Antipodean Men: Constructing Ruling-Class Masculinity in Early Colonial New South Wales, 1800-1850

Author: Michael Nicholls B.A.

Macquarie University
Department of Modern History, Politics and International Relations

Table of Contents

Abstract

This thesis examines the construction of ruling-class masculinity in the early colonial period in New South Wales. It shows how a specific form of masculinity emerged to cater for the particular demands that political and economic authority wrought on ruling-class men. Consequently, the figure of the British gentleman during this period was renegotiated and then re-enacted by these men in order to meet the uneasy and contradictory ways this masculine ideal was reshaped by these demands. By asking questions of the family and school, this thesis argues that we are able to see this renegotiation play out through two institutions that sustain – and promote – gendered norms and expectations.

Through a close reading of the Macarthur family correspondence, this thesis demonstrates the vulnerability of the gentlemanly stereotype in the antipodes, as well as shows John Macarthur's determination to train his sons James and William in colonial manliness. This thesis also examines the role played by the King's School in Parramatta in constructing ruling-class masculinity, including the ways in which it was founded and its devotion to the schooling system 'godliness and good learning'. I argue that the formation of an antipodean ruling-class not only paralleled a struggle to consolidate political and economic authority, but also an explicit attempt to construct a particular form of colonial manliness.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Tanya Evans. I am eternally grateful for not only your support and guidance, but also your patience, kindness and encouragement. I am convinced that your passion for history – and teaching history – for which I have had the pleasure of observing so often during this endeavor, has undoubtedly helped me more than I can adequately articulate, especially during those really tough days.

I would also like to thank the Modern History Department at Macquarie University. How blessed I am to have been taught by some of the most caring and passionate historians who, like Tanya, have been a constant source of inspiration. I cannot thank them enough for helping me broaden my intellectual horizons – which, from Leigh Boucher, I now know might only be limited to the language we use to shape the past! I thank Leigh for always encouraging me to think critically about the methods we use to think historically, and it was his lively gender theory class that inspired my early – and growing – fascination for masculinities. But I would be remiss if I did not also thank the many other faculty members who have made this journey possible, and who are, in no particular order, Margaret Sampson, Nic Baker, David Christian, Kate Fullagar, Mark Hearn, Matthew Bailey and Robert Reynolds.

I am also very grateful to my boss, colleague, friend and part-time counselor, Melissa Turner, whom I have worked with at Douglass Hanly Moir Pathology for the past ten years. Her support, as well as her ability to accommodate me during the past two years has been, without a doubt, a major reason why I have been able to complete my postgraduate studies. My other colleagues and friends, Tony Azizi, Walter Ronda, Kelly Shaw and Adele Richards have also supported me a great deal, and I thank them for not only putting up with my seemingly endless talks about my research and love for history, but also my absences during the final few months of writing this thesis.

To the entire MRes cohort, thank you for your love and support. We were strangers at the beginning of this journey but a lot of us are now really close friends. I knew postgraduate study was stressful, but I was totally unaware of just how rewarding it was going to be if you happen to meet a bunch of people who are just as passionate

about history (and Jurassic Park) as you are. Amy Way, Eirlys Stubbs, Georgia McWhinney, Greer Gamble and Marion Lorrison – I thank you guys in particular.

I would also like to give honorable mentions to Chelsea Barnett and Rachel Franks. Chelsea sat with me for hours one day listening to all the crazy ideas I had about my thesis, and has always been so ready and willing to help me ever since; and to Rachel for all her help and support during my time at the State Library of New South Wales. I gained some invaluable experience under Rachel's tutelage, and I will always be grateful to her and Tanya for allowing me to participate in the Library's Scholarly Musings Series.

Finally, to my family. Over the past year or so I have come to realise that families are complex system of relationships, and mine is certainly no different. Those relationships may be shaped and divided by time or distance, but you have all supported me in your own special way over the past few years. But thank you Mum(s) and Dad for your support in particular, and for always encouraging me to follow my dreams. Obviously none of this would have been possible without the three of you, but it's more than that: your love is beyond the definition of unconditional and I cannot help but think of how lucky I am to have each one of you by my side and ready to help in any way you can. This thesis, from the first word to the last, is for you.

Introduction

Masculinity and the Early Colonial Period

Anxious to consolidate their political and economic authority in the antipodes, the elite members of society occupied the roles akin to that responsibility.[1] However, given the men elevated to such positions were often underprepared and underqualified for such roles, this undertaking had highly gendered repercussions. Indeed, as most historians and sociologists agree, the elite ranks of society in early colonial New South Wales were far removed from their British equivalents.[2] Landowners joined military officers, lesser clergy and businessmen promoted into positions of influence far beyond what they could have exercised at home. They fulfilled, as Linda Young notes, 'an aristocracy-equivalent role as the powers of the land, the holders of patronage and the leaders of society.'[3] They may have been the products of genteel upbringings, familiar with the practices of manners and etiquette, internalised the values of evangelical religion and domesticity, but of noble birth they certainly were not. In the absence of a ruling-class sanctioned by tradition, therefore, the elite became the effective ruling-class by grounding their success in commerce, land-holdings and displays of grandeur.[4] Faced with the task with which these circumstances imposed, a particular form of colonial manliness developed in the antipodes. It is this explicit attempt to construct a ruling-class masculine identity, explored through the colonial family and school, with which this thesis is primarily concerned.

This thesis is focused on the construction of ruling-class masculinity in two institutions that promote gendered values. As inherently didactic, the family and school reveal the ways in which gender is reshaped and renegotiated in specific historical contexts. It is this ability to constitute gender that has raised a series of

---

[1] As the term 'antipodes' is a generalised position to signify a geographic opposite, this thesis adopts the term insofar as it relates to Australia, or more specifically, New South Wales.

[2] See R. S. Neale. *Class and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century*. (London, Routledge, 1971); Linda Young, *Middle-Class Culture in the Nineteenth Century: America, Australia and Britain*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); R.W. Connell & T.H. Irving. *Class Structure in Australian History: Documents, Narrative and Argument*. (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1980); Michael Roe, *Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia, 1835-1851*. (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

[3] Young, *Middle-Class Culture in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 53.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 52.

questions about the role of these institutions in forming manly character in the antipodes. Accordingly, this thesis aims to bridge what we already know about elite colonial men with new ways of thinking about the historical construction of their masculine identities. As sociologist Michael Gilding has observed, the family is particularly useful for this task because, as a field of relationships, gender in the family is constantly shaped, negotiated and reworked 'to meet the contradictory demands of everyday life.'[5] The demands of elite social position, for example, thrust upon men a new set of gendered expectations and competencies, and one of the ways in which this was expressed and negotiated was through familial relationships. 'Among a population so raw and mobile,' notes Alan Atkinson, 'and in a place so wholly strange,' families of all kinds jostled and struggled to gain a foothold in the antipodean clay.[6] Elite families, then, even from their high perch, were not immune to the chaos. Early colonial schools operated along similar lines. Like the family, an early appreciation of class difference and expectation meant that boys were taught that they had special talents and abilities – the likes of which were necessary to be the natural leaders of society. Accordingly, historians Helen Proctor and Craig Campbell have argued that it is the school's important role in cultivating gender norms and responsiveness to social rank and class that renders them suitable for historical enquiry.[7] Indeed, schools for boys were often explicit in their attempts to form character, and regularly blurred the lines between scholastic pursuits and an outright commitment to the training of manliness.

Set within a period of great social and political development, then, this thesis focuses on the construction of ruling-class masculinity as it paralleled the formation of the ruling-class as a collective body. As Robert Hughes reminds us, British society could not simply be transplanted in the antipodes, it had to be constructed, or reconstructed, in new conditions.[8] As a result, explains Penny Russell, 'it was a world of social as well as geographical mobility, … where the construction of colonial society was at

---

[5] Michael Gilding, *The Making and Breaking of the Australian Family*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1991), p. 8.
[6] Alan Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume One: The Beginning*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 201.
[7] Craig Campbell & Helen Proctor. *A History of Australian Schooling*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2014), pp. xiii-xiv.
[8] Robert Hughes. *The Fatal Shore*. (London: Vintage, 2003), p. 324.

best piecemeal.'[9] But this does not mean society in the antipodes embraced fluidity. On the contrary, social boundaries were erected and defended with anxious regularity. Above the confusion and uncertainty, the ruling-class reigned supreme by consolidating their authority within a range of social and political institutions. However, the 'class' in ruling-class needs to be carefully defined. It was their *claim* to authority that set them apart from those below which, according to sociologists Raewyn Connell and T. H. Irving, evolved from the beginnings of a set of social relations. Connell and Irving have traced the turbulent development of class structure in Australia, and warn that we need to think of this period not as a 'full-blown' class society, but rather as 'a structure of a set of relations as a whole'.[10] This is because, as a purely convict colony, the settlement was experimental. Nevertheless, by the time Whitehall considered it was a failure, their judgement was irrelevant: colonial capitalism emerged and an expanding white settler society materialised. Backed by a common economic base, a shared experience with a growing convict workforce, a firm consciousness of status and political power through the magistracy, a loosely defined ruling-class was formed.

Importantly, the mobilisation of the ruling-class as a political and economic force had highly gendered implications. For ruling-class men in particular this was considerably pronounced. From the onset, the power structures of mercantile and pastoral capitalism in the colony forced respectable landowners to be appointed as local magistrates. Only gentlemen, of course, could be made magistrates, and in much of the colony the only gentleman available were pastoralists. To a lesser extent, they were joined by other prominent figures such as military officers, clergy and other state officials. But it was mostly those wealthy landowners who confessed a desire, or were even granted permission, to enter the realm of politics.[11] As a result, a distinct masculine ideal emerged. Culturally exalted through the guise of the British gentleman, this ideal developed out of a particular need to conquer that which the

[9] Penny Russell, *Savage or Civilised?: Manners in Colonial Australia*. (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010), p. 87, 114.

[10] Connell & Irving. *Class Structure in Australian History*, p. 51.

[11] *Ibid*., p. 34. According to James Macarthur, there were over 100 magistrates in New South Wales in 1834. By 1840, and the height of the pastoral boom, that number almost doubled. See James Macarthur. *New South Wales: Its Present State and Future Prospects*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 132. Also see Alan Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume Two: Democracy*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 44.

political and economic worlds had wrought on elite colonial men. It was a man's ability to successfully navigate the colony's capitalist, free market society, then, that gave him the right to political ascendency. Consequently, a particular discourse emerged valorising the attributes that underlined this dominant ideal. However, re-enacting this masculine identity not only secured individual and collective ruling-class success and authority, but also ensured the colony was safely and honestly administered.

To date, the historical studies into the realities of these men's lives – as they navigated the social and cultural landscape of the antipodes – have uncovered currents of adversity and discontent. For example, Penny Russell writes that 'colonial gentlemen seemed … too willing to sacrifice all that made them gentle, and much that made them men, in pursuit of gain.'[12] Likewise, Kirsten McKenzie notes that in the act of 're-inventing themselves as British aristocrats', the story of colonial gentlemen in the antipodes is really 'a story of social climbing as much as it is falling,' and that these men often risked it all in order to 'cast themselves in a new image.'[13] The fluidity of colonial society and the havoc and uncertainty it wreaked upon its male population is a theme that dominates so much of the literature concerning the early colonial period. Robert Hughes even goes so far to suggest that the gentlemanly figure was all but absent, stating, 'frontiers have a way of killing, maiming or simply dismissing gentlemen.'[14] What is clear, and what this thesis advocates throughout, is that the antipodes revealed the vulnerability of the British gentlemanly figure. In securing ruling-class masculinity, then, elite men renegotiated and reconfigured this manly ideal in a colonial context. Through language and discourse, the image of the gentleman was therefore not enacted by elite men, but rather *re-enacted* to cater for the particular demands which ruling-class responsibility required.

One of the ways we can determine how this renegotiation of the gentlemanly stereotype occurred is by exploring the family and school, as well as by asking questions of the functionality of these institutions in the antipodes. As Stuart Macintyre has observed, it was the governor and other state and church officials who

---

[12] Russell, *Savage or Civilised?*, p. 91.
[13] Kirsten McKenzie. *A Swindler's Progress: Nobles and Convicts in the Age of Liberty*. (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010), p. 9.
[14] Hughes. *The Fatal Shore*, p. 324.

