much emphasis had been placed on personal opinions and antipathies, especially in regard to the personal character and administration of Sir Thomas Brisbane. But then Lang was not an impartial person, and although he called his work a history, it was history as viewed by Dr. Lang.

It is very easy when looking back to see how it was that Lang had wiled away the tedium of a voyage by setting down his own comments upon the colony and its history. It makes entertaining and informative reading now, since his impressions and opinions can be examined in perspective. But for those embroiled in issues at the time, and with opposite views to Lang, it seemed as though the Doctor was stealing a march upon them, and publicising his own activities and opinions. And, of course, he was. But despite this, he was promoting New South Wales as his adopted country, as his descriptions of the countryside and explorations bear witness. In this respect the work had a positive influence, and its style was such that it was easily read. G. B. Barton writing of Australian literature in the eighteen sixties, maintained that this work (which had been updated by Lang in 1837 and again in 1852) had done more to affect public opinion in England than any other publication. Naturally the work is full of Lang's opinions, his
prejudices and his bigotry, but none-the-less it is an immensely readable, though not a well balanced, history of the colony. Even the chapters dealing with events before Lang's arrival are not impartially dealt with. C. W. Sailer, in an article on Lang's ideals, describes him as essentially a fighter, and claims that the reader of the History discovers this. The language Lang uses, he says, is that of a person of "great strength, ability, force and sincerity" and the questions Lang discusses are those of importance at the time. Consequently it is almost impossible to read the History without being under the necessity of taking sides.\(^{17}\)

Lang's complete lack of circumspection is revealed by his treatment of personalities in the History, and an notable example of this is his comment on General Darling. The Sydney Gazette thought the comments on Darling's administration alternated between praise and censure, and that the censure was too harsh, especially since they felt that Lang had been a silent spectator of the strife pervading the colony at that time.\(^{18}\) Darling himself took exception to Lang's remarks on his administration, and accused Lang of making general criticisms which were not substantiated.\(^{19}\) It was just this type of criticism which had caused so much trouble to Lang and to those he had criticised in the colony previously. It appeared as though he could not control his pen when it came to constructive criticism, and allowed himself to make a comment in general terms without considering the implications, and the effect it could have on those who had been so summarily dealt
with. It was this type of unbalanced writing which was so detrimental to any cause which Lang promoted, and was a failing which he apparently never overcame. In a sense, it marks the main criticism to be made of the History, but it also reflects a sense of purpose and drive which can be detected in his writings generally. Take away this unfortunate aspect, and his work would probably have attracted less criticism; take away the criticism and Lang would possibly have lost the fuel necessary to feed the furnace of his inspiration. 20

Lang's History must also be examined in relation to several other works published at the time. For instance, the second edition of the History, which was printed during his visit to England in 1837, appeared in the same year as James Macarthur's New South Wales, Its Present State and Future Prospects. 21 This book was developed basically out of the problems arising over the transportation and constitutional issues then prevalent in the colony and in Great Britain. The tone of this work is in contrast to Lang's History even though in many instances the subject matter is similar. John Metcalfe has noted of Macarthur's volume:

... the organization of the book, its freedom from personalities and the comparative simplicity of its style obviously pleased supporters and warmed opponents; nothing like it had been seen in the colonial controversy before, and it was somewhat new in Great Britain, where heavy sarcasm, verbal humour and personal reference were still the rule rather than the exception in political pamphleteering. 22

Edward Edwards, who assisted Macarthur with this work, had undoubtedly
created a new image for this literary genre, but presentation of the material and the tone of the work mirrors what one would expect from the personality of James Macarthur. And this can best be described as one of complete contrast to that of John Lang.

In some respects it is difficult to compare the two works by Lang and Macarthur, because the latter's book was in some measure designed to support the two Sydney Herald petitions which he had brought with him to London. If this was the basis upon which we should judge, then Lang's Transportation and Colonisation would be the one to compare. However, that particular work was very specific, and dealt with matters concerned in the title only. It was almost as specific as another work which was also designed in support of the Herald petitions, James Mudie's The Felony of New South Wales, which in style and content displayed excessive viciousness towards the emancipists and was also an attempt to vindicate the previous actions of its author. But in many respects a comparison of Lang's History and Macarthur's work is valid, as they both seemed to express a genuine interest in the colony in which they lived and in which they supported projects for its future development. They differed very much in scope, for Lang covered the period from foundation, whereas Macarthur was interested in the current situation, and future possibilities. The Colonist thought highly of Macarthur's work:

Unlike Major Mudie and other scribblers ... Mr. Macarthur
has banished all gross personalities from his pages, and we
do not hesitate to pronounce that his Book is the work of a
scholar and a gentleman". 25

There were other works with which Lang's History might be compared -
such as W. C. Wentworth's A Statistical, Historical, and Political
Description of the Colony of New South Wales, which was printed in London
in 1819, and had three editions in five years. In many respects, this was
the forerunner of Lang's work. There were others too, but most were
excerpts from colonial life, and did not have the scope of a history.

In 1834 as well as the History Lang published another work
entitled A View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation.
This scholarly treatise set out to demonstrate how the Polynesian peoples
made their way across to America and gradually settled there. His
interest in this subject appears to have been a genuine one, but one which,
after publication, he was forced to abandon as he had so many other matters
in New South Wales which claimed his attention. His interest in this
field is comparable to that which he gave towards determining the various
Aboriginal dialects in the colony. As previously mentioned, his collected
papers contain many note books on Aboriginal vocabulary collected during
his journeys throughout the countryside. His own field work seems to
have been the basis for this collection, and so too was his theory with
regard to Polynesian emigration. He had sailed through the same
waters between New Zealand and South America several times himself,
and after much thought, arrived at his theory. In 1877 he published this
work in a second edition, and made the following comment:
As a believer in Divine Providence, I hold also that God not only made the earth to be inhabited, but that, in order to the fulfilment of that Divine purpose in regard to America, He planted that remote and solitary isle, Pasquas or Easter Island, in the deep sea exactly where it stands for the express purpose of serving as a stepping stone for the people of the Polynesian race to reach America; and I regard myself as highly honoured by Divine Providence in having been selected to solve the great problem that has vainly exercised the ingenuity of the learned of all European nations ever since the days of Columbus... in demonstrating how that continent was originally discovered and settled, and in therefore proving... that God had made of one blood both the Polynesian and Indo-American nations, and that all the efforts of modern scepticism to prove the latter a distinct creation, or the mere result of evolution, are therefore as silly and futile as they are uncalled for.

This passage demonstrates so clearly how, even as late as 1877, he had not changed one iota in his attitude towards what he knew to be his own place in society. The principles which are at the basis of this statement were indicative of the manner in which he carried out the various assignments in his life. These assignments, conveniently, were divinely ordained, whether they ranged from the Polynesian discovery to active participation in colonial affairs. Contained within the 1877 edition was an accusation of piracy made against two missionaries on his 1834 edition. Lang accused a Rev. John Williams, a South Seas missionary and the Rev. William Ellis, Secretary of the London Missionary Society and an authority on the Polynesians himself, as having appropriated his theory of Polynesian migration. The reception of the first edition was apparently quite favourable, except in America where it was greeted with absolute skepticism.

G. B. Barton, writing
in 1866, commented that Lang's work on the Polynesian nation was by far the most valuable of his writings from a critical point of view, in that it showed a depth of research, a readiness in argument and a capacity for profound philosophical investigation. This was glowing praise from one who, in his book *Literature in New South Wales*, when commenting on Lang's *History*, described him as an "indefatigable writer[but] he never seems to have paid much attention either to his matter or his manner".

Lang's most ambitious literary undertaking commenced with his decision to print a newspaper. This step was taken, so he says, in the 1837 edition of the *History*, to protect his own interests and to raise the level of journalism. The interests which he felt bound to protect comprised the Australian College, and one suspects, his own particular style of Presbyterianism - although the need to protect the latter became more apparent after the establishment of the paper in 1835. The first edition of *The Colonist*, as the paper was called, on 1st January 1835, stated that its main object was:

... general diffusion of useful knowledge and inculcation of right principles in regard to the means of promoting the moral welfare and general advancement of the colony of New South Wales.