'tried persistently to civilise these colonies and plant the institutions that would redeem their inhabitants.'[15] The family and school were two such institutions. In a vast, distant and unpredictable environment where drought, fire and disease might ruin even the most resolute men, the colony was not for the 'faint-hearted.'[16] A certain mental fortitude and toughness was required to survive in the antipodes, and the family and school acted as a kind of retreat or site through which to reinvent and embody the particular ways in which this survival might be achieved beyond their walls. For example, Antoinette Burton argues that the 'home' is 'a space where contests over colonial domination can be discerned and historicized.'[17] As gendered institutions, the family and school were at the forefront of how men and boys perceived themselves as manly and thus the location within which the renegotiation of the gentlemanly stereotype took place. But if the catalyst for this renegotiation was stimulated by outside pressures and influences, what gendered forces and processes were at play from within the family and school in response? Accordingly, this thesis has asked questions of the ruling-class gentleman as both individual and family patriarch, as well as how this manly ideal was imposed on ruling-class youth as both sons and channels of intergenerational responsibility. This thesis has also asked questions of the context in which elite colonial schools were conceived and established, including how they operated through curricula, discipline and codes of manliness.

That the stereotype of the gentleman could be reshaped in a colonial context is not surprising. As an historically realised configuration, the gentleman as a masculine identity in Britain evolved regularly as it interacted with a variety of social and cultural forces. A long list of historians has tracked how this ideal altered over time from the early modern period to the early twentieth-century.[18] Indeed, one of the most

---

[15] Stuart Macintyre. *A Concise History of Australia*. (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 81.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 59.

[17] Antoinette Burton. *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home and History in Late Colonial India*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 5-6.

[18] For by far the best examples see Alexandra Shephard. "From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentleman? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 281-295; Karen Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 296-311; Michèle Cohen, ""Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 312-329; Philip Carter, "Polite 'Persons': Character, Biography and the Gentleman," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (2002):

important and powerful messages to emerge from these investigations is that the historical study of the British gentleman appears to be synonymous with a lesson in change and continuity. So while the patriarchal dividend may be ruthlessly upheld despite numerous challenges to the gender order, the attributes culturally exalted as the most desirable or manly change over time. When John Tosh asked the question 'what should historians do with masculinity?' his answer was to move from masculinity as a 'set of cultural attributes to consider masculinity as a social status, demonstrated in specific social contexts.'[19] Almost in the same breath, however, Tosh argues that gender status cannot be reduced to class status, even if the two are running in parallel. Instead, it becomes important to 'place gender at the centre of class formation itself, [for] it has its own pecking order which is ultimately to do with upholding patriarchal power rather than a particular class order.'[20] In order to grasp what this statement means for the antipodes we must examine the renegotiation of the gentlemanly stereotype as it paralleled the formation of the ruling-class, which we are able to see play out through the family and school.

The definition of the early-colonial period as defined by this thesis, then, is as much about its differences in gender and masculinity as it is about colonial capitalism, politics and class formation. This is because, during the latter stages of the nineteenth-century as Australia began to coalesce into a nation from a set of colonies, a distinctively athletic and physical form of manhood emerged. Martin Crotty's research on Australian middle-class masculinity reveals how 'manliness became less to do religious morality and more to do with patriotism, military usefulness, and a man's worthiness as a member of the nation and empire.'[21] The athletic, militaristic paradigm that replaced the ruling-class gentleman with which this thesis aims to uncover was certainly the result of the nation's growing anxieties regarding its safety on the international stage. This development, combined with new ways of thinking about male sexuality, reproduction, and challenges to the gender order by women, resulted in the slow decline of the ruling-class gentleman. By the end of the

---

333-354. John Tosh, "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800-1914," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 330-342.

[19] John Tosh. "What Should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain," *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994): 184.

[20] *Ibid*., p. 190.

[21] Martin Crotty. *Making the Australian Male: Middle-Class Masculinity, 1870-1920*. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001), p. 11.

nineteenth-century, with the spread of industrial economies and the growth of bureaucratic states, in addition to the 'power relations of empire' and the 'gendered accumulation process in industrial capitalism', the political and economic power of the ruling-class had diminished.[22]

Masculinity as a Field of Enquiry: A Literature Review

As Clive Moore wrote in 1998, interest in the historical construction of Australian masculinities emerged out of a desire to consider 'the role gendered discourse plays in the lives of Australian men.'[23] This follows Marilyn Lake's call in 1986 for historians to '[treat] men, historically, as men, socialised into "masculinity"', and argued that 'it is time for historians interested in gender to move beyond "women's history"'.[24] As Angela Woollacott has also pointed out, the history of the British Empire has been rejuvenated by the collective insights of postcolonial and feminist perspectives.[25] The language provided by these intellectual regimes have allowed both the historian and sociologist to trace social constructions of gender through the guise of settler colonialism. 'Masculinities are not only shaped by the process of imperial expansion,' explains Raewyn Connell, 'they are active in that process and help shape it.'[26]

Accordingly, insight into the divisions between normative and transgressive sexualities provided scholars with an answer to the monolithic, unproblematic category of Australian masculinity, revealing a multitude of masculinities on the continent that needed to be accounted for. The historiographical charge to illuminate this slew of Australian males reached its crescendo in the late 1990s as Richard Nile, Clive Moore and Kay Saunders set out to 'place Australian masculinities in a larger historical perspective' by examining a set of familiar categories like the convict, the

---

[22] R. W. Connell. *Masculinities*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), p. 191. Also see Macintyre, Stuart. *A Colonial Liberalism: The Lost World of Three Victorian Visionaries*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1991.
[23] Clive Moore, "Guest Editorial: Australian Masculinities," *Journal of Australian Studies* 22 (1998): 1.
[24] Marilyn Lake, "The politics of respectability: Identifying the masculinist context," *Australian Historical Studies* 22 (1986): 116; John Tosh makes a similar proclamation in Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity," p. 179; As does Natalie Zemon Davis in what was probably the first of its kind: Natalie Zemon Davis, "'Women's History' in Transition: The European Case," *Feminist Studies* 3 (1976): 90.
[25] Angela Woollacott, *Gender and Empire*. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), see Introduction.
[26] Connell. *Masculinities*, p. 185.

larrikin, the sensitive new age guy, the gay man and a range of others.[27] Subsequently, a growing body of literature on Australian masculinities continued to problematise, deconstruct and destabilise pre-existing ideas around Australian men.[28]

Nevertheless, the masculine identities of early colonial ruling-class men in New South Wales have yet to be acknowledged by scholars. This is despite a mass of recent scholarship that has impressively, and consistently, uncovered the realities of these men's lives. What have been particularly powerful are the narratives that detail the ways in which these men navigated the colony's fluid and ambiguous class system, and social historians Penny Russell and Kirsten McKenzie provide two glaring examples.[29] But we need to probe further in order to reveal the power relations inherent in the positioning of these men in an explicitly gendered society. It is the omission of gender, then, that leaves boarder questions about ruling-class men unanswered.[30]

---

[27] "Australian Masculinities: Men and their Histories", offers a collection of articles in a special issue in 1998 of the *Journal of Australian Studies* edited by Nile, Moore and Saunders. See Vol. 56, pp. 1-179. It was not until the early twenty-first century did historians tend to concentrate on ruling-class men. Previously, historical targets were typically the mythology of the bushman, the digger and the working-class man. See Mark Peel, "A New Kind of Manhood: Remembering the 1950s," *Australian Historical Studies* 27 (1997): 149-153; Stephen Garton, "Return Home: War, Masculinity and Repatriation," in *Gender and War: Australians at War in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Joy Damousi and Marilyn Lake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Stephen, Nicholas. *Convict Workers: Reinterpreting Australia's Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Russel Ward. *The Australian Legend*. (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1958). For critiques on the latter see Lake, "The politics of respectability," pp. 116-131 and Marilyn Lake, "Frontier Feminism and the Marauding White Man," *Journal of Australian Studies*, 29 (1996): 12-20. Also see Lisa Featherstone, "Sex and The Australian Legend: Masculinity and the White Man's Body," *Journal of Australian Colonial History*, 10 (2008): 73-90 and Hilary Carey, "Bushman and Bush Parsons: The Shaping of a Rural Myth," *Journal of Australian Colonial History*, 11 (2013): 1-26.

[28] Stephen Tomsen and Mike Donaldson sought to advance the field of gender by reforming Australian masculinities in two ways: first, by contributing to recent public debates about men, boys and masculinities; and second, by presenting cutting-edge social research to assist in the development of agendas of change in arenas from health policy to family violence to primary education. Raewyn Connell echoed these objectives in her controversial *The Men and the Boys* by exploring problems in education, health, and international peacemaking. While both were groundbreaking in terms of their *intention*, that is, to influence policy and policymaking, they also exemplify the glaring disciplinary differences between sociologists and historians. See: Mike Donaldson & Stephen Tomsen. *Male Trouble: Looking at Australian Masculinities*. (Sydney: Pluto Press Australia, 2003); R. W. Connell, *The Men and the Boys*. (Sydney: Wiley Publishing, 2000).

[29] Russell. 2010, *op. cit.*; McKenzie. 2010, *op. cit.*

[30] Where gender has been used to historicise elite colonial men, the focus is either confined to the Queensland frontier, like the works of Robert Hogg and Clive Moore, or has concentrated on the latter half of Australia's colonial period, such as Martin Crotty's research on the development of Australian middle-class masculinity. See Robert Hogg, *Men and manliness on the frontier: Queensland and British Columbia in the mid-nineteenth century*. (Houndmills, Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Robert Hogg, "'The Most Manly Class that Exists': British Gentlemen on the Queensland Frontier," *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 13 (2011): 65-84; Clive Moore,

Overall, the investigations into the historical formation of masculinity reveals that the role played by gender and masculinity in shaping Australia's past is a crucial one. As recently as 2015, Chelsea Barnett has shown how the cultural and political climate of post-war Australia in the fifties contributed to a wider renegotiation of Australian masculinities.[31] This thesis continues that trend by utilising masculinity as a field of enquiry to uncover a historically specific category of Australian man. An underlying objective of this thesis, then, is to not only ensure ruling-class men are examined as gendered beings, but also as active agents in the wider historical narrative that is the preservation of patriarchy – from within both their own colonial context, and the broader and much more complex framework of Australia's history as a 'nation'.

One of the challenges faced by historians of gender and masculinity is to think critically about the best formulae we can use to historicize men as gendered beings. Initially, the study of masculinities arose as a response to feminism and the study of femininities. Not a reaction against them, but a realisation that if in the historical record scholars began constructing a specific category for women, then what was needed was a theory of men, who were not un-gendered beings, but people also carrying their own gender – that of masculinity. Interest in the field over the past thirty years has found its intellectual roots in feminist, gay liberationist and post-colonial theory, all fuelled by a common concern to expose the power inequities that promote a unified, unproblematic category of historical 'man'. Despite this diversity in studies, however, almost all scholarly writings about the historical formulation of masculinity derive from the work of the sociologist Raewyn Connell. Connell's concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' has provided the intellectual anchor for a wide range of historical studies, showing how different categories of men come into existence at different times and places.[32] For Connell, the message is clear: masculinities are, in a word, historical.

"Colonial Manhood and Masculinities," *Journal of Australian Studies* 56 (1998): 35-50; Crotty. 2001, *op. cit.*

[31] Chelsea Barnett, "Masculinity in Australian Film, 1949-1962" (PhD Thesis, Macquarie University, 2015).

[32] Connell's popular concept was first theorised in a brief section in her 1987 work *Gender and Power*. However, it is explored in greater depth in the 1995 volume *Masculinities*. See R. W. Connell. *Gender and Power*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987), pp. 183-186; Connell. *Masculinities*, pp. 76-81.