It then went on to give an account of the circumstance leading to its establishment and cited the *Sydney Gazette*, *The Australian* and *The Monitor* as having attempted to ruin Lang's character over the supposed offence given by him to the Sydney College; of having attempted to prove
misappropriation of government and public funds for the establishment of the Australian College; and finally of having launched a campaign against the Scots mechanics Lang had brought out in the Stirling Castle.

In the same article Lang is indicated as having been advised by friends in England to establish the newspaper in order to keep the Australian College in operation, and to answer criticisms made against it. A newspaper, says Lang:

whose columns should exhibit something very different from the vapid inanity of one of the existing colonial journals, the mean temporising policy of another, the ignorance and effrontery of a third, and the loose morality and rampant infidelity of a fourth. 32

It seemed as though Lang enjoyed the thought of producing a newspaper as much because he would be joined in battle with other members of the colonial press as for the need to support his college.

The reaction from the colonial press to the appearance of The Colonist was possibly just what Lang expected. The Sydney Gazette wrote that The Colonist "... will ... be appreciated by the Colonists seeing that its undisguised object is to insult them". 33 The New South Wales Literary and Political Advertiser in 1836 contained an article which commented upon the founding of The Colonist thus:

... it was after the third circumnavigation of the globe by the Reverend Gentleman that the colonial public was astounded by the announcement that there was amongst the trophies of his late exploits in London, an immense Columbian press, under the weight of which colonial affairs would in future be converted into a jelly, and the essential oil thereof, sprinkled drop by drop over the whole extent of the colony. 34
And this, of course, is what Lang found he was unable to resist. All aspects of colonial life came in for a critical appraisal, and most were found to be wanting. Possibly of all the various causes Lang had associated himself with in the colony since his arrival, it was this venture which placed him on the first rung of the political ladder. All his previous efforts had had predetermined goals - the founding of the Scots Church; the establishment of a college; the support of emigration (which The Colonist was to aid); and the attempts to solve the problems within the Presbyterian Church resulting from its expansion within the colony. These goals he achieved, or was in the process of achieving, through normal channels, such as pamphlets, letters, meetings, public speeches and sermons from his pulpit. But in 1835, when he was still championing the cause of free immigration; when he still had need to defend his educational scheme; when he was so critical of the standards existing within colonial society; when the Presbyterian Church began to show its structural weaknesses; when transportation as a political issue began to become particularly important, and when too the educational proposals of Governor Bourke were being widely discussed, Lang commenced his newspaper. It was not likely that the paper would remain on the outside of general discussion on these issues, and although Lang did not intend to be its editor, there seemed to be no doubts existing within the colony as to who would control editorial policy.

The editor, as Lang tells us in the History, was to have been the Rev. Henry Carmichael, but due to his disagreement with the council
of the Australian College, and with Lang himself, his services were
not utilized. Instead, a Mr. Kenneth Munro became the first editor.
but the other members of the colonial press delighted to point out that
Dr. Lang was the real editor. Further, the paper was printed within
the buildings of the Australian College, which did not help the progress
of the institution in the eyes of the colonial press. Thus, from the
beginning the paper expressed all the views which Lang himself held,
and although he was not a member of any of the political parties in
existence at the time, he was able readily to express attitudes which
helped to mould public opinion.

It is not possible to give an exhaustive account of Lang's
experience with The Colonist, but some of the major issues which
demonstrate the role he was able to take in the affairs of the colony are
worth mentioning. The uses Lang made of the paper in the fields of
education, emigration and transportation have already been discussed.
There were several issues in which Lang, through its columns, was
able to initiate general discussion, and then there were others which
he printed solely for the purpose of vindicating and explaining his own
actions. As an example of this, the correspondence and editorial comment
surrounding the departure of the Rev. Henry Carmichael from the
Australian College, and correspondence concerning a debt Lang owed
to the Rev. Samuel Maresden, are two instances of what were really
personal matters, but Lang chose to make them known to the colony at
large. Thus, he really could not complain when outsiders took an
interest (or interfered) in his affairs. But, as always, he considered
himself the judge of all circumstances. Perhaps the inclusion of this
type of correspondence in his newspaper was justified, as the matters
were generally connected with the Australian College, or the Presbyterian
Church - and it was ostensibly for these reasons that the paper was
established. But one cannot help thinking that both would have been
better served by a degree of public silence being observed over some of
their activities, at least.

Even if one makes allowances for both the journalistic style
of the day, and the fact that a parochial interest in minor matters was
much in evidence in those times, some of Lang's replies to accusations
made against him are in very bad taste, if not actually slanderous. The
issue involving the Rev. Samuel Marsden reveals this quite clearly.
Marsden had indicated in a letter to the Sydney Herald of 19th February
1835 that he had made a loan of £750 for the building of the Scots Church
some ten years previously, and the debt had not been liquidated. Lang,
in The Colonist of 26th February, replied that all but £300 had been
liquidated, but claimed that Mr. Marsden:

being my creditor for money to the amount of £300 advanced
at ten percent interest on behalf of the Scots Church, being
a gag to restrain me from telling the whole truth respecting
Colonial Episcopacy ...".

And in reply, of course, we find that the rate of interest is in dispute;
Lang calls Marsden an "avaricious man". The interest of the colonial reader having no doubt been whetted by such correspondence - and having to buy two papers to enable him to follow both sides - then finds that no conclusion is reached. Nothing happens, in print at least. It is this aspect of *The Colonist* which condemns it as being merely Lang's vehicle for the propagation of personal views and petty squabbles, and which tends to detract from what were some of its very positive contributions to colonial journalism. It was this very aspect which drew forth criticism from various sources on the purposes of a newspaper, and as to how Lang was interpreting his responsibilities to the community.

An interesting commentary was given by John Lhotsky of the *New South Wales Literary and Political Advertiser* after the fourteenth edition of *The Colonist* had appeared, containing in it a comment which read: "... now that a spirit of enquiry has been awakened and a taste for reading formed by our journal ...". Lhotsky could not understand how this could possibly be said after the press had been in operation in New South Wales for some thirty years past. He also complained of the obvious intrusion of the real editor into the main articles (Mr. Kenneth Munro being editor in name only) and of the apparent reason for the paper's establishment: to fight Dr. Lang's battles on behalf of the Australian College. His main criticisms, apart from the general comments already referred to, were that the paper was neither an uncommon nor a spirited publication; that the obvious rules of editorial
or literary decorum were not observed; and that its doctrines were subservient to the rules of morality and charitable feeling; in fact, they were fit only to instill a spirit of acrimony, dissention and bad fellowship amongst the colonial inhabitants. Not satisfied with that, Lhotsky also accused The Colonist of "padding" to fill up space with miscellaneous articles. And he gives examples: "The Conquest and Occupation of Algiers by the French (eight columns); Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris...". Such articles were of little interest, he felt. But his main conclusion was that Lang was not fit to conduct a political paper, although "the Dr. possesses real merit", and he instances Lang's introduction of emigrants; the formation of the Australian College, and his endeavours to improve the system of emigration.  

Of all the criticisms levelled at Lang over The Colonist and its various articles, this one from John Lhotsky seems the most reasoned and conclusive. It emphasizes how Lang, through that paper, was endeavouring to influence colonial affairs, and how far it was thought he had succeeded. And if one is to believe John Lhotsky, it did not succeed at all. Naturally Lang was not pleased with the criticism. Writing some twelve months later, Lhotsky observed that his publication had not received a mention in The Colonist since his criticisms were made, and in a note he remarked that this was not the only case of its type - The Colonist itself was kept under a similar interdiction by the Sydney Herald.'
Perhaps the most vigorous criticism *The Colonist* generated was over the series of articles which appeared on the colonial press in the months March to June of 1835. 40 Lang had given a résumé of all colonial journals in the first edition of *The Colonist*, and this had provoked the *Sydney Gazette* to respond with an article designed to expose "arrogance of the very first water", and a demand to know why Lang should assail all contemporary journals in the first issue. The *Sydney Gazette* then answered its own question by indicating that it was because these journals would not follow the Lang line - they would not be "led by the nose". 41 The *Sydney Gazette* gave regular space to articles, letters and comments about Lang during the first few months of 1835, and in general they were not at all complimentary. For instance, a letter signed "Australicus" appeared in one edition, asking in part what the £3,500 of government money for the Australian College had been spent on, and suggested the answer was: - a house for Dr. Lang, plus a small school; a house for Dr. Lang's newspaper and a house in an unfinished state. The writer demanded an inquiry. 42

An inquiry came via the pen of Dr. Lang, but perhaps not quite the kind "Australicus" envisaged. It took the form of a minute appraisal of the role of the press in the colony, especially the "convict press" as Lang preferred to term it. The *Sydney Gazette* was singled out for inspection because it epitomised what was unbelievably bad in the eyes of Dr. Lang, a situation where two ex-felons were controlling
a newspaper. Mr. Edward O'Shaughnessy was an emancipated convict and Mr. William Watt was holding a ticket of leave, and they occupied the position of joint managers of the Sydney Gazette whose owner was Mrs. Howe (widow of the original editor and proprietor of that paper, George Howe). This article, entitled The Literary Profession was a continuation of an article on the history of the colonial press appearing in a previous issue. In his efforts to point out the moral unfitness and general inappropriateness of any person arriving in the colony as a convict to manage a newspaper, Lang incensed Mr. O'Shaughnessy to such an extent that he sought an application for leave to file an information for criminal libel against Lang. There exists no evidence to suppose this upset Lang at all. In fact the tenor of his following articles shows no abatement in his dictatorial and moralizing tone. The truth appears to be that he welcomed such a move from O'Shaughnessy, for it gave greater publicity to his campaign against emancipated convicts holding influential public office.

The application was heard before Chief Justice Forbes and Justices Dowling and Burton, and the Sydney Herald reported the salient points of the case, including the two hour address made by Lang.

Needless to say The Colonist reported this address virtually verbatim.

The main theme of Lang's address was the place an emancipated convict should occupy in society, and the areas into which his influence should not be permitted, and editorship was one of these. Despite such arguments
Forbes and his colleagues granted O'Shaughnessy's application, and a criminal prosecution against Lang was instituted, but was later abandoned. O'Shaughnessy himself left the Sydney Gazette and later that year reappeared with the Sydney Herald, denouncing "convict trash with all the gusto with which he had belaboured the Tories in his days on the Sydney Gazette". 43 It would seem that Lang had won his point from this encounter.

An interesting comment made at the time on Lang's attack against O'Shaughnessy came from John Lhotsky, whom we have already mentioned. Lhotsky upheld O'Shaughnessy claiming "[he] is now (and probably always was, since he has been in the Colony) a man of steady, quiet and decent behaviour, more over a man of Application". He then continued and made a valid criticism of Lang by maintaining that if the Sydney Gazette could be called a "vile, dispicable mawkish verbage" (Lang's own words) then it should be attacked on those grounds, for that fact might be the case even if another person - and he suggests a Doctor of Divinity - was sitting in the "Editorial Chair". 44

Lang claimed credit for having O'Shaughnessy leave the Sydney Gazette, but he could not claim the same in the case of William Watt. However, he gave a full description of Watt's departure from that paper in The Colonist of 17th September 1835, in another editorial, The Convict Press. He claimed that with Watt the colonial press had
finally proved its merit, and thrown out the "accursed ones". Watt had been accused of stealing a printed slip from the offices of the Sydney Herald, and also of casting strong doubt as to the manner in which Major Mudie treated his convict servants. The result was that Watt was put up for trial, found guilty and sent to Port Macquarie.

Lang felt it was a just reward, for through the Sydney Gazette Watt had done:

more real and permanent injury to this colony in regard to the moral welfare of all classes of its inhabitants, than would in all likelihood have been done by a visitation of any one of God's three greatest scourges, the sword, the famine or the plague. 45

Lang also took this opportunity to make accusations against the Patriotic Association of New South Wales, 46 suggesting that the character of William Watt was indicative of the type of person within that Association, and that its members were in fact conniving at the type of life being led by such people as William Watt. Lang could have pointed out that this Association was losing some of its impetus, as even W. C. Wentworth had by this time apparently turned away from it, as he led the prosecution against William Watt.

Lang again had to endure the hearing of an action for libel a year later in the Supreme Court. The plaintiff was the Rev. Lancelot Threlkeld, an Anglican missionary who had been working amongst the Aborigines since 1825. Mr. Threlkeld, apparently, had caused many difficulties with the Anglican Church over these missionary
activities, and it was of these that The Colonist found worth reporting. It accused him of failure to manage funds entrusted to him and of generally having an adverse effect upon the natives. Threlkeld took exception to the subject matter, wrote to Dr. Lang and imputed authorship of the article to him. Lang would not admit this, so Threlkeld commenced an action for damages against the editor, whereupon Lang acknowledged he was the author. The case was heard before Mr. Justice Burton in March 1836, and Threlkeld won the case, being awarded damages of one farthing. Lang had to pay the costs of both parties, a fact which seemed to aggravate him, because in an editorial in The Colonist of 31st March considerable emphasis was placed on the fact that the jury apparently wished to bring in a verdict which would allow each party to pay his own costs. This editorial, which reported the case, extended over six pages and there appears little doubt the The Colonist viewed Lang as having won the case. In fact, Threlkeld was referred to as being "theatrical, improvident and self-righteous" which would seem an imprudent comment to make after Lang had just lost the case. Both of these libel actions revealed that part of Lang's character which craved not only attention, but notoriety. And this notoriety he could justify, because it was not for personal satisfaction, but for the betterment of the colony. But there can be little doubt that had he really taken time to analyse his reasons for acting the way he did, he would have discovered that he enjoyed such battles.
The Colonist held a review of its effectiveness in an editorial entitled Ourselves on 19th May 1836. Apart from stating that its principal object - the reestablishment of the Australian College - had been achieved, it continued by listing about seven major contributions it had made to colonial life. These, briefly, are as follows:

(i) it contributed in "an eminent degree" to the discontinuance of the female emigration system, and it claims credit for the exposure of the evils which led the Colonial Executive to examine the system;

(ii) it directed the attention of the "reputable portion of the community" to the importance of land sale revenue as the "source of political advancement and moral regeneration of the colony";

(iii) it demonstrated the practicability of the gradual discontinuance of the transportation system and its replacement by free emigration sponsored by funds created by land sale revenues;

(iv) its support of general education and religious liberty;

(v) it "created and diffused a taste for literature amongst the colonists";

(vi) it virtually annihilated the convict and emancipist press, and its effect in this field can be gauged from the "feeble and expiring efforts of the Patriotic Society (New South Wales)". This facet of its work was claimed to be its most important contribution;

(vii) it made a firm and successful stand against the prevailing immorality and profligacy of the colony.
The Colonist's claims to the above contribution are justified, but in part only. For example, items (i) to (iv) were also the policy of other publications in the colony at the time. Item (v) was certainly amongst its better claims, but it extended further than "a diffused taste for literature". The Colonist was promoting a style of journalism which gave greater variety in its content than the others of the time, and it also believed in a good coverage of public affairs - both at home and overseas. But it failed on this count when it began to criticise individuals, for then it lost sight of the main object, and examined minutely the various personalities in an attempt to highlight all the faults which could be found. Even John Lhotsky could say a kind word, for writing of Lang he said "... his views are at times lofty and elevated; his style manly, correct and perspicuous; he is moreover, an ordered friend of Australia...". But Lhotsky, even in the midst of such praise, thought the quality of articles for The Colonist would rise if Lang would only pay more - he suggested £1.1.0 for leading articles, less for other contributions, and as a consequence better contributors would be attracted; he even suggested as an example of the better type of contributor, Henry Carmichael! But Lhotsky's point was well made, for Lang, intolerant of strong views from others which were opposed to his own, would not entertain the idea of publishing under such conditions. This circumstance was to his loss, for although The Colonist did attempt to introduce new matter into its pages, it did not seem to attract a great deal of colonial talent. In fact the issues
which were published during Lang's absences from the colony are
generally bereft of lively interest. None the less, The Colonist did
represent a progressive step in journalism by its attempt to interest
its readers in subjects other than colonial politics and society.
Perhaps the real point at which one can cavill was its laborious and
constant reporting of Presbyterian Church matters, faction fights and
disciplinary procedures. Certainly there was no need to keep these
affairs private, but also there was no necessity for Lang to champion
his particular Presbyterian views at the expense of other Presbyterians
in the colony. Not only was this a lapse from the avowed aims of the
paper, but it was bad journalism, and tended to identify the paper in the
public mind as being an organ for the distribution of Lang's religious
ideas. By these activities, Lang was exceeding the original scope of
the paper, which was to act as protection for the Australian College.
Rather, it became the protector of the policies of Dr. Lang.