While this thesis does engage with Connell's work, it certainly follows the trajectory of the field in what appears to be a broader move by historians to challenge hegemonic masculinity.[33] 'Hegemonic masculinity' was a category constructed in direct opposition to the static and structural 'sex role theory', emphasising instead the historical nature of gender relations, *and* the on-going struggle between powerful and subordinate groups in society.[34] Most recently, Connell defines hegemonic masculinity 'as the pattern of practice (i.e. things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allowed men's dominance over women to continue.[35] Hegemonic masculinity attempts, moreover, to distinguish between hegemonic, subordinate, and complicit masculinities.[36] But given the rigid nature of hegemonic masculinity, historians are becoming increasingly uneasy of its ability to ask questions of discourse and language. Recent post-structuralist debates have raised a series of critical questions of Connell's singular model of hegemonic masculinity, most of which point to its failure to recognise the discursive nature with which masculinities are formed in the first place.[37]

Subsequently, this thesis has adopted the theoretical template applied by historians Henry French and Mark Rothery in their study of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century British elite. They point out that hegemonic masculinity fails to reconcile two distinct historical processes. Connell's model, they argue, 'conflates the underlying hegemonic patriarchal distribution of power and authority in society, with the less rigid and constraining societal stereotypes about appropriate male behaviour.'[38] More is needed, to use an antipodean example, if we are to explain the stereotypes, or 'symbols of collective identification', that allow for the social categorisation of ruling-class men. The construction of antipodean ruling-class masculinity must therefore be understood in what French and Rothery have classified as three causal layers: the first or 'deep', largely unchanging layer sustains the principles and

---

[33] See, for example, Henry French & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 1-38; Barnett, "Masculinity in Australian Film, 1949-1962," pp. 7-9, 259.

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 21-27.

[35] R. W. Connell & J. W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender & Society* 19 (2005): 832.

[36] For an explanation of subordinate and complicit masculinities, see Connell, *Masculinities*, pp. 78-80.

[37] For a series of arguments, and Connell's rebuttal, see Connell & Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity", pp. 836-837. Also see D. Z. Demetriou, "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: a critique," *Theory & Society* 30 (2001): 337-361.

[38] French & Rothery. *Man's Estate*, p. 11.

assumptions behind the values of patriarchy. It is these values that interact with a series of masculine stereotypes – the second layer – therefore providing the impetus for social categorisation. The third layer, then, is the particular ways in which these manly stereotypes are re-enacted in everyday life through the use of language and discourse.[39] In this sense, the construction of ruling-class masculinity is really a story of the renegotiation of the British gentlemanly stereotype in a colonial context. Meaning, this masculine ideal was refashioned and then re-enacted in the antipodes to cater for the particular needs of those men who claimed political and economic authority. Challenging hegemonic masculinity in this way, then, allows us to recognise the discursive nature with which gendered identities are ultimately shaped, renegotiated and constructed.

Chapter Outline

The first chapter of this thesis will investigate how the Macarthur family functioned to inculcate the gender norms necessary to construct ruling-class masculinity. It will begin with an analysis of their patriarch, John Macarthur, showing how his attempts to secure his family's position in the colony exposed the vulnerability of the gentlemanly stereotype. Additionally, it will show how Macarthur achieved ruling-class masculinity through a renegotiation of this stereotype, and then disseminated the gendered preconditions of this masculine ideal upon his sons who later became successful ruling-class men themselves. Finally, this chapter will show that landownership and pastoral success were essential elements of this masculine ideal, and how, collectively, this identity consolidated ruling-class social, political and economic authority in the colony. Throughout the chapter, however, I will advocate

---

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-15. French and Rothery posit their poststructuralist approach within Fernand Braudel's famous analogy. This analogy equates three layers of causal significance, and historical timeframes, with three wavelengths. Deep, and slowly oscillating, is the first layer, which we would liken to any popular description of the dominance of patriarchal gender relations. It is internalised by individuals and permeates social, political and economic institutions in order to appear, quite simply, 'how the world worked'. Braudel's second layer, *conjecture*, is where these principles interacted with societal norms, customs, identity and fashion so as to create highly idolised examples, or stereotypes. Through language and discourse, these stereotypes are formed *discursively*, providing shorthand diagnostics that allow for social categorisation to occur in the first place. The third layer is *événements*, or the day-to-day responses to immediate social interactions, familial relationships, and a range of personal responsibilities or duties. See Fernand Braudel. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 892, 1239-44.

for the importance of family as not only acting as a site through which ruling-class masculinity was heavily invested, but also as a beacon and source of respectability in the colony.

The second chapter of this thesis will investigate the role played by the King's School in Parramatta in constructing ruling-class masculinity, as well as its role in further consolidating ruling-class authority. It will show how, as an institution heavily invested in shaping men and manliness, it contributed to the construction of ruling-class masculinity through the popular schooling system 'godliness and good learning'. It is via this process, mostly encouraged by the headmaster, through which the School also renegotiated the stereotype of the gentleman. In order to produce those men destined for political roles in the colony, the School valorised a particular set of manly attributes. Consequently, this chapter will discuss the history of the founding of the School, demonstrating the collective church, state, and ruling-class efforts to establish a viable elite school. It will do so by analysing the School's curriculum and affinity for godliness and good learning. Its dedication to intellectual and religious achievement were essential elements of ruling-class masculinity both in terms of the ways in which it prepared boys for political duty, but also how it contributed to the colony's passion for respectability and moral improvement.

Despite the fact that the primary source material used in both chapters is well traversed by historians, this thesis has tried its upmost to raise new questions and use the available data in fresh and original ways. For the chapter on the Macarthur family I have primarily drawn upon the family's extensive correspondence, and linking with, where possible, the many secondary sources written about its members. It is accepted, however, that the Macarthurs are not a representative sample. Nevertheless, as a case study, they are more than merely illustrative, revealing the ways in which antipodean ruling-class men experienced the family at the time. The chapter on the King's School uses records from both the New South Wales and Australian volumes of historical records, as well as drawing upon several anecdotes from *The King's School Magazine*. Additionally, the School's two social histories have been consulted to contextualise my primary source material. Overall, my method for both chapters has been to synthesise the primary source material, to provide my own analysis of key

themes and issues, and to enrich those findings with its associated secondary literature.

Finally, a word on terminology. Throughout this thesis, the use of the term 'ruling-class' is an attempt to define a section of colonial society in New South Wales that had a legitimate claim to authority through their wealth, power and prestige. It is an attempt, moreover, to encompass the common language that describes this group throughout the primary source material – terms like 'wealthy', 'leading' and 'upper' classes; as well as those primarily found in secondary sources, such as 'exclusives', 'gentry' and the 'elite'. While this thesis does on occasion adopt the latter terms, it is only to be taken as those belonging to the ruling-class, and are used only strategically in order to engage with the secondary literature. The aim, therefore, is to simplify the discussion by bringing together the terms that often characterise the same group of people.

Chapter One

The Macarthurs and the Importance of Family

> You have absolutely accomplished a labour not much short of a miracle, and for all your family, I return you my sincere thanks, and that from me, you know means a great deal.[1]

The institution of the family as a legitimate subject for historical enquiry has long been acknowledged by historians of gender and masculinity. The tremendous amount of work by British and Australian scholars over the past decade or so is a glaring testament to that.[2] They have not only broadened our understandings of the ways in which gender is embedded in the family, but also how the family can be used as a prism to learn more about the society within which it is situated, as historian Penny Russell explains:

> It is perhaps not surprising that writing history from the perspective of family should bring the intimate world of kin, intimacy and emotion, the powerful play of gender and the impact of reproduction more clearly into view. Family perspective [allows] us to see how actions and decisions apparently made in and for the "public" world could have origins or implications deeply embedded in domestic life.[3]

Indeed, historians of the family have revelled in the political possibilities simmering beneath so many family stories, especially those of the indigenous or the poor.[4] But the exploration of historical understanding via a single, stand-alone family has been far less charted in recent scholarship. Russell's research on the Thompson family,[5] however, has

---

[1] John Macarthur to John Macarthur Jr., 24 January 1824, Macarthur Papers, 1815-1832, A2899.

[2] For several key texts see Leonore Davidoff & Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (London: Routledge, 1992); John Tosh. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. (London: Yale University Press, 1999); Henry French & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Tanya Evans. *Fractured Families: Life on the Margins in Colonial New South Wales*. (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015); Allon J. Uhlmann. *Family, Gender and Kinship in Australia: The Social and Cultural Logic of Practice and Subjectivity*. (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 111-168.

[3] Penny Russell, "Travelling Steerage: Class, Commerce, Religion and Family in Colonial Sydney," *Journal of Australian Studies*, 38 (2014): 390-393.

[4] Evans. *Fractured Families*, pp. 7-20.

[5] The Thompson family, headed by Joseph and Mary Thompson, arrived in Sydney Cove in April 1834. It was their 'middle-of-the-road respectability' that encouraged Russell to write a social history of Sydney in the middle decades of the nineteenth century from the point of view of a single family – the Thompsons – in order to understand the changing nature of the city as they would have experienced it, as a site of 'commercial opportunity, domestic experience, religious faith, colonial enterprise and interlocking social networks.' See Russell, "Travelling Steerage," pp. 383-395.

shown convincingly the methodological power of a single family in constructing historical understanding: 'narrowing the focus to a single family', she argues, 'makes it far more practicable to follow threads of connection in and out of the so-called "public" and "private" realms, while still recognising the ideological boundaries of privacy that were precariously and incompletely erected across these intermeshed worlds.'[6]

This chapter follows Russell's lead by examining a single colonial family as a lone, yet historically rich source within which to historicise a particular aspect of colonial New South Wales. Accordingly, this chapter will begin with an analysis of John Macarthur's attempt to secure his own, and by extension his family's social and economic position in the colony. It will show how this exposed the vulnerability of the gentlemanly stereotype, thus leading to its renegotiation and the internalisation of particular gendered attributes. It will then examine Macarthur's relationship with his sons in what was an attempt to ensure their own success as ruling-class men. Finally, but also throughout the chapter, I will advocate for the importance of family as not only acting as a site through which ruling-class masculinity was heavily invested, but also as a beacon and source of respectability in the colony.

The powerful interplay of home, kinship and domesticity has played a significant role in the establishment of a colonised, British society in colonial New South Wales,[7] but how these elements coalesced in the family to help construct masculinity is less certain. This is because manly character is often determined in, and through, the experiences of men via discourses of gender. Accordingly, the Macarthur family correspondence must be read carefully in order to discern how these experiences were so regularly shaped in the family. As Robert Hogg has shown, colonial men often wrote of their 'displayed self', or the 'self they wanted others to know', in the letters, journals and other memoirs they left behind.[8] 'At the same time,' he continues, 'they may be seeking to protect (or suppress)

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 391.
[7] Penny Russell, "'Unhomely Moments': Civilising Domestic Worlds in Colonial Australia," *The History of the Family*, 14 (2009): 327-339.
[8] Robert Hogg, "'The Most Manly Class that Exists': British Gentlemen on the Queensland Frontier," *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 13 (2011): 73.

elements of their masculinity.'[9] The point is that these texts are not isolated events or experiences, but rather conscious efforts to articulate a sense of self-awareness and perception. It is of the upmost importance, therefore, to reveal what these texts fail to capture, and a greater sense of the meanings they obscure and hide.

It must be added that the Macarthur family has been chosen because of their significant impact on the development of New South Wales during its earliest years.[10] They have long been accepted as the preeminent ruling-class family, with Robert Hughes even going so far as to suggest that they represent 'the founders and prototypes of the colonial gentry' in the antipodes.[11] While this thesis has no intention of entering into this debate, it certainly accepts the Macarthurs' place within the annals of Australian history – as both family and institution – who, for the purposes of this chapter, have been a welcome platform through which to examine ruling-class men, manliness and masculinity. Moreover, because stories about the Macarthurs' are so common and endlessly repeated, it is important that we ask new questions of the available data.