Items (vi) and (vii) in The Colonist's list of major contributions
it had rendered the colony can be grouped together, since Lang's
attack on the emancipist press and other newspapers was combined
with his campaign to highlight the moral depravity existing in the colony.
He certainly succeeded in gaining publicity, but if our much quoted
journalist John Lhotsky is to be believed, by various articles designed
to highlight the prevailing depravity, Lang was actually publicising it.
Lhotsky writes that Lang "has by every such article greatly fostered
and encouraged the love for scandal, a sin which in a young colony like
this, we cannot well forgive". 50 It is doubtful if Lhotsky's attitude on this can be taken seriously, for the degenerate moral state of Sydney at this time was well-known, not only within the colony, but in England also. 51 What Lhotsky took exception to was Lang's singling out of various persons, usually readily identifiable, as exhibits in order to prove the existence of low moral standards amongst Sydney Society. Lhotsky wondered why Lang should single out some when there were others who were equally eligible. 52 The answer is possibly to be found in Lang's own character and beliefs, which we have seen in operation before, and providing the end was justified, then the means used to attain it were incidental, and no exceptions were made for individuals who were to be found guilty during the process.

Lang, in writing in 1876 on what he considered to be his chief non-political services rendered to the colony throughout his lifetime enumerated four main categories, and placed the improvement of moral standards third on the list. It was surprising, for those preceding it were architecture and education. Under this heading of morals, he noted the influence of The Colonist, especially the campaign conducted through its pages against the convict press. The court hearing of the charge brought by O'Shaughnessy, says Lang, marked the end of the power of that section of the press, and "there was thus a great moral and salutary revelation effected for the colony". 53
"I will go through with what I have undertaken", I neither care nor fear what may befall me. No power of yours, no injury of fortune shall shake my fixed resolution. I know that my endeavours to replace such as you are, and to place worthy ministers in your room, is acceptable to God; and in the last judgment, I trust it will be safer for me to have incurred your enmity than to have enjoyed your favour.
"Public men" wrote the Rev. John McGarvie in the leading article in the first edition of the Sydney Herald "have not the benefit of honest intentions". It is perhaps unlikely that John McGarvie was thinking of his only fellow Presbyterian minister when he wrote this in 1831. At that time Lang was in England to seek approval for his educational institution and to recruit some more Presbyterian ministers for the colony's growing number of Presbyterian inhabitants. But within a few years of this, McGarvie was to realize, in his own mind at least, the truth of those words, as a bitter struggle ensued between himself, as "a representative of the Scottish establishment, upholding that heritage against social change and spiritual innovation", and John Lang, as the representative of "a loose federation of evangelicals crying out against all corruption". McGarvie stood as a good theologian, moralist, historian and journalist, but as one who was content to carry out these activities in a quiet, peaceful and efficient manner. Lang, also, stood as a good theologian, a moralist, historian and journalist, but he believed not in setting the example but in pointing out the way which others were to follow. There was no doubt in Lang's mind of the correctness of his own actions, and whilst he may have appeared to others to set according to his own laws he, conveniently, was able to rest assured that he was acting with divine guidance in all situations. It was this confidence which oftentimes allowed him to continue in circumstances where other men would have given up. But
it was this same confidence, or rather a self-confidence as opposed
to a truly humble belief that he was carrying out a divinely ordained
plan, which enabled him to oppose McGarvie and his supporters from
the colonial Presbyterian church when he realised he was in the minority.
In reality he cared nothing for the opinions of others within his church.
He alone was its master and any opposition to his wishes had to be put
down, regardless of the cost to the church of such disciplinary action.
The outcome was that the church in the thirties gradually descended
into a state of chaos; chaos because Lang thrived on violent strife and
controversy "which are always destructive to the peace, sound work and
good reputation of a religious organisation". ³

Lang had arrived in the colony fresh from his studies in
Glasgow, and imbued with the idea of forming a Presbyterian Church
in Sydney. The theological background which he brought with him was
one of dogmatic Calvinism, but one which held certain principles
sacred; and one of these was the democratic nature of Calvinism as
demonstrated by the right of church members to chose their ministers.
But it was this adherence to such principles which gave his theological
beliefs their dominant quality. Man he knew to be "by nature evil and
destined to suffer intolerable but inevitable and everlasting wrath which
God metes out to sinners", ⁴ To be saved from this fate man had to
develop an understanding of Christ and repentence, and repentence
itself could only be manifest through the saving grace of God. In his
early years in the colony the chief element of his theology was an emphasis
on predestination. Even though this element was the basis of his theology until his death, at times he was able to moderate its predominance to some extent. For example, in a sermon in 1835 he was able to say that the Church's teachings of formal creeds was a minor matter, and that the important task was for "the formation of an intelligent, and virtuous and Christian population". But his belief in predestination was at the basis of his theology and, consequently, of his actions throughout his life. There were occasions, such as the example just mentioned, where he appeared to be foregoing his claim to have been singled out as one of the elect. But this was not really so. He firmly believed that the course of his life had already been decided by God from eternity in respect of all events. It was to be his duty as one of the elect to carry out the various activities which God had foreordained.

Predestination as a general theological belief, maintains that God has foreordained who shall, and who shall not, be saved. Election describes the condition of those saved, and reprobation that of those who are lost. However, clear though this may seem to be, the doctrine also involves the nature of the relationship between other closely interdependent ideas; those for example, of creator and creature; man's will and determinism; ground and cause; guilt and punishment. So, it can be observed it is a belief with many ramifications, and not as simple and straightforward as may first appear. But to Lang it was a simple and clear belief. His was a logical extension of the severe
Scottish Calvinism prevalent in his church at that time. Calvin had asserted what has been termed the doctrine of double predestination; that God has determined from eternity who shall be saved and who shall not, regardless of man's faith, love or merit, or particular lack of these qualities. It might be said that Lang went a little further. He certainly believed he was one of the elect, but he also looked upon God in an almost personal sense, as though there was a special bond between the two of them. Archibald Gilchrist has said of Lang and his conception of God that:

Divine Providence as conceived by Doctor Lang was a fearsome being punishing many innocent as a lesson to the few guilty, inconsistently preventing or permitting wars and murders, taking sides with Lang in his squabbles, in various ways capricious, unreasonable and vengeful, without any of the tenderness and loving-kindness pictured by the best of the prophets.

Lang's belief of predestination gave him an unshakeable faith in his own destiny, the course of which was foreordained. This knowledge enabled him to act where men of lesser belief would have hesitated. Thus many of his actions, which he did not have to justify to himself, were often condemned by others because they were viewed as selfish, heartless, or even as dishonest. But such critics failed to realize that Lang was not accountable to them, only to Divine Providence, and that his progress through this mortal life was to promote higher things, regardless of sinful man's desire to interfere. Lang was on earth to fulfil a divine purpose.
The belief in predestination is not, of course, only a Presbyterian one, but is to be found in varying degrees of intensity in many Protestant faiths. But the belief has had a profound effect where the believer has felt himself to be endowed with an unshakeable purpose in life. Hence, the many instances where it has been the basis of the faith of many a strong leader - not only religious, but also political. But although it was the basis for his own faith, Lang found that it was not always practical to expect the average member of colonial society to understand its implications. So we find instances where Lang apparently relaxed his normally inflexible attitude, as for example, in his Prospectus for the Caledonian Academy. In this he indicated that there was to be no attempt made to proselytise, although lessons were to commence daily with prayer, and the Bible was to be read. This was an example of compromise, unusual in Lang, but he thought it better to educate in general Christian principles than to restrict education to those who would accept Presbyterian doctrines only. This attitude suggests that Lang considered religious differences were not all important, at least where education was concerned, and where it was he who was making the proposals.

Archibald Gilchrist has commented that it was surprising that Lang did not, with his "rollicking sense of humour and friendly interest in common people emancipate his mind from dogmas of the ecclesiastical bodies with which he was continually at variance". This failure was due, perhaps, to a duality in his character. On the one hand was the
ecclesiastic, imbued with Calvinistic dogma, believing that God had already foreordained that which was to pass; whilst on the other there was present the spirit of exploration - the nineteenth century adventure. It was to some extent this latter characteristic which had prompted Lang to come to the colony - there was the image of the pioneer minister. As a result of both of these aspects of his character, he found that he should take steps to rectify the evils which existed throughout the colony. It was not to be wondered at that having so energetic and forceful a character, he would find that the rectification of one evil led to the necessity to root out and destroy others. This crusading, or missionary, zeal Lang owed not only to his own composition of character, but to the influence of his early idol, Thomas Chalmers. We have seen, in Chapter one, the effect that Chalmers had upon Lang, but it may be as well to mention here that one of Chalmers's main beliefs centred around Bible teachings as a means of saving and elevating the masses, who would otherwise fall into both moral and physical degradation.13 Also, Chalmers thought that often such people were not conscious of what they wanted most, and consequently it was necessary to unfold the divine plan to them. For this to be done effectively, finance from the State was desirable.14 Hence Chalmers's belief in State aid for the church, a belief which Lang also shared, as witnessed in his establishment of the Scots Church in Sydney.

This duality in Lang's character appears strongly when we consider the manner in which he directed the development of the Presbyterian Church in the colony. His first sermon had invoked the
idea of Scotland in tones of warm affection, and he expressly declared his mission to the colony to be to those Scotsmen and Presbyterians who had come out to New South Wales. He ran the church he formed with ministers recruited in Scotland — ministers which he himself later admitted were not of the highest standard — and in general adopted an attitude towards the church which was divorced from the problems encountered by those in colonial society. He himself could launch out into other activities, but he did not seem to relish the thought of other ministers doing the same. In this respect he exhibited an attitude towards his own church which was designed to isolate it in colonial society. The church played the major role in his life, but one gains the impression that it was kept in his mind in a compartment on its own. It was only during the disputes which arose in the thirties, and the reporting of Presbyterian activities in *The Colonist* that the integration into the colonial setting began. And even then it was perhaps alien to what the non-Presbyterian colonist could understand. The church was considered inviolate, and was not to be tampered with, except perhaps as Dr. Lang saw fit to do himself. The truth was that he looked upon it as his church, in much the same way as the Australian College, despite its shareholders and its council, was his college.

There seems to be a tendency to view Lang's efforts on behalf of Presbyteriansim from his arrival in the colony as being singular and unusual, and whilst this is so to some extent, it does not appear to be the whole of the matter. Although one imagines Lang would have wished...
to have been regarded as the only individual struggling against the
authority of the colonial government, and then against the influence
of his own church in Scotland, this was only part of a pattern common
to the nineteenth century. Michael Roe states:

In Australian colonies, as throughout the world,
Protestants battled against restraint, both secular
and spiritual, on the practice of their religion . . .
this discontent incorporated three major themes;
resistance to any ecclesiastical hierarchy; antipathy
to control from Britain; and antipathy to control by
the state. 19

The peak of this trend apparently came in mid-century. But Lang had
experienced all three aspects prior to that time. Without delving too
deeply into this matter, the various stages outlined by Michael Roe can
be transposed into Lang's career. Resistance to ecclesiastical
hierarchy can be evidenced both in his struggle with dissention in his
church, and in his own church in the thirties, when the Presbytery, led to all intents by
John McGarvie, wished to follow the dictates of the Church of Scotland,
whereas Lang was in favour of adopting a less rigid interpretation.

Lang's reasons for adopting this attitude sprang principally from the
second point, antipathy to control from Scotland (not Britain in this
instance). The Church of Scotland had done nothing, according to him,
to promote the welfare of the colonial church. Consequently he was not
able to bring himself to bow to its authority when, in the thirties, it
decided to exercise its powers. Antipathy to control by the state was
evidenced from the first, when Lang was confronted by so many obstacles
before he could obtain what he had determined were the Presbyterians' by right - freedom and equality in religion. This he eventually achieved, and established his church in the colony on this basis, with state support for a minister's salary. But in the mid-thirties he began to change his ideas - state support meant state interference. However, it was only after a journey to the United States of America in 1839-40 that he was absolutely convinced of the wisdom of rejecting state finance in the church, and in 1842 he put his theory of voluntarism into practice. 20

Lang's theology was directly related to the various ventures he embarked upon, and it would perhaps be best to examine these before analysing his influence upon the colonial Presbyterian Church in the thirties. Initially, of course, was his establishment of the Scots Church, and this was examined in Chapter three. The main point to note, at this stage, was his insistence on religious equality for the Presbyterians, which included state support for the maintenance of clergymen he brought out to the colony until 1842 at least. Also important was his obtaining of state finance to aid in the building of a church, both in New South Wales and in Van Diemen's Land. In the latter colony, the Rev. Archibald Macarthur was the only Presbyterian minister, and he had settled in Hobart Town prior to Lang's arrival in Sydney. Macarthur, however, looked to Lang for guidance in his dealings with the authorities in Van Diemen's Land, and that guidance Lang apparently gave. 21 Much conflict arose between Lang and the authorities over the establishment
of the Presbyterian Church in the colony, and the particularly notable product of such strife was the manner in which Lang was prepared to fight for what he believed to be a correct point of view - his own. Because of his belief in predestination he had no doubts as to the correctness of his actions, and was prepared to sacrifice anything or anybody so long as the avowed goal could be obtained. In the case of the establishment of the Scots Church, the sacrifice was Commissary-General Wemyss, and to a certain extent Governor Brisbane. In the establishment of the Australian College, Lang sacrificed the Sydney College and Archdeacon Broughton, but very nearly destroyed his own efforts by an over-sealous attempt to discredit the Archdeacon through his administration of the Church and School Corporation. It was basically his theological beliefs which prompted him to act so positively in these matters, as he saw all attempts to thwart his plans as interfering with a divinely inspired purpose. But such interference and opposition to his plans was a challenge, and as a human being he had certain characteristics, one of which was that he enjoyed meeting and overcoming obstacles. The fact that he did this in the name of religion, and with loud affirmations that the course of destiny could not be overset, only succeeded in highlighting the problem, and confusing the issue in the minds of the colonial citizens. The inevitable consequence was that Lang was generally misunderstood; but the fault was his, since in many instances, acting in the name of religion, his actions were not those of a
man of Christian principles. He described his reasons for acting in this manner when he said that although he gloried in the calling of the gospel of peace, he had had:

abundant occasion during my past career in the colony, to say with the Psalmist, "Blessed be the Lord, my strength, which teacheth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight". 22

Lang's theology was thus very flexible, but the ultimate goal was always the same. It was this ultimate goal which perplexed his fellow colonists, for it was always being promoted in different guises, and could change direction at will; furthermore, it was Dr. Lang who reserved the right to authorize change, and who vehemently disputed any challenge to his decisions.

It has been demonstrated in earlier chapters how Lang's religion was closely linked with his educational ideas, and how much a part of the divine plan the eventual formation of the Australian College comprised. As well as being an integral part of his theology, education and religion had formed the whole of his training in Scotland, and it was unlikely in his calling as a minister that he would fail to try and promote a college based on Scottish lines, especially since the colony had such a poor educational establishment. The Australian College was the result. But when Governor Bourke tried to implement a system of universal education based upon the style of schooling then operative in Ireland, Lang, not fully understanding this system, let himself be persuaded into opposing it. He classified the so-called Irish System as being unchristian in its principles, latitudinarian in its tendency and
oppressive in its practice. It is difficult to understand how such condemnation, from a theological standpoint, could be reconciled with his later admission that he was wrong in opposing Bourke's scheme. However, he explained it away later when he put forward the reason that his opposition, and that of those with whom he was associated, was founded in "misapprehension as to the real character and tendency of the Irish system"; and also "in a want of experience in regard to the inefficiency and extravagance of the Denominational system". But this comment was made after the Denominational system (the replacement for the Irish system, in which state aid was given to religious organizations who sponsored schools) was found to be a very inefficient one, and also when Lang himself had decided to follow the path of voluntaryism.