A Vulnerable Patriarch: John Macarthur

The colony brought a combination of risk and uncertainty for any free emigrant who travelled to the frontier, let alone for those of the higher echelons who could simply invest in it later. John Macarthur, born September 1767 near Plymouth, England, was not one of them.[12] The second son of a tailor and merchant, Macarthur was barely fifteen

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

[10] See, for example, Alan Atkinson, "The position of John Macarthur and his family in New South Wales before 1842" (Masters Thesis, Sydney University, 1971); Alan Atkinson. "The political life of James Macarthur." (PhD Thesis, Australian National University, 1976). Alan Atkinson. *Camden: Farm and Village Life in Early New South Wales*. (North Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2008); Robert Hughes. *The Fatal Shore*. (London: Vintage, 2003), pp. 326-328; M. H. Ellis. *John Macarthur*. (Sydney: Angus & Robertson Publishers, 1978); Margaret Steven, 'Macarthur, John (1767–1834)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-john-2390/text3153. First published in hardcopy in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 2, (MUP), 1967.

[11] Hughes. *The Fatal Shore*, p. 326.

[12] Throughout this thesis John Macarthur will simply be referred to as 'Macarthur', while the younger members of the family will be assigned their given names.

when he followed in his elder brother's footsteps to serve in His Majesty's armed forces.[13] Fresh-faced and eager, he earned his first commission in 'Fish's Corps', a regiment formed for the purpose of fighting abroad in the American War of Independence, but it was never called upon. The War ended, leaving him with half pay and searching for future prospects. He eventually settled to 'live at a farmhouse' near Holsworthy, in Devon, where he ultimately met and married, in the years in which they both 'came of age', a young and humble lady of Scottish decent, Elizabeth Veale.[14] It was not until April 1788 that Macarthur returned to full pay, accepting an ensign in the 68th Regiment at a time when British interests had stretched to their furthest point. War flared up in India and a newer, penal colony was planned for the southern most tip of the Pacific quarter. In June 1789, thrilled with his transfer to the New South Wales Corps and associated promotion to the rank of lieutenant, his circumstances rose sharply. Twelve months later and accompanied by Elizabeth, their first-born son and the rest of the Second Fleet, he landed in Port Jackson.[15]

In keeping with the standards of the time, Macarthur arrived in New South Wales with a familiar form of late eighteenth-century manhood. Having missed the opportunity for martial glory, it was not uncommon for military men to re-route that energy and assist in their country's appetite for land exploration. As Stuart Macintyre points out, 'the conquest of unknown territory was proof of manhood in imperial service.'[16] Additionally, Macarthur had procured a wife, entered the cult of fatherhood and was accepted amongst his contemporaries. Indeed, like many men from the middling sort to have made the colony their new home, Macarthur sniffed opportunity and relished the possibility of social mobility. Talk of such movement had very little currency in England, was vilified even, but according to Elizabeth their move to the antipodes was quite the worthwhile adventure:

> I was considered indolent and inactive; Mr. Macarthur too proud and haughty
> for our humble fortune or expectations, and yet you see how bountifully
> Providence has dealt with us. At this time I can truly say no two people on

---

[13] Steven, 'Macarthur,'; Ellis. *John Macarthur*, pp. 5-6.
[14] *Ibid*., pp. 6-7.
[15] Steven, 'Macarthur,'
[16] Stuart Macintyre. *A Concise History of Australia* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 57.

earth can be happier than we are. In Mr. Macarthur's society I experience the tenderest affections of a husband, who is instructive and cheerful as a companion. He is an indulgent Father, beloved as a Master, and universally respected for the integrity of his character. Judge then, my friend, if I ought not to consider myself a happy woman.[17]

On the surface, Macarthur's duty as both man and husband placed his family in a strong position to succeed. At a deeper level, however, their circumstances merely reflected the gendered proprieties of 'the family' that arrived with them. England was a 'common reference point', explains Penny Russell, 'variously imagined as the source and measure of social and moral standards in the colony'.[18] The rise of evangelical religion had recently taken hold in Britain, with family and faith 'cast in an everlasting mutually supportive role.'[19] Mutual emotional support and assistance, concern for the nuclear family and the household – this is the happiness with which Elizabeth refers. Fully ordained, of course, by 'Providence' and God himself. While Macarthur's role as 'Master' of the family guaranteed patriarchal organisation, religious belief strongly reinforced it.

There is also no reason to believe the other 'ladies in the Regiment', whom Elizabeth alludes to in a letter to her mother in 1791, did not share her experiences within their own respective families.[20] This point of female stability, however, can hardly be surprising. Senior officials and officers worked quickly to erect a masculine structure of authority in the colony, for which women – as subjects of the government – were key ingredients. Arthur Philip, in his vision for a stable, settled colony, encouraged marriage almost immediately.[21] In this sense women were central to the gendered divisions of the colony; it brought a sense of familiarity and respectability, with family playing a crucial role in the negotiation and stability of that process.[22] 'The treatment of women by men in

---

[17] Elizabeth Macarthur to Miss Kingdon, 1 September 1795, Macarthur Papers, 1789-1840, A2906.

[18] Penny Russell, *Savage or Civilised?: Manners in Colonial Australia*. (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010), p. 116.

[19] John Tosh. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. (London: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 38.

[20] Elizabeth Macarthur to Mrs Veale, 18 March 1791, A2906.

[21] Alan Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume One: The Beginning*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. xiv, 129-131.

[22] Macintyre. *A Concise History of Australia*, p. 40. Also see Marion Aveling. "Imagining New South Wales as a Gendered Society, 1783-1821," *Australian Historical Studies* 25 (1992): 1-12.

power,' writes Alan Atkinson, 'was considered a hallmark of good government.'[23] As wives, then, and both the guardians and objects of genteel practice, women were essential to the way masculinity was played out in the colony.

Contingent to this process was the elite male's ability to re-enact the British gentlemanly stereotype. Amid the Reformation of Manners campaign in the mid seventeenth-century, Britain witnessed the emergence and proliferation of what Karen Harvey posits as the typical British gentleman.[24] More affectionately known as the 'polite' gentleman, this manly ideal was culturally exalted through language and discourse – encompassing, simultaneously, the virtues of Christianity, the characteristics of manly vigour, self-control, honesty, integrity, temperance and self-restraint, and the attitudes associated with sensibility and politeness – especially towards women, no matter their class.[25] While this popular form maintained social and cultural dominance, and was for the most part successfully re-enacted in the antipodes, the harsh and largely male populated colony rendered it susceptible to frequent episodes of violent homo-social disputes. With respectability having infiltrated colonial homes via this gentlemanly figure, eighteenth-century codes of honour maintained a strong influence outside it. It led to a renewal, of sorts, in proving one's manhood through male-only encounters. Simmering beneath the notions of respectability in the colony, then, were very strict codes of honour between men, and we are able to see these codes of honour play out through the prism of Macarthur's duel with his commanding officer, lieutenant-colonel William Paterson, in 1801.[26]

Paterson was so offended by Macarthur's attempt to alienate him from the governor that he challenged Macarthur 'to give him the satisfaction he, as an injured man, has a right to

---

[23] Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia*, p. xvi, 128.
[24] See Robert B. Shoemaker, "Reforming Male Manners: Public Insult and the Decline of Violence in London, 1660-1740", in Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen eds., *English Masculinities, 1660-1800* (Harlow: Longman, 1999), pp. 133-150; Karen Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 301-304.
[25] *Ibid*., p. 304.
[26] Ellis. *John Macarthur*, pp. 196-210.

require.'[27] According to Paterson's right-hand man, captain McKellar, Macarthur's actions toward Paterson were 'a violation of what has ever been held sacred amongst men of honour, proceeded from a design to injure his reputation in the opinion of the world, but particularly in that of the Governor, as well as to wound his feelings.'[28] Paterson earned himself a non-fatal wound from the ensuing duel and Macarthur was sent back to England, court martialed under arrest. According to Macarthur, however, he was made a scape-goat 'without having committed any offence', and that it was in fact Paterson who 'intended to prejudice the world against my conduct, and deeply to wound and injure my reputation as an officer and a gentleman.'[29] Conflicting reports litter the stories and statements of all those involved, including eyewitnesses, meaning favouritism and loyalty were clearly something to be admired in the colony. However, that both men were guilty is irrelevant. Rather, emphasis is placed on the ways in which these men justified their actions to governor King, who both sited a 'defence of honour'.[30] Honour and reputation appeared to be paramount for the maintenance of not only their connections and commissions, but also their perceptions as honourable, elite men. All of which were of great importance in a colony as isolated as New South Wales.

Paradoxically, though, duelling placed colonial men in a unique position: while those who fought risked almost certain legal action, those who resisted faced a punishment far worse – social reprimand and a blow to their manhood. Macarthur, always within close proximity of his supporters, accepted Paterson's challenge without question.[31] Indeed, even as a practice traditionally reserved for the British aristocracy, stories of duelling between officers both military and naval filled colonial newspapers with distinct regularity.[32] But the tensions and contradictions attached to these medieval acts placed Macarthur in a precarious position. After all, he was simply a product of his time: 'formed almost too much upon the old Roman model', as James, his third son once

---

[27] 'Captain McKellar's Account' 15 September 1801. *New South Wales Historical Records, Volume IV*, p. 560
[28] *Ibid*., p. 560.
[29] 'Captain Macarthur to Adjutant Minchin' 21 September 1801 in *Ibid*., p. 567.
[30] See *Ibid*., pp. 558-586.
[31] 'Captain McKellar's Account', p. 560.
[32] Russell, *Savage or Civilised?*, pp. 132-138.

20

described him.[33] Classical literature had long admired the 'virtues' of valor, excellence, courage and strength associated with its most famous protagonists, but the language provided by chivalry slowly repurposed these ancient manly attributes in favour of a much more polite and well-mannered approach to homosocial disputes.[34] Subsequently, duelling became less to do with honour and refinement and more to do with barbarism and immoral behaviour. Given the penal nature of the colony, however, combined with a great imbalance of the sexes, the practice of duelling survived the trip to the antipodes as a prerequisite to the dominant male stereotype – even if governor King himself viewed it as an act 'departing from the strict line of military discipline.'[35] Clearly, then, Macarthur conformed accordingly, but this process also included a challenge to the authority of the gentlemanly figure in the colony by diverging from many of its moral and respectable virtues.

As a result, manhood for elite men in the antipodes was intimately entangled with notions of honour and reputation, but these acts of public hardiness also carried with them a potential for great personal loss. Unfortunately for these men, the forces that drove the cultural authority behind duelling was also at odds with the respectability and colonising imperatives of the family and home – in which they were both master and protector. Macarthur's correspondence with Elizabeth suggests a warm, safe and well-grounded household in which he was an affectionate husband and father, thereby maintaining the gendered imperatives of the family through his protection of it. So while his confrontation with Paterson went some way in ensuring his masculine standing outside the home, the resulting punishment and exile deeply endangered his ability to maintain that home. It is here that French and Rothery's template is useful: while patriarchy was guaranteed in the colony via an importance placed on marriage and the family, the enactment of the gentlemanly stereotype as part of an elite class of males caused a series of contradictions in everyday antipodean life.

---

[33] Quoted in Sibella Macarthur Onslow. *Some Early Records of the Macarthurs of Camden*. (Sydney: Rigby Limited, 1973), pp. 471-472.

[34] Michèle Cohen, ""Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 312-329.

[35] 'Governor King to Lieutenant-Colonel Paterson' 21 September 1801. *New South Wales Historical Records, Volume IV*, p. 568.