Perhaps his explanation as to why the Irish System was opposed was correct, but one is forced to believe that it was his bigotry which was partly responsible for his opposition to Bourke's proposals. His fear of Irish Catholic influence in the colony was a real one, and his theology had given him no answer for this.

Emigration was to be the source for increasing the number of Presbyterians in the colony, but this was not the only reason why Lang supported and promoted various emigration schemes. The colony was much in need of a better type of settler, not only for economic and political reasons, but in order to improve the tone and the moral sense of society. Lang's Calvinism was of a strict kind, and although his
preaching may not have been as powerful from the colonial pulpit
as perhaps it may have been back in Scotland, his belief in the sanctity
of the Sabbath and the need to establish a high moral awareness in the
minds of the populace was very real. It is likely that he saw in emigration
a means of solving these particular colonial ills - since it was not
possible to turn out those who were a bad influence from the colony,
then an influx of a better type of person would have the effect of giving
an improved example. A strange doctrine for a religious leader from
whom one would have expected a policy designed to aid the reform of
those whose influence was detrimental to the maintenance of high
standards. The Rev. Alan Dougan has pointed out that there is little
evidence to indicate that there was much awareness on the part of the
Presbyterian Church - and therefore at that time of Lang - of such
problems as the plight of the convicts, the abuses of alcohol, the problems
associated with an overbalance of men to women and the general loneliness
experienced by those in frontier communities. Lang was aware of the
existence of such problems, but he seemed to be of the opinion that there
was no need to minister to such people. Reform was by example, and
example would come through the presence of a better class of settler.

But, whilst these problems existed, Lang was prepared to break the
unity of his church simply because he felt his authority was challenged.
Transportation was another of Lang's advances into the field
of public affairs, and one in which his theology played a notable role,
involving the question of punishment. Lang believed that punishment must be exacted for a crime committed, but it did not cease at that point. He extended it further, and maintained that the ex-convict would always be an ex-convict, and, as has been noted in Chapter six, he should not force himself on to society. Lang believed in punishment such as the transportation system envisaged, providing it was properly constituted and maintained. It would seem that Lang lacked charity and an understanding of the difficulties which beset so many people in those days, and instead of attempting to solve the problems which existed, he preferred to postulate theories for improved systems of transportation.

The apparent lack of charity was based on the proposition that if man erred, then he had to pay the penalty for such action. Repentence was all very well, but alone it was not enough; if repentence was genuine, then it had to be made a life-long penance, and did not cease merely because the period of man-made sentence had come to an end. It was a harsh belief which pictured the Christian religion in such a manner; harsh and uncompromising.

It was this uncompromising attitude which made itself apparent in Lang's conduct of the internal affairs of the colonial Presbyterian Church in the early thirties. This attitude was not so noticeable in the early years of the church, as then the only ministers were John McCarvie at Portland Head, and Lang himself in Sydney, with the occasional contact being made with the Rev. Archibald Macarthur in
Hobart Town. The growth of the church after that initial struggle for recognition with the government was relatively peaceful, the only major disturbance arising in 1825 over the right of Presbyterian ministers to celebrate marriage. This matter was common both to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, and eventually was satisfactorily solved, but not until Lang had made quite clear the position he was going to adopt. One other internal matter which arose at this time was the drawing up of a Constitution for the Scots Church. This Lang did in 1824, and presented it to Governor Brisbane for his approval, which was given, subject to the Secretary of State for the Colonies giving his sanction also. Lang was bound by his ordination vows to ensure that his church was connected with the Church of Scotland, and this was apparent in the Constitution. But this fact enraged Commissary-General Wemyss at the time who, as a Dissenter, would have preferred to see no connection whatever with that Church. Interestingly enough, this very Constitution was used by Lang in the thirties when he wished to dissociate himself from the actions of the Presbytery of New South Wales.

The Presbyterian Church began to expand on Lang's return to the colony with the masters for the Australian College and two new ministers in 1831. The Rev. John Cleland took John McFarvie's place at Portland Head, and the Rev. Thomas Thomson went to Bathurst. John McGarvie, who during Lang's absence had carried out the duties
at Scots Church, formed another church in Sydney, St. Andrews, which commenced services in November 1832, though the Church itself was not completed until 1834. Lang accused McCarvie of supplanting him during his absence, and of drawing away members of the Scots Church in order to form his own. It would not have occurred to Lang that the growing town of Sydney was in need of another Presbyterian Church. This affair marked the beginnings of a breach between these two ministers, a breach which widened as the church in the colony continued to expand. In December of 1832 the Presbytery of New South Wales was formed and Lang appointed Moderator. At the first meeting the Presbytery ordained Mr. John Anderson, a master at the Australian College, as a licentiate to take up pastoral duties at Launceston. The colonial Presbyterian Church had finally begun its own organisation, and whilst still linked to the Church of Scotland, it was now in a position to expand as the need arose. But more importantly, it meant that there were now more ministers to share the increasing burden of work and organisation - but strangely enough it seemed as though Lang did not wish to relinquish any of the controls he had exercised. It was as though he regarded the church as his own, and consequently the new ministers should defer to his wishes. But this could not always be the case, and his absences overseas provided opportunities for decisions to be made without his being consulted. But in the early thirties, the Presbytery as an active body was not particularly strong, as its members were spread throughout the colony, and many matters had to be decided by correspondence.
Lang departed the colony for England again in July 1833. Before his departure he made arrangements to have a replacement minister perform his duties in the Scots Church, and applied to the Governor for his approval of these arrangements. However, he received a reply from the Colonial Secretary, Alexander McLeay, to the effect that the Governor would not accede to Lang's request as the replacement minister, A Rev. Mr. Price, was objected to by a large portion of the Presbyterians in the colony. 31 Lang, sensing the interference of John McGarvie behind this objection, wrote to McLeay and pointed out that the Governor would have made an entirely different decision had he been aware of the Constitution of the Scots Church - the Constitution approved by Sir Thomas Brisbane in 1824 and later sanctioned by Lord Bathurst. He indicated that the only medium for replacing a minister during his absence from the church was vested in the Kirk Session, not the congregation (whose right it was to choose a new minister to replace departing one). In this letter to McLeay Lang joined battle with McGarvie, and he pointed out to the Colonial Secretary the reasons why he would "withstand the contemptible intrusion of Mr. McGarvie in to the Scots Church". 32 The matter was resolved by the Rev. Mr. Pinkerton from the Australian College being appointed to act for Lang during his absence.

The phase into which the colonial Presbyterian Church was now entering proved to be one of prolonged strife; a bitter struggle...
ensued between the forces of conservatism and allies of the Church of Scotland as led by John McGarvie and those who advocated a more liberal interpretation of the pronouncements of that Church, led by Dr. Lang. The contest appeared to take place on two levels. On the one there was the personal struggle between McGarvie and Lang, whilst on another was a less personal but more intensive campaign waged on the question of authority; whose dictates should the colonial church follow, those emanating from Scotland, or those as conceived by Dr. Lang? The question began to be raised after the passing of a Declaratory Act by the Church of Scotland in 1833, which defined its attitude towards the colonial churches. This Act authorized these churches to set up Presbyteries, but the Scottish Church claimed jurisdiction over them. And it was over this question of ultimate authority that Lang and McGarvie differed. As the Act was passed during Lang's voyage back to England, and the Presbytery had been in operation only some six months anyway, the immediate problem of interpreting this Act fell to John Cleland as Moderator (he had been appointed prior to Lang's departure) and John McGarvie and the other members of the Presbytery. Consequently, upon Lang's return towards the latter part of 1834, the members of the Presbytery did not take kindly to Lang reasserting his domination in church affairs.

The disagreements between Lang and the Presbytery commenced immediately upon his return and continued for the following two years. The main issue which Lang presented to the colonial public - and The
Colonist was used to exploit the situation - was that which concerned various charges laid against several members of the Presbyterian clergy for intemperance. But this was only one issue, and one which was easily understood by the ordinary colonist. A more involved, and more important issue concerned the question of the voluntary principle, which was apparently opposed by the majority of the members of the Presbytery, though strongly favoured by Lang. Those who opposed this wrote a letter which was published in The Colonist, indicating that although they supported closer financial ties with the government, they felt they had given:

mortal offence to the dictatorial sagacity of a fellow minister. . . . But at the next meeting, when his own case shall be discussed he will find it no easy task to reconcile the receipt of a handsome salary from His Majesty's Government with the avowal of principles that would render any other man, who had sworn to maintain the tenets of the Church of Scotland, an apostate from that Church.

Presbytery had a certain amount of power over his... The Editor answered this letter in the same edition of the paper, and made two important points:

(i) Lang had never opposed the introduction of more formal and closer ties by the Presbytery of New South Wales with the British and Colonial Governments and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; but he had maintained that such recognition was unnecessary, since appeals for disciplinary matters, for example, could not in all seriousness be transmitted to Scotland for a decision.

(ii) So far as the voluntary principle was concerned, Lang said he had sworn to maintain the relationship between the Church and
State in Scotland, but "he never swore to maintain the propriety and
the expediency of keeping up three contemporaneous establishments.
... or of having the Church of Scotland, the Church of England, and
the Church of Rome all supported by the same treasury chest."

The above matters have been dealt with at some length, but
this has been rendered necessary to indicate the extent of the issues
displayed by both sides, and how irreconcilable the situation became.
The situation deteriorated as Lang continued to speak and write against
the members of the Presbytery, whilst they endeavoured to circumvent
his actions, relying upon the fact that they were the legally constituted
spokesmen for the colonial Presbyterian Church. Lang attempted to
render their opposition ineffective in the same manner as he had done
opposition to his secular schemes, but it was not so simple, as the
Presbytery had a certain amount of power on its side. Lang had not
had such problems in the church since his attempts to establish it in
1823-24. Then the opposing forces had come from within the church
and from the government; and now the same pattern was being repeated.
To try to gain support for his cause in Scotland, and to recruit more
ministers to fill the growing need in the colony (as well as to replace
those who had fallen by the wayside) Lang journeyed to England again
in July 1836, after having made satisfactory arrangements for a
replacement to carry out his duties at Scots Church. 35

Governor Bourke was aware of the problems arising within
the Presbyterian Church, but could do little towards suggesting a
solution. He warned Lord Glenelg of the situation in a despatch, advising that Lang was on the way to England to recruit more clergy, and that he had allowed this as the church was in a declining position due to the misconduct of some of the existing ministers. Whilst Lang was absent in 1836-37 one of Bourke's liberal reforms took place - the passing of the Church Act, which established equality for religions. This Act extended government financial support, providing certain amounts were raised by congregations for the church buildings and for the ministers' salaries. As Lang was thinking seriously of embracing the voluntary principle, this Act was not given his approval. Also, one suspects he was not wholeheartedly in favour of the financial support which would be given as a consequence to the Roman Catholic Church. In his History he indicates that though the Act was politically wise, viewed from the standpoint of the Christian religion it was:

antiscrptural, latitudinarian and infidel in its character, and could not fail to be ultimately and extensively demoralising in its tendency and effects.

In September 1837 at the instigation of the Presbytery of New South Wales a Church Temporalities Act was passed by the colonial legislature. This was designed to regulate the temporal affairs of the Presbyterian Churches and Chapels connected with the Church of Scotland in New South Wales. Lang was furious when he heard that this Act had been passed, not only on the grounds that he had not been consulted, but
because it took place only three months before he arrived back in the colony. As well, he had brought back with him ministers who were to help reinstate the church in the colony, and by this Act, the Presbytery was given authority to speak for and control the actions of the Presbyterian Church. Lang realized that the Act completely destroyed his plans, for it was the Presbytery which now had the power to recommend finance for church buildings and for the maintenance of ministers; it had the only authority to recommend ministers for appointment, and where a vacancy occurred, the governor was to apply to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for a qualified person to be appointed. Lang found his plans for the church hopelessly circumvented. But apparently two important aspects had been completely overlooked. These concerned the fact that the Act had made no provision regarding the administration of the Church, and that the governor had been given what amounted to a virtual right of patronage.

When Lang returned in December with new ministers for the church and discovered the extent of the changes made during his absence, he refused to abide by them. He realized he would have little chance to carry through any measures for the welfare of the church if he rejoined, and so he formed the Synod of New South Wales—a Court of Superior Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. His justification for this action was set out in a letter to the Marquis of Normanby, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in September 1839. Lang suggested in this letter that the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church,
like that of the British Constitution, did not lay down what events warranted departure from normal practice; he also could not decide, except that he stated that:

I am happy to inform your Lordship that the Presbyterians of New South Wales - the party most deeply concerned - have determined in favour of my esteemed brethren and myself. 39

This favourable decision to which Lang referred was obtained at a meeting of a large proportion of the Presbyterian community held in Sydney in December 1838. But naturally, there were supporters for both sides, the Synod and the Presbytery, and even Lang's arguments could not change the position. Whilst he did not approve of the dual system which resulted, he could tolerate it, knowing that in the end it would be his ideas which must triumph. But when Acting Governor Snodgrass (Sir Richard Bourke had left the colony on 5th December 1837) reported the matter to Lord Glenelg, who passed it on to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for their opinion, Lang felt he had endured enough. He took no action until the report of the proceedings of the General Assembly was made available. This report was found to be highly condemnatory of the Synod (amounting virtually to an excommunication according to Lang) and so Lang determined it was his duty to journey again to England on behalf of the Church. He departed the colony in January 1839.

It seems incredible that so much time and effort should have been spent by the members of the colonial Presbyterian Church over
internal matters. It is easy to hold Lang responsible, but although he was in regard to some aspects, it does not answer for the whole situation. Lang's desire to oppose measures which reduced his authority was undoubted - in the early thirties at least. But then further issues arose which divided the church into opposing groups; Lang considered himself as progressive and practical, whereas he looked upon the Presbytery as representing those who wished to bind themselves to the Church of Scotland. That church had neglected the colonial churches for so long that Lang considered it had forfeited its right to interfere in local church affairs. After the formation of the Synod Lang claimed to be upholding the fundamental principles of the Presbyterian Church. This may have seemed strange since by this the Synod was presuming to think itself wiser than many eminent churchmen in the General Assembly in Scotland. Lang gave as his reasons for making such a claim that those at home had lost sight of the need for a church to control its own destiny, and that was so since there had been no need to apply such principles for many years past in Scotland. That church was now free; the colonial church was not. And so Lang claimed that the:

power or authority which a minister receives at ordination is received in trust from the church, and can be limited, extended, modified or augmented by the church at pleasure.

In reality he was claiming that the Church of Scotland was trying to exercise a power over him and over the Synod which it did not possess.
A power which the Presbytery of New South Wales was apparently prepared to admit did exist.