Consequently, Macarthur begins to articulate how his misadventures affected his manhood, a mental process he appears to have started during the aftermath of the infamous 'Rum Rebellion'.[36] Camden Park produced more than most for the colony by 1808, and the Macarthur family had also grown considerably – another six children joined Edward in the ranks, totalling four boys and three girls. However, by March 1809 Macarthur sailed to England with his two youngest boys, James and William, with the purpose of defending his role in the deposing of governor Bligh. Exasperated, he wrote to Elizabeth in the northern spring of 1811:

> Whenever I feel disposed to indulge melancholy I endeavour to cheer my spirits by reflecting that great as our disappointments and losses are they have been unavoidable, and have arisen more out of the state of things in our strange Colony than from neglect of indiscretion. I say more, for I cannot but admit that part of our difficulties might have been avoided had I been a little less disinterested.[37]

All accountability is overlooked in favour of a belief that it was, in fact, the colony's dissimilarities to Britain that led to the circumstances with which his wrongdoing was bound. It is the strangeness of the colony – its harsh, isolated and highly homo-social character that, despite his early success and connections, Macarthur fails to overcome. It is a theme that continues:

> A man of my known principles must be hated and de-cried in self defence in such a Colony, and if to these feelings be added that of envy at my prosperous circumstances, what can I expect in a Society so constituted. It remains to be considered what prospect we have of deriving such an income from the Colony as will defray the expenses of our Family in this Country, and enable us to prosecute our present plans for the education and establishment of our Boys in the world.[38]

In detailing his concern for the future, Macarthur reveals the vulnerability of his masculinity. His actions in a 'Society so constituted' not only compromised his lofty position in the colony, but also his ability to provide for his growing family – the latter being perhaps the most sacred and essential of all that was manly in a capitalist, enlightened and patriarchal-driven world. Notably, it is this fine line between success and

---

[36] For the most detailed accounts of the infamous Rum Rebellion and Macarthur's long feud with governor Bligh, see Ross Fitzgerald & Mark Hearn. *Bligh, Macarthur and the Rum Rebellion*. (Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1988); Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia*, pp. 280-291; Ellis. *John Macarthur*, pp. 269-339.

[37] John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 21 April 1811, Macarthur Papers, 1808-1832, A2898.

[38] *Ibid*., John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 16 October 1812.

failure as a pastoralist that draws Macarthur to a life of political responsibility, which he expresses to Elizabeth as early as 1810:

> Be patient, and all will be well, for I have found a powerful body of Friends in this Country, who are not only able but willing to give me their support to my endeavours to obtain satisfaction for the past and security for the future, depend upon it, the Colony will soon undergo a radical reform. I think I shall be obliged to procure a seat in Parliament – the expense will be great – but the prospect of the benefit will be greater.[39]

Thus, the survival of the gentlemanly stereotype in the antipodes appears to have been limited by its ability to transcend ruling-class obligations towards landownership, political responsibility and the general harshness and fluidity of colonial society. Macarthur's early experiences in the antipodes, therefore, had highly gendered repercussions.

Ironically, the motivation for Macarthur's misdemeanours had always been stimulated with an eye for improving his family's lot. Hostilities with King were the result of the governor's unwillingness to parlay with Macarthur over the proposed sale of Elizabeth Farm, leading to a smear campaign and culminating in the duel with Paterson.[40] Likewise, the Rum Rebellion – at least for Macarthur – grew out of a dispute over convict labour. Macarthur depended on Bligh for more hands, but with the new governor already harbouring ill-feelings toward Macarthur for his role in the trafficking of rum, he flatly refused.[41] In the end, Macarthur's pastoral interests far outweighed his political prowess, sending him back to England not once but twice while Elizabeth played caretaker – a role she fulfilled with astute brilliance.[42] Additionally, it is through these matters that we begin to uncover the extent of Macarthur's concern for the preparation of his sons in adult life. As the works of Tosh, French and Rothery have shown, men of all classes in Britain placed an extreme importance on establishing their sons within society,

---

[39] *Ibid.*, John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 11 November 1810.
[40] Steven, 'Macarthur,'
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] So much has been written about Elizabeth Macarthur's experiences in New South Wales. See: Lennard Bickel. *Australia's First Lady: The Story of Elizabeth Macarthur*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1991); Hazel King. *Elizabeth Macarthur and Her World*. (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1980); Jill Conway, 'Macarthur, Elizabeth (1766–1850)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-elizabeth-2387/text3147. First published in hardcopy in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 2, (MUP), 1967.

often with the father's own manhood at stake.[43]

It is also during Macarthur's exile that he makes several attempts to warn, and give advice to, several men with plans to emigrate to the colony. It is via this correspondence that a particular discourse begins to emerge regarding the types of manly attributes necessary for economic survival in the antipodes. As Alan Atkinson has observed, Macarthur's mind 'was never still', constantly obsessing over 'the prosperity of the colony and of himself.'[44] So while Macarthur never formally acknowledged his indiscretions, he most certainly re-engages with them through offers of advice and guidance. In detailing the particulars of a gentleman's imminent arrival, he stresses the importance of these manly attributes to Elizabeth:

> You will have already learnt from former letters that Mr. …[45] is now on the point of setting off and will deliver you this Letter. From him I have learnt that his proposals to emigrate were favourably received and that a positive management has taken place between them … [If] good nature, and susceptibility of heart and temper are the only requisite qualifications in a Husband, I know not where I should find one to surpass this young man in these qualities, but unluckily constituted as is the frame of human Society many other qualifications are indispensible to enable a man to discharge the duties of a Husband and a Father. Amongst these the most useful are prudence, economy, and if a man be born without an inheritance, an enterprising spirit.[46]

Macarthur's call for prudence, economy and an enterprising spirit is an explicitly gendered one. While he acknowledges the importance of 'heart and temper', he is as equally convinced of the 'many other qualifications' married elite men must internalise in order to consolidate their manliness in the colony. In this way, Macarthur appears to accept the fact that current models of British manhood are unfit for the harshness and unpredictability of the colony. According to him, survival as a successful ruling-class man called for the added internalisation of particular attributes, including the independence, endurance, diligence and self-restraint associated with his call for prudence, economy and an enterprising spirit.

---

[43] Tosh. *A Man's* Place, p. 98, 115; French & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate*, pp. 220-222.
[44] Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia*, p. 282.
[45] There were several sections of this manuscript that were illegible, including this gentleman's name.
[46] John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 14 May 1812, A2898.

24

Consequently, there is perhaps no better example of the significance of, and a concern for, both private and public responsibility. For Macarthur, the family was not detached from public success – it was interwoven, and essential even, to that success. Indeed, it was almost as if his legacy was at stake, for although pastoral achievement paid many social dividends, it was also contingent to the family with which its patriarch maintained. For Macarthur, his misdemeanours placed his family in an insecure position, and by extension his masculinity as well. Accordingly, in the summer of 1816, he delivers this message to a Mr Edward Grey – via another letter to Elizabeth – advising him not to 'proceed to cultivation' until he has 'acquired a sufficient stock of knowledge and experience in what manner he can most advantageously dispose of his little capital.'[47]

Therefore, it is clear that Macarthur did not achieve ruling-class masculinity simply by obtaining social badges, or by some pre-ordained natural order exported from Britain, but rather through a period of conflict and challenge. True, his wealth, land and unofficial seat on the Legislative Council – on two separate occasions between 1825 and 1832 – gave him the outward appearance of a ruling-class gentleman, but it was not something given, or particularly guaranteed. Indeed, it was via this conflict and challenge that the stereotype of the British gentleman was successfully renegotiated. It was Macarthur's ability to protect and support his family through his economic success that was thus a strong indicator of manliness in the colony, which by extension allowed him to ascend into the realm of politics. It is for these reasons that Macarthur not only warned a long list of prospective gentleman of the potential dangers of colonial life, but also moved to disseminate the gendered implications of these dangers in the development and education of his sons.

Lessons Learnt, Lessons Taught: The Macarthur Sons

As John Tosh has uncovered in his analysis of British middle-class masculinities, boys attained manhood not by some natural process or by filling one's 'allotted niche', but

---

[47] *Ibid*., John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 26 June 1816.

rather by jumping through a succession of metaphorical hoops, which were governed by, and reaffirmed in, a set of gender norms and expectations – a 'code':

> Manliness expresses perfectly the important truth that boys do not become men just by simply growing up, but by acquiring a variety of manly qualities and manly competencies as part of a conscious process which has no close parallel in the traditional experience of young women. If men are the sex at large in society, they must live by a code which affirms their masculinity.[48]

Importantly, this 'conscious process' is often shaped and constructed in the family. However, as Raewyn Connell notes, the family is also an institution where 'the reproduction of class society and patriarchy is accomplished.'[49] So while masculine norms and expectations are undoubtedly *formed* in the family, they also reflect the society within which it co-exists, and therefore masculinity simply *operates* in the family as well. In other words, while this thesis advocates for the importance of the construction of masculinity in the family, it is only to be taken as that which has been socially constructed and then re-represented in the family. This is because gender itself is constructed through relationships that are so often found in the family, 'but how those relationships are formed, and what meanings they are invested with, are strongly conditioned by cultural expectations.'[50] As the father role allowed Macarthur, he applied the assumptions behind these cultural expectations in order to develop his sons into competent ruling-class men.

It is for these reasons that the story of the Macarthur sons is an intriguing one. All but one, Edward, was born in New South Wales, but all four spent a majority of their childhoods receiving their 'schooling' in England and other various parts of Europe. It was not uncommon in Britain for boys to spend a majority of their formative years away from the family home; the mother's maternal and emotional affections were often considered too disruptive to the training of manly character.[51] This was probably true to some extent for the Macarthurs, but with the early colony lacking a suitable establishment

---

[48] John Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain," *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994): 181. Also see John Tosh. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. (London: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 110-111.
[49] R. W. Connell. *Masculinities*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), p. 17.
[50] Tosh. *A Man's Place*, p. 1.
[51] *Ibid*., p. 7.

26

for elite children, it was likely more out of necessity that each of their boys left the colony between the ages of five and ten.[52] Elizabeth alludes to these circumstances in the spring of 1795:

> Nothing induces me to wish for a change but the difficulty of educating my children, and were it otherwise, it would be unjust towards them to confine them to so narrow a society. My desire is that hey should see a little more of the world, and better learn to appreciate this retirement. Such as it is the little creatures all speak of going home to England with rapture. My dear Edward almost quitted me without a tear. They have early imbibed an idea that England is the seat of happiness and delight; that it contains all that can be gratifying to their senses, and that of course they are there to possess all they desire. It would be difficult to undeceive young people bred up in so secluded a situation, if they had not an opportunity given them of convincing otherwise. But hereafter I shall much wonder if some of them make not this place the object of their choice.[53]

Elizabeth and John were plagued by moments like these for many years, but they were not alone. Many elite members of early colonial society sent their children 'home' for the good of their educations.[54] Although many returned during the colony's earliest days, others did not. In the case of the Macarthurs the result was divided equally: the eldest two, Edward and John Jr, forged successful lives of their own in England, while James and William returned to New South Wales with their father in September of 1817. With two remaining in England and two returning to the colony, we might expect profound differences in the values that sustained their masculine identities. This point is all the more poignant considering their father ultimately chose, and heavily encouraged, their professions. But this was not uncommon according to French and Rothery. British eighteenth and nineteenth-century middle and upper class families had long held a tradition of 'guiding sons down socially acceptable career and behavioural paths'.[55] It was both encouraged and expected.

Macarthur was also quite the colonial agitator, but the same could not be said of his family, and that of his sons in particular. In fact, it has been well documented that

---

[52] Ellis. *John Macarthur*, pp. 475-485.
[53] Elizabeth Macarthur to Miss Kingdon, 1 September 1795, A2906.
[54] Jan Kociumbas, *Australian Childhood: A History*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1997), p. 55.
[55] French & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate*, p. 222.

Macarthur's successful pastoral ventures were 'family ventures.'[56] A strong and lucrative wool industry in the antipodes may have been the dream and life-long pursuit of John Macarthur, but it was certainly the result and reality of his entire family. That Macarthur entrusted his wife to administer their interests is no coincidence. Along with Macarthur's nephew, Hannibal, Elizabeth not only managed the farm and livestock, but also maintained a strong network of connections and alliances. She exemplified the ruling-class woman in that she was certainly active in the making and maintenance of ruling-class networks, despite her husband's preservation of domestic authority. The former is evident in so much of Elizabeth's correspondence with Macarthur. For example, upon the arrival of Mr Grey and his family, Macarthur requested that Elizabeth 'not only advise, but afford them any little assistance which strangers in the Colony may need.'[57]

At Camden Park, meanwhile, James and William developed into quite the enterprising pastoralists.[58] Along with their elder brother John Jr, who managed the family's legal interests from England, they improved upon much of their parent's early efforts. Eventually, with James and William appointed as magistrates, their influence in the colony matched and even surpassed their father's; such was their success and respectability throughout the colony, and a clear illustration of the ways in which ruling-class families consolidated their intergenerational authority. James and William's success as ruling-class men, then, was largely the result of their father's labour and determination. Macarthur's letters to Elizabeth reveal an enthusiastic and at times anxious desire to prepare their two boys for life in the antipodes. During the earliest years of their schooling, for example, Macarthur wrote early and often, reporting that they were

---

[56] Jill Ker, "The Macarthur Family and the Pastoral Industry," *Royal Australian Historical Society Journal and Proceedings* 47 (1961): 131.