It is not our intention to pursue Lang's various arguments put forward against the Presbytery of New South Wales, the Colonial and British Governments, and the Church of Scotland, but it is perhaps sufficient to note that Lang was fighting for what he considered to be fundamentals in the Presbyterian Church organization - a liberal interpretation of the disciplines of the administrative function of the Church of Scotland. In this he envisaged a right to have internal independence for the colonial churches. The struggle, which took place within the colonial church during the thirties before the issues were presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland for settlement, was to be symptomatic of growing differences within the Church of Scotland itself. Although Lang does not escape from the conflict without a certain measure of condemnation for the manner in which he held the Presbytery, and in effect the Presbyterian Church, up to public ridicule, there was a basic question which only gradually emerged over the years - that of authority as defined by the Church of Scotland. The issue became very real to Lang after his return from England in 1837, and occupied most of his time until after his return from England and the United States of America in 1841. His other interests were relegated to a secondary place during this period. This reinforces the contention that Lang regarded the church as his first interest; and his primary role that of a clergyman. His career
in the colony had turned full circle. He had begun in 1823 by establishing
the church, and not until that was complete did he take up various
secular pursuits. By the end of the thirties, the important question
again was the position of his church, and so his other interests were
superseded for a time. But the problems confronting him in 1837-39
were more sophisticated than those he had encountered in 1823. But
then he had changed also. His position in the colony was that of an
eminent, if somewhat disliked, churchman. He carried much more
authority than would the normal churchman in his position, and this
was due to his active participation in colonial issues over the years.
But despite this eminence, it is possible that he overlooked the most
important asset to be cultivated - humility. He had adopted an attitude
towards his colonial brethren which equated very closely to that which
he claimed the Church of Scotland showed towards the colonial church.
Had he realised this, the enormity of the internal struggle, and the
conflict between Synod and Presbytery may have been, if not avoided,
then mitigated.

The Church in the thirties concentrated on manner rather
than matter, and inevitably its work as a church amongst its congre-
gations and the colonial inhabitants suffered. Lang cannot be condemned
for the stand he took, but he can be criticised for the manner in which
he made it. For it seems he entered into the spirit of the struggle
with all aspects in his favour and he even had The Colonist to back him.
The struggle developed into an extremely parochial issue, and no
feelings within the church were spared. The injury done the Church is difficult to assess, and part of the blame must be borne by Lang. He tried to bring to bear on the Church the same attitude he adopted when dealing with problems which arose during the course of his various other ventures. Whilst involved in these he never lost sight of the fact that he was a clergyman, and used his position to give consequence to his actions. In his relationship with his church and with those in it, he reversed his role. He used every opportunity to indicate to them that it was not just as a clergyman that he was to be regarded, but as an active contributor to the development of the colony and to colonial society. As a consequence he undoubtedly expected those within the church would pay more attention to his views, and when this did not happen he treated the exposure of their attitude in the same manner as he had argued and fought his secular battles. It appears he saw the role of a clergyman in society in two guises - the attitude which should be adopted by the average clergyman, confining his interests to within his church, and that of his own, which was answerable to no man, but to God alone.
CONCLUSION

John Dunmore Lang's arrival in the colony of New South Wales coincided with official realisation that the nature of the colony was undergoing a gradual transformation from that of a penal settlement into a land with a future for independent settlers. The character and attitudes which were combined in Dr. Lang caused him to react to conditions within the colony and to attempt to influence its changing character through areas other than that which concerned the development of his own church. His achievements in the fields of education, emigration and transportation were very real achievements indeed, but the strife and lacerated feelings which he left in the wake of these ventures was unfortunate, as it tended to obliterate the extent of his contribution. Lang was not alone in his endeavours in these fields, but he was not so much an originator of measures as rather a man of great practical application. He saw benefits to be gained from certain lines of action, and appropriated ideas and put them into practice. This was of no loss to the colony, for it was in need of those who were prepared to take risks - and these Lang certainly did take. But it was his failure, or his inability, to co-operate to any great extent with others which jeopardised his various schemes, and placed him continually on the defensive in regard to them. His achievements, even in the field of education, were essentially of a physical nature. He seemed to derive
as much satisfaction from the overcoming of obstacles as he did from the completion of the venture itself, and the benefits which resulted. It was this missionary or crusading zeal which prompted him to commence and carry through various plans; this is the dominant characteristic of his activities in this period. He became involved with so many different activities it became inevitable that the emphasis placed on the benefits which would accrue from a successful outcome of one scheme often became lost in the launching of another.

However, it was Lang's concern with his religion, and with his own position as one of the elect, which was the predominant characteristic of his activities in the eighteen twenties and thirties. His concern for his church and his interest in its expansion were genuine; as was also his concern for the welfare of the colony itself; for it was only in a stable and moral society that the church could be expected to prosper. This desire, in part, led him into his numerous secular activities. But in spite of his major interest being his church, he failed to understand that his role in the church had to change as the church expanded. This failure, together with the various ideological conflicts which arose during the thirties, caused severe internal strife in that church; and Lang's uncompromising attitude did not help towards a solution. The situation was made even more difficult because Lang, as an expatriate Scotsman with rather radical ideas on the position of the colonial church in the Presbyterian system, was forced to co-operate
with other expatriate Scotsmen (the imported ministers) but the surroundings were not Scotland. Consequently, the failure of the colonial Presbyterian Church to solve its internal problems in the thirties was not entirely due to its senior minister. The effect of cantankerous Scottish tradition can be evidenced by the situation between the Synod and the Presbytery in the later thirties. It was a situation which arose over the form the colonial church was to take, and is to be condemned, so far as the colonial church was concerned, because that church expended its time in internal squabbles instead of ministering to the needs of its congregations and to the welfare of the colony. In this latter respect Lang, though an extremely active participant in the internal conflicts, did contribute in great measure towards the improvement of colonial standards.

Despite the many criticisms which can be made of the manner in which Lang contributed to the colony in the first two decades of his life in New South Wales, his achievements are memorable ones. His role in the colony was primarily that of a minister of religion, and it was this position which gave him a distinct advantage over his secular opponents, as it could be claimed his motives were impartial - so far as political aims were concerned. As a minister of religion it was expected he would speak out on certain issues, but perhaps no one (himself included) realised just where this outspokenness would lead. As a journalist and minister of religion he wielded an even greater force, and although his was undoubtedly a very disturbing influence, his
continual efforts on behalf of improved social and moral standards had salutary effects. He appears to have been entirely impervious to criticism, and this makes all attempts to assess his worth very difficult, for he acted always as he himself decided, and was apparently not influenced by criticism in any way at all. As a strong believer in predestination, he had no fears as to the efficacy in which he carried out his earthly tasks. In truth, he did not expect to escape without criticism of his actions - for it was this very criticism which demonstrated to him the worth of the efforts he was making. His was a very personal campaign, for he allied himself to no political party. It was recognised and in the making of himself as though his religion set him apart from others, and was the only respect in which he stood in the party of which he was a member. Consequently he was very conscious of the worth of his personal efforts, and publicised them unceasingly. This egotism was apparent until his death, as in a letter to Sir William Macarthur in 1875 H. R. Francis (a District Court Judge) wrote: "Dr. Lang's first lecture has been honoured with three columns of the Herald, but I don't think it drew much notice. Of course, it was "I, I, I" from beginning to end." Throughout his life it was to be a very personal role which Lang assumed in his ventures into colonial affairs, and perhaps because he was so independent he was forced to advertise his actions and his ideas so assiduously. His personality in part accounts for this, but it was his religion which determined his intense interest and participation in public matters. His idea of the position which a clergyman should adopt in society was not governed by normal standards.
We have observed how he did not encourage his fellow clergymen to adopt as active a role in the colony's affairs as he himself did. This was in some measure due to the position in society which he knew was foreordained for him - as well as for the reason that he did not want competition. But for all his complexity, in this early period he made a notable contribution to the development and progress of the colony.

Although in many respects Lang stands condemned for many of his actions and attitudes, he made constructive contributions towards the improvement of the colony in the fields of education, emigration and in the raising of social standards. His opinions with respect to transportation and his journalistic efforts and other literary pursuits were of distinct benefit to the colony. He had made these contributions by 1840, and it was not to be thought his efforts would cease; it was not reasonable to expect it, and it was not in his nature. Thus, his early career in the colony, important and distinctive though it was, was only the beginning. His faith in himself, backed by his particular religious beliefs, would not let him remain inactive. Writing in the 1875 edition of the History, in his far from modest style, he indicated that he had been able to secure many important and permanent benefits for his fellow colonists, and "... perhaps also to leave footprints on the sands of time in Australia, that, in all likelihood will never be effaced".  

There can be little doubt of Lang's position in Australian history as one of our "founding fathers", but it was a position which he himself envisaged. Despite this egoism, his contribution to the colony in the
eighteen twenties and thirties was in every sense - remarkable.