[57] John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 26 June 1816, A2898.

[58] For histories on James and William Macarthur see Atkinson. 2008, *op. cit*; Atkinson. "The political life of James Macarthur."; J. D. Heydon, 'Macarthur, James (1798–1867)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-james-2389/text3151. First published in hardcopy in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 2, (MUP), 1967; Ruth Teale, 'Macarthur, Sir William (1800–1882)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-sir-william-4061/text6469. First published in hardcopy in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 5, (MUP), 1974.

'making rapid progress' and 'reading Virgil'.[59] The didactic power of classical literature was well established in British middle and upper class educational traditions, and a key foundation in the training of manliness. With those beliefs realised, Macarthur then set about preparing James and William for the rigours of pastoral life:

> James, as you have repeatedly been informed has been employed all this year in a Merchants Counting House: and I think he has now acquired a sufficient knowledge of Book Keeping, and Accounts, to answer any purpose to which he may hereafter have occasion to apply that species of knowledge. William has also made a good progress in his education, and would do little good by a longer continuance with Dr. Lindsay. I propose therefore to set off in about a month for the South of France, with James and William, and to place them for a short time under the care of some enlightened French Preceptor of established reputation. With him, they will be led into a habit of reading and studying those sciences particularly Mineralogy, that may be useful to them in New South Wales. They will also have an opportunity of seeing and studying the whole practice of the Culture of the Vine and the Olive, and the making he Wine and the Oil. They will likewise learn those exercises which give ease and gracefulness to the person, and all at a smaller expense than it would occasion in England … In addition to what I have enumerated there may be many useful arts practised in Agriculture in the South of France which might be successfully introduced into New South Wales.[60]

In Macarthur's mind, learning the skills of agriculture, bookkeeping and the more physical aspects of pastoral life were essential to James and William's success as ruling-class men. This is also evident in the fact that Macarthur never writes of James and William as boys in the present, but rather as men in the making.

This explicit and calculated attempt to prepare James and William for the colony is a theme that continues even upon their return in 1817. With the practical qualities of pastoral life attended to, Macarthur then switches his focus upon the finer, more inwardly associated virtues of ruling-class masculinity. These attributes are high on the agenda for Macarthur as he sought the help of his fellow landowning and ruling-class friend, Walter Davidson:

> I am endeavouring to break James and William in by degrees to oversee and manage my affairs. They appear to be contented with their lot, but I by no means think them well calculated for it. They have not sufficient hardness of character to manage the people placed under their control, and they set too little value upon money, for the profession of agriculture as you know requires

---

[59] John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 5 December 1810, A2898.
[60] *Ibid*., John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 8 December 1814.

that not a penny should be expended without good reason. Whatever may be the result there is no alternative for them. Here their lot is cast. Before I quit this subject I must not omit to offer you my sincere thanks, for your kind proposal to take James under your protection. Had the thing been more practicable, I should have accepted the friendly offer most joyfully; but I find his assistance indispensible and should I be removed his Mother and Sisters would require his aid. He is as you always knew him, grave and thoughtful, and if he should acquire a little more firmness, and energy he may become capable of sustaining the weight which my death would impose on him.[61]

Again, Macarthur makes clear his call for the gendered imperatives behind the attributes of prudence, economy and an enterprising spirit. But another key attribute appears to be the necessary toughness associated with the management of their sometimes immoral and ill-disciplined convict workforce – a particular form of mental resolve Macarthur accepts as essential to ruling-class manliness. Macarthur thus projects his own sense of colonial manhood *through* fatherhood. In doing so, he is repeating the lessons of moral discipline, self-control, and independence of character that were sharpened by his own antipodean experiences.

Therefore, James and William did not become successful ruling-class men by simply growing up, 'but by acquiring a variety of manly qualities and manly competencies' that their father considered as essential and necessary to that success.[62] Over the coming years these preparations underlined much of how their lives unfolded at Camden Park. Said Elizabeth to her friend Eliza in the summer of 1817:

James and William assist their Father in the management of his farm and stock. By way of amusement, they ride, shoot wild fowl, fish and occasionally associate with the Officers of the 48th Regiment which is now here.[63]

Elizabeth's correspondence with Eliza is littered with stories of the daily happening of James and William, which often culminate in such statements as 'our two youngest men devote themselves entirely to agriculture and the care of stick.'[64] According to her, James and William appear to have formed perfectly, and were indicative of, pastoral men – a

[61] John Macarthur to Walter Davidson, 3 September 1818, in Macarthur Onslow. *Some Early Records of the Macarthurs of Camden*, pp. 318-319.
[62] Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity?" p. 181.
[63] Elizabeth Macarthur to Eliza, 11 December 1817, A2906.
[64] *Ibid*., Elizabeth Macarthur to Eliza, February 1821.

fact she states with confidence on the eve of their twenty-fourth and twenty-second birthdays respectively:

> They are excellent young men, with minds highly cultivated they devote themselves to the management of a very large agricultural establishment with unceasing assiduity.[65]

Elizabeth's positive proclamation of her 'excellent young men' could be taken as a simple statement of affection from an obviously proud mother, but we are offered further clarity through her attempt to forewarn Eliza, whose nephew just revealed his own plans to emigrate to New South Wales. She writes, with tactful determination, that

> Mr Macarthur and myself were glad to see your brother Roger's handwriting once again. He will consider the subject of his son's coming to this colony … My husband is decidedly of opinion that no young man should become a settler in this Colony under the age of one or two and twenty. In truth we see no pleasing prospect held out to respectable persons. There are a world of difficulties to be encountered, when they arrive at this far distant place … I have more than once written on the subject of young gentlemen migrating here with small capital. It requires, perhaps, more than usual fortitude.[66]

Elizabeth's warning that it takes, for many young gentlemen to settle in the colony, 'more than usual fortitude', is an explicitly gendered one. But it also appears to be one that she and her husband believe James and William have been able to embody. Therefore, spearheaded by Macarthur's determination to prepare his boys so that they, too, acquired this 'more than usual fortitude', James and William's success as ruling-class men appears to be underlined by their ability to successfully re-enact the renegotiated form of the gentleman.

By comparison, the gendered expectations placed upon elder brothers Edward and John Jr are remarkably different. This is to be expected given their polarised upbringings, as both location *and* occupation differed for the two sets of Macarthur boys. While Macarthur is satisfied with Edward's success as a soldier, for example, that success was specific to the social and gender relations within which he occupied:

> Of our gallant boy … he is everything that can give pleasure to the breast of a Parent – sober, discreet, sensible, active, intelligent, brave in short everything we could wish a son to be.[67]

---

[65] *Ibid*., Elizabeth Macarthur to Eliza, 4 September 1822.
[66] *Ibid*., Elizabeth Macarthur to Eliza, 21 September 1822.
[67] John Macarthur to Elizabeth Macarthur, 31 August 1813, A2898.

Thought of as the most intelligent of all the boys, John Jr also excelled at his profession, this time as a man of the Bar:

> You have absolutely accomplished a labour not much short of a miracle, and for all your family, I return you my sincere thanks, and that from me, you know means a great deal.[68]

We can surmise with confidence that while both Edward and John Jr grew to be rather successful men in their own right, they would have lacked the gendered requirements to transfer that success to the antipodes.

Yet, despite expressing varying degrees of desire for a life in politics, James and William both approached the political arena with a sense of patriotic responsibility. Whereas William was far from an active politician, applying himself instead to the family's affairs as well as his own private interests, James devoted a significant portion of his time gaining a reputation as an anxious but able magistrate.[69] However, as Alan Atkinson's work on the political life of James has uncovered, 'he always felt obliged to perform, as if on a stage, but it was never easy for him.'[70] Their mother revealed on several occasions that the boys had inherited their father's sense of patriotism towards New South Wales, and it was this sense of duty towards their native land that appears to have propelled James to succeed as a politician:

> This is my native land. I have ever cherished a fond attachment for it. I have hoped to be of some benefit in my day … by attending as in my power to the duties of the station in which it has pleased an all wise providence to place me.[71]

James clearly feels his duty as an elite male in New South Wales is synonymous with political responsibility. That his brother William delved into politics at all considering his wondering eye for botany and agriculture tells us that he likely felt the same, even if only to a lesser degree. Therefore, with ruling-class masculinity closely associated with political and economic success, James writes favourably of the family's circumstances:

---

[68] John Macarthur to John Macarthur Jr., 24 January 1824, A2899.
[69] Alan Atkinson. "The political life of James Macarthur." PhD Thesis, Australian National University, 1976, pp. 31-32.
[70] *Ibid*., p. 3.
[71] James Macarthur to John Macarthur Jr., 17 May 1827, A2899.

> And certain I am that comparing our actual situation and profits with those of other Colonists and of the Agricultural, manufacturing, and Commercial classes in England (I believe I might say Europe) we may consider ourselves most fortunately circumstanced.[72]

However, this success was undoubtedly the direct result of that which his father so ruthlessly invested upon securing for he and William. Indeed, it was a lesson in colonial manhood disguised as duty and responsibility.

The family's attitude towards marriage also appears to be one of duty. This is despite Macarthur's consistent emphasis on the importance of family, but he avoids the subject of marriage with his sons. Either such topics were left for more private and personal encounters, or marriage was simply considered too 'natural' and inevitable so as to be left unsaid? What *is* clear, is that unlike British middle-class masculinity, which emphasised marriage as central to the comforts of domesticity,[73] the Macarthur family correspondence offers an alternate view on marriage: underlining the importance of protecting the family's interests, marriage appears to be more closely associated with duty and respectability – meaning, the growing influence of domesticity may have offered a relief from the harshness of the colony, but marriage ensured moral order and intergenerational authority. In this sense, with ruling-class masculinity firmly imbedded in the colony's capitalist relations, marriage between elite families reinforced vital business and friendship networks.[74] Marriage for ruling-class men was therefore as symbolic as it was practical, heavily embedded in the Christian faith, and devoted to the principles of compulsory heterosexuality.

Through marriage and the family, then, the survival of patriarchy in the antipodes was guaranteed. Originally imported by the original elite families of the colony it quickly proliferated, even among the criminal classes. Convicts were encouraged to marry and start families almost immediately, and some of the ways in which this aspect of colonial

---

[72] James Macarthur to William Macarthur, 7 November 1829, in Macarthur Onslow. *Some Early Records of the Macarthurs of Camden*, p. 431.
[73] Tosh. *A Man's* Place, pp. 27-29.
[74] Kociumbas. *Australia Childhood*, p. 59; Michael Roe, *Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia, 1835-1851*. (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 39.

life was consolidated was through the cultivation of land.[75] Given its economic benefits, convict men regularly embraced agriculture in order to prepare for life after their sentence, which not only included their own standing as colonial men, but also as husbands and fathers.[76] The significance of agricultural pursuits for convict men was its power to moralise through a sense of duty and responsibility. In this way, similarly to their ruling-class masters, cultivating antipodean land was training in colonial manliness.

Not surprisingly, given the task of ruling-class men to manage their convict workforce, they often took it upon themselves to propagate this moral instruction. In 'fostering a belief in the organic unity of society,' writes Alan Atkinson, 'such gentlemen tried to make themselves the fathers of their people, a source – *the source* – of moral guidance, welfare, discipline and mercy.'[77] We are able to see this dynamic play out via Macarthur's discussion with John Bigge who, under orders from Governor Macquarie to enquire into the state of the colony, asked Macarthur for his opinion regarding the employment of convicts, writing, 'have you observed and are you of the opinion that Agricultural Occupations in their most extended sense afford better means of employing Convicts and have a greater tendency to reform them than any other species of Labour?'[78] To which Macarthur replied:

> From every observation I have been enabled to make upon the character and conduct of Convicts, both during the time of their servitude and when they are restored to freedom I am confirmed in my opinion, that the labours which are connected with the tillage of the Earth, and the rearing and care of Sheep and Cattle, are best calculated to lead to the correction of vicious habits. When men are engaged in rural occupations, their days are chiefly spent in solitude. They have more time for reflection and self-examination, and they are less tempted to the perpetration of crimes, than when herded together in Towns amidst a Mass of disorders and vices … the Convicts would then discover that honesty and diligence, vice and idleness, were differently estimated … Under such a system there would be some rational ground of hope, that a few of the unfortunate men, sent hither for their crimes might in time be completely reformed, and most of them would be restrained from the Commission of Gross Vices.[79]

---

[75] Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia*, pp. 180-184.
[76] Grace Karskens. *The Colony: A History of Early Sydney*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2010), pp. 98-137.
[77] Atkinson. *Camden*, pp. xii-xiii.
[78] John Bigge to John Macarthur, 7 January 1821, Macarthur Papers, 1800-1831, A2900.
[79] *Ibid*., John Macarthur to John Bigge, 7 February 1821.

Although convict men were exempt from ruling-class status – for a long time politically as Emancipists, and even longer culturally because of the negative connotations associated with that title – Macarthur was otherwise convinced of the power of agriculture in reforming these men. Intimately entangled with the moralising lessons of agriculture as reform, then, were the gendered imperatives behind the formation of manly character. It is these same lessons that Macarthur imposed upon his sons so that they, too, were not only free of immoral behaviour, but also highly cultivated for a life in which their success was as much about their family's as it was for them individually.

As this chapter has shown, the family was essential to the way ruling-class masculinity was constructed in the antipodes. As an institution, it provided both the impetus for moral order and as a site through which to teach and consolidate masculine character. As his role as patriarch showed, John Macarthur's attempts to secure his family's social and economic position exposed the vulnerability of the gentlemanly stereotype. His growth as a successful ruling-class man was only achieved through a period of conflict and challenge – which was, essentially, his ability to renegotiate that stereotype in a colonial context. Consequently, Macarthur begins to reveal a specific discourse around colonial manliness. It is this emphasis on language and discourse, then, that allows us to reveal the flaws in Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity. True, ruling-class masculinity was constructed historically and maintained the patriarchal dividend, but it was also constructed discursively – that is, culturally, via the language and discourse that sustained the renegotiation of the gentlemanly stereotype. Finally, it is through familial relationships that Macarthur was also able to instil the gendered repercussions of this discourse upon sons James and William. One of the most powerful lessons was the ability to protect and secure the family's social and economic position, and it is here that we learn of an inherent responsibility toward both private and public worlds. If economic success was essential to elite colonial manhood, and if this success ensured the protection of one's family, their interconnection was vital in securing ruling-class masculinity. What is more, it is through this success that ruling-class men were able to rise to public ascendancy through politics, thereby embracing the responsibility to which the name of their class suggests.

Chapter Two

The Role of the King's School in Parramatta

> It would be unjust … if we were to confine our observations to those
> parochial schools which are devoted to the humbler branches of
> instruction; and were not to notice the establishment of a school of a
> higher class of instruction for affording the benefit of a good classical,
> scientific and religious education to the sons of parents in the middle and
> upper ranks of life. It was time that such an establishment should be set on
> foot.[1]

On 25 January 1830, Archdeacon William Grant Broughton, as the new Vice-President of the Committee of the Trustees of the Clergy and School Lands, laid a plan before Governor Darling for providing 'a useful and liberal education' for the leading classes of colonial society.[2] It was in reaction to his discovery that 'the very elements of a liberal education are with difficulty to be acquired here', and a statement in which he ended with an even stronger proclamation:

> The inheritors of even large properties who are hereafter to take the lead in
> Society and to occupy a station of importance in the Country are too often
> destitute of the requirements which should qualify them for such a
> situation … Such a forgetfulness of what is due to themselves and to
> Society, I need scarcely remark, could not occur if their minds were duly
> cultivated.[3]

Within only a few short months in the colony, Broughton joined its ruling-class contingent in their wish for a school capable of preparing young boys 'to occupy a station of importance in the Country', and his proposal included a 'connection with the Established Church … that revealed religion should form the basis of all education.'[4] If ruling-class masculinity was heavily dependent on a man's economic success, and if these men should be the class with which political responsibility fell, it was the role of the King's School to ensure ruling-class boys were properly educated for the task. That 'role', however, was not confined to the teaching of practical and theoretical knowledge, but also proper moral and religious instruction – the latter, of

---

[1] A charge delivered to the clergy of New South Wales: at the visitation held February 13, 1834, in the church of St. James, at Sydney by William Grant Broughton. See 252.1/B in Mitchell Library, Sydney.
[2] "The King's Schools," *Sydney Gazette*, January 28, 1830, p. 2.
[3] 'Archdeacon Broughton to Governor Darling' 26 January 1830. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV*, p. 362.
[4] "The King's Schools," p. 2.

course, being heavily linked to the colony's obsession with manners and respectability.[5]

This chapter will discuss that role and reveal how the King's School in Parramatta – as an institution capable of inculcating gender norms – aided in the construction of ruling-class masculinity, as well as further reinforce ruling-class authority. The previous chapter discussed the importance of the family in reinforcing economic success and how this was a key prerequisite for access into the political arena, but how the school operated in order to maintain and reinforce that right to public ascendancy is the subsequent aim of this chapter. This chapter will also discuss the types of manly attributes valorised by the school, and how it also took part in the renegotiation of the gentlemanly stereotype. Overall, this chapter aims to show, given its colonial context, that the King's School ensured the minds of ruling-class boys were properly prepared for political responsibility in the colony, in what was a move by the colonial church and state that had highly gendered implications.

As Martin Crotty has shown in his evaluation of the role of public schools in constructing Australian middle-class masculinity, 'instructing boys in appropriate gendered behaviour was one of the principal tasks of these institutions.'[6] Helen Proctor and Craig Campbell, too, have shown how school founders and operators often produced intended outcomes that were not always explicit in the teaching of general curricula.[7] While this thesis moves to follow the lead of Crotty, Proctor and Campbell, it also aims to show how the school helped construct masculine identities specific to the particular needs and requirements of the class from which advocated its foundation.

During what was considered the early colonial period in the antipodes, methods of schooling changed rapidly in Britain. The impact of industrialisation called for new approaches to the education of working and middle-class youth, resulting in new ways of thinking about the division of labour, sexuality and reproduction. As a result, the

---

[5] Penny Russell, *Savage or Civilised?: Manners in Colonial Australia*. (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010).

[6] Martin Crotty. *Making the Australian Male: Middle-Class Masculinity, 1870-1920*. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001), p. 32.

[7] Craig Campbell & Helen Proctor. *A History of Australian Schooling*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2014), pp. xiii-xiv.

training of manliness in British schools varied widely, but unsurprisingly it was the middle-class who led the way in terms of influence and didactic authority.[8] Accordingly, their methods left a heavy imprint on antipodean models, including discipline, curricula and codes of manliness – all of which have been known to coalesce into what David Newsome has described as 'godliness and good learning'.[9] Originally developed by Thomas Arnold in the Victorian era during his headmastership at the famous English Rugby School, it promoted a specific type of manliness, characterised by a ruthless dedication to intellectual, moral and religious development. According to Arnold, 'education and religion were really two aspects of the same thing – a system of instruction towards moral perfection.'[10] These ideas were well entrenched by the time they arrived on the shores of colonial New South Wales, but strategically reshaped and reconfigured by the King's School into a colonial context.

Inevitably, then, the works of British scholars are highly important to antipodean understandings of masculinity and schooling. For example, John Tosh, Henry French and Mark Rothery have been key exponents of the importance of identifying the sorts of gendered practices applied to young boys at school. For Tosh, the majority view for the British middle-classes was that school prepared boys for the wide world in ways home tuition or even the domestic sphere could not match.[11] The most telling characteristic was that schooling for boys was effectively a men-only sphere – not only were women excluded from the school body or the teaching staff, they were more or less banned as points of emotional reference. 'There was a long-held belief,' says Tosh, 'that school was an indispensible introduction to the company of males. It taught a boy to rub shoulders with his peers, to experience competition, and to bend to public authority.'[12] Likewise, French and Rothery argue that the British elite shared similar experiences to their middle-class peers. Boys were sent to school, among other purposes, 'to be instructed in the knowledge of social life, not a social life founded on

---

[8] See P. W. Musgrave. *Society and Education in England Since 1800*. (London: Butler and Tanner Ltd, 1968), pp. 6-27.
[9] David Newsome. *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal*. (London: William Clowes and Sons Ltd, 1961).
[10] *Ibid*., p. 2.
[11] John Tosh. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. (London: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 103-106.
[12] *Ibid*., p. 118.

their own notions, but one which shall be a fit introduction to the social state of manhood.'[13]

These works are key if we are to fully understand ruling-class views and approaches to elite schooling in early colonial New South Wales, but they must only be read in the context of the colony's social, economic and political culture. In other words, if the gendered expectations placed on British boys reflect the society within which they happen to coexist, the same must be said of those who attended the King's School in Parramatta. This is because, as Raewyn Connell reminds us, masculine identities are socially constructed, and historically specific, to the gender relations within which they are formed.[14] Like the ruling-class family, then, the King's School in Parramatta lies at the heart of the historically specific construction of ruling-class masculinity in the antipodes. It is the aim of this chapter, therefore, to bring that process into view.

'Class' is in Session: The Founding of the King's School in Parramatta

One of the key indicators of ruling-class interest in elite schooling in New South Wales was the early involvement of John Macarthur. We know from the works of Alan Atkinson that Macarthur's obsession with furthering the colony's interests, especially within the eyes of those 'back home' in Britain, extended far beyond the reach of his own family ventures. Indeed, his interest in the establishment of a suitable school for the higher sections of society rivalled, at least in the latter years of his life, the breeding of his precious Merino sheep.[15] However overshadowed by his pastoral success, Macarthur's role in the push for an elite school is far less documented. Considering his efforts to mould and prepare his own sons for manhood in the colony, such a revelation can hardly be surprising. In fact, it is not too much to suggest that his involvement with the church and state over the proposed establishment of an elite school was an explicit attempt to further cement his own family's intergenerational authority in the colony.

---

[13] Henry French & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 42.
[14] R.W. Connell. *Masculinities*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), pp. xii-xvi.
[15] Alan Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume Two: Democracy*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 58.

Macarthur's involvement begins with Thomas Hobbes Scott, the merchant turned bureaucrat hired by the home government to enquire into the state of the colony. Scott was joined by his loyal assistant, John Thomas Bigge – the former Chief of Justice of Trinidad – and together they confirmed many of the issues reported to have plagued the colony under the tutelage of Governor Macquarie. But it was the colony's educational needs that most interested Scott, and as early as 1823 he declared his intentions for an elite boy's school:

> In each county when the Population shall require it, a Central School may be established for higher attainments, that is, upon an equality with those usually called Academies in England … It may not be immaterial to observe that this foundation would tend to strengthen the connexion between the Colony and the Parent Country, by implanting English habits and opinions, amongst the best educated members of the Community.[16]

That this 'foundation' was a school for boys is revealing of state intentions. Clearly it was men, specifically from the ruling-class, that were considered the rightful agents of connection between colony and motherland. Accordingly, colonial hierarchy made alternate plans for young women, establishing a variety of elementary and orphan schools as well as 'female schools of industry'.[17] True, orphan schools were also established for young boys, but there was certainly no elite alternative for young women. It was therefore men, from 'the best educated members of the Community', who were marked as the most able to fill positions of authority in the colony. In order to expedite such plans for an elite school, then, Scott recruited the likes of John Macarthur, even occupying a house rent-free on his grounds.[18]

By 1829, however, plans for at least 'one good grammar school in the Colony' failed its first hurdle.[19] Under the guidance of Macarthur, Scott drafted his first idea for a state-controlled school for the elite. Where Scott and Macarthur disagreed, however, was whether or not the school was to be made exclusive to the ruling-class, for in Scott's mind this was not a particularly smart move politically. His wish for an elite school did not include discrimination against the lower members of society, and in

---

[16] 'Thomas Hobbes Scott to Governor Brisbane' 30 March 1824. *New South Wales Governor's Despatches, 1813-1879, Volume 5*, A1191-A1321.

[17] Alan Barcan, *A History of Australian Education*. (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 13-32.

[18] Lloyd Waddy. *The King's School, 1831-1981*. (Sydney: Macarthur Press, 1981), p. 14.

[19] 'Thomas Hobbes Scott's final report to Governor Darling' 1 September 1829. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV*, p. 220.

paragraph 19 of his final report, he claimed that he would not consent to such a school because although he wished to admit 'the children of parents who were humble or immoral', the 'upper class objected to send their children to this school, urging as a reason that they would be contaminated by such an association.'[20] In the end, and not unsurprisingly, Scott left the colony in 1829 as a rather unpopular figure among the ruling-class.

When, still in 1829, William Grant Broughton was appointed Archdeacon of the colony, he arrived a man possessed of the necessary diplomatic skills. Yet, Bigge left a sizeable shadow, one by the name of John Macarthur, and it took Broughton the better part of twelve months to shake the undisputable champion of the ruling-class. It is unknown whether the Archdeacon disliked Macarthur, but he appears to have neatly sidestepped an alliance by successfully removing him from the political equation, much to the pleasure and approval of the liberal-minded Darling.[21] What kept Macarthur in the equation in the first place was, unsurprisingly, his land. Once the creation of the King's School was announced by Broughton in 1830 it was quickly decided that Parramatta, being the agricultural capital of the colony and the town where many of the leading families chose to live or maintain a house, was the chosen site for the School.[22] However, while Broughton and the rest of the members of the Church and School Lands Commission remained undecided on the precise location in Parramatta, Macarthur offered Elizabeth Farm, to which Broughton replied:

> I have the honor to state that an intimation has been made to me by John Macarthur Esq … of his willingness to appropriate from his Establishments at Parramatta such a portion of land as may be requisite for the erection of a school and of the necessary buildings … It is however, worthy of consideration, whether as the School is designed to be of Royal Foundation, it may not be more consistent with that the land attached to it should be wholly derived from the bounty of the Crown?[23]

With Macarthur thanked, but removed from the picture, Broughton was free of the last direct ruling-class involvement. Still, Broughton was no fool – he knew ruling-class endorsement was crucial to the success of such a School and so disguised its claim for elitism under a veil of diplomacy.

---

[20] *Ibid*., p. 220.
[21] Waddy. *The King's School, 1831-1981*, pp. 18-20.
[22] *Ibid*., p. 13.
[23] 'Archdeacon Broughton to Governor Darling' 4 February 1830. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV*, p. 367.

In February 1834, some two years after the King's School first opened its doors to pupils, Broughton revealed to his clergy the depth of his political prowess:

> The education received in the King's School is not for the exclusive benefit of those upon whom it is bestowed; but for that of the entire community. It concerns all ranks that they who are to be the chief inheritors of property, from among whom in all probability the future legislators, magistrates, and other public functionaries will be taken should enjoy those advantages of liberal education which alone can expand and invigorate their understandings in the degree which their rank and employment will call for, and give them those enlarged and liberal views of morals and the science of government, those sentiments of independence, and that fixed impression in favour of revealed religion, which afford in any country the surest guarantee that its affairs will be well and honestly administered.[24]

Broughton's intentions for the King's School are clear: as an institution it will teach, train, and prepare boys for the 'degree which their rank and employment will call for' in order that the colony's 'affairs will be well and honestly administered.' However, that the 'entire community' benefitted from the School is a misnomer – not every boy from every social class in the colony was eligible for admission. True, every boy in the colony no matter his social standing was encouraged to apply, but certain provisions often excluded him. In this way, the entire community benefitted from the School, but only insofar as it maintained the social and gender boundaries of the metropole. For the ruling-class this meant further consolidating their authority because it was they who gained most from the School, 'from among whom in all probability the future legislators, magistrates, and other public functionaries' were chosen.

Through his operational provisions, then, Broughton preserved the School's elite status. The first concerned strict conditions of admission, while the second laid guidelines for the proper and continual development of the boys' character. This not only assured the School's exclusive reputation, but also helped avoid further ruling-class displeasure. The latter was especially important for Broughton because, as a fee-paying establishment, the School was heavily reliant on ruling-class investment. His first provision was a test of character: an interview-style evaluation that needed to be satisfied before successful admission into the School because, critically, a 'positively

---

[24] Broughton's charge to the clergy, February 13, 1834. 252.1/B.

evil home influence, or of ineffectual home-training, was not to be permitted to enter the school as a contaminating influence.'[25] Maintaining and developing that character composed the second, but it was also the most important, and was 'set forth as the principle object which the foundation of the school had in view.'[26] A liberal education was an essential element of this provision, but it was religion that was 'regarded as the basis of morality, and its permanent importance in that regard was fully emphasised' in the day-to-day running of the School.[27]

Under these provisions Broughton ensured the School aligned with the colony's obsession with respectable behaviour, that it be 'a direct bearing upon the maintenance of order and prosperity in this and every other human society.'[28] Penny Russell has illustrated what this meant for those in colonial New South Wales, showing both the importance of manners and respectability in forming society as well as a sense of identity, stating, 'in manners the colonial self was made, in all of its cultural uncertainty.'[29] Outside the School the ruling-class had already secured their place as the unofficial cultural guardians of this obsession with respectability, and as Russell further reminds us, the social elite regularly used manners and etiquette as the measurement of choice through which to evaluate character.[30] In this sense, economic and political success may have been key indicators of manhood for ruling-class men, but they meant little if those same men should lack proper manners and etiquette. As James Macarthur put it, 'the possession of property affords but slight proof of good character'.[31] If 'how one acts' determines one's place in the colony's social hierarchy, and if economic success and political ascendency consolidated that place, it was the role of the King's School to ensure the elite represented themselves in society not just as 'legislators, magistrates, and other public functionaries', but also as respectable men worthy of ruling-class status. Therefore, manners played a key role in a deeper negotiation for what it meant to be manly in the colony.

---

[25] S. M. Johnstone. *The History of the King's School Parramatta*. (Parramatta: The Council of the King's School: The King's School Old Boys' Union, 1932), p. 24.
[26] *Ibid*., p. 24.
[27] *Ibid*., p. 24.
[28] 'Archdeacon Broughton to Governor Darling' 26 January 1830. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV*, p. 363.
[29] Russell, *Savage or Civilised?* p. 16.
[30] *Ibid*., pp. 1-16.
[31] James Macarthur. *New South Wales: Its Present State and Future Prospects*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), see appendix 2.

On the first Monday of 1832, amid great public fanfare, the King's School opened its doors to students for the first time. Underneath the façade of celebration, however, lay a trail of political infighting, conflict and indecision. But this is hardly surprising – the history of schooling and education in colonial New South Wales has been described as a highly political affair, and the King's School was certainly not immune to the chaos.[32] Officials squabbled continuously over rightful denominations, curricula, land, grounds for inclusion/exclusion, and whether the colony needed an elite-style school in the first place. In the end the School became the first elite establishment to be fully operated, overseen and managed by the church, but officially owned by the state. Interestingly, state efforts usually concentrated on schooling for the lower and criminal classes, with the only other elite school experiment – the erratically operated and controversial Sydney College – being a private venture.[33] But the King's School prevailed, setting an 'example' for which future elite schools were expected to follow:

> Education is now conducted, wherever the Church has a voice, with a direct reference to religious character. The example has extended to the Colonies, and New South Wales will now share in its blessings. It only remains that that large and influential part of the community who profess her faith, come forward to support, in every possible way, the efforts of His Majesty's Government in behalf of their offspring.[34]

Indeed, advertisements like this one in the *Sydney Gazette* in late 1831 not only reveal church and state confidence in their prized school, but also the class from which the School expected the most support. With the ruling-class having already positioned themselves within state affairs and state institutions, the founding of the King's School brings that dynamic even closer into view.

Manliness as Curriculum: 'Godliness and Good Learning'

At least in an alien land, one as harsh and distant as the antipodes, educated parents fell back upon their own schooling and educations, and most viewed these experiences as the gold standard through which elite schooling in New South Wales

---

[32] See Campbell & Proctor. *A History of Australian Schooling*, pp. 1-63.

[33] See Barcan, *A History of Australian Education*, pp. 45-48. Also see Clifford Turney. *Grammar: A History of Sydney Grammar School, 1819-1988*. (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1989).

[34] "The King's Schools," *Sydney Gazette*, December 10, 1831, p. 2.

needed to match. In the interim, many ruling-class parents remained dissatisfied with the colony's lack of appropriate alternatives, and the Macarthur family provide a case in point. As the previous chapter shows, all four Macarthur boys spent time in England either at school or with their private tutor, and their parent's decision to do so is all the more poignant given that John Macarthur happened to be the great uncle of one of the first pupils at the new King's School.[35] The implications of young George Macarthur's enrolment are great and serve to prove Macarthur family approval in the School, both in terms of the type of education it provided but also the ways in which the School prepared young boys for ruling-class manhood in the colony.

But if the King's School further consolidated ruling-class authority in the colony, it only makes sense that this process included particular methods of training in manliness. That is why, as John Cleverley reminds us, 'it would be an over-simplification to attribute parental preference for private schooling solely to a demand for social status.'[36] For well educated and ruling-class parents such as the Macarthurs, the difficulties of raising their children also included the hardships attached to the pioneering of a new land. As we have seen, this not only included the successful cultivation of land, but also a duty and responsibility to both private and public worlds – a dichotomy that rendered both manners and respectability of great importance in the colony. It is little wonder Archdeacon Broughton later claimed of the King's School that 'my endeavour has been to introduce the spirit of our English Institutions.'[37] England was the source of moral excellence and the King's School implemented that same 'spirit' by founding its curriculum 'in connection with the Established Church … that revealed religion should form the basis of all education.'[38] With that, the gendered intentions of the School and indeed the types of men they hoped to produce are clear, and is characterised by the fundamental practices that define 'godliness and good learning'.

---

[35] James Hassall. *In Old Australia: Records and Reminiscences From 1794*. (Brisbane: R. S. Hews & Co., 1902), pp. 13-14. Also see K. J. Cable, 'Macarthur, George Fairfowl (1825–1890)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-george-fairfowl-4060/text6467. First published in hardcopy in *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Volume 5, (MUP), 1974.

[36] John F. Cleverley, *First Generation: School and Society in Early Australia*. (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1971), p. 128.

[37] 'Archdeacon Broughton to Governor Darling' 26 January 1830. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV*, p. 363.

[38] *Ibid*., pp. 362-366.

What needs to be remembered, however, is that godliness and good learning as a system of schooling was more closely associated with the personal regime of the headmaster, rather than with the school itself. Martin Crotty illustrates this point well in his investigation of several late colonial public schools: John Bracebridge Wilson, who was appointed headmaster of Geelong College in 1863, is a perfect example.[39] So while the school may adopt many aspects of the intellectual and religious preconditions of godliness and good learning, the headmaster often put his own personal stamp on how the school formally conducted its classes. According to French and Rothery, this is why analysing the impact of schooling in shaping masculinity is perhaps the most difficult to assess. They argue that this is because it is extremely difficult to disentangle 'the experiences of schooling from a series of stereotypes'.[40] With the headmaster at the forefront of teaching and teaching strategy, this was often at odds with the school's informal structures that placed 'normative approval, validation, and coercion firmly in the hands of peers'.[41]

If students regularly policed stereotypes and codes of manliness within the school's walls, it makes sense for the historian to uncover and analyse direct student experience. However, there are difficulties in this assumption for the King's School because very little archival material survives that offer insights into student experience, especially for the early colonial period. It is far more practicable in this case, then, given this thesis' concern for the construction of masculine identities, to analyse the school and headmaster. Doing so allows us to fully appreciate the role of the King's School in the wider context of early colonial New South Wales in *constructing* ruling-class masculinity, rather than simply analysing how masculinity *operated* in the School. If, then, the school as a gendered institution is capable of inculcating gender norms, this places a concept like godliness and good learning firmly in the spotlight – not only as a system of schooling, but also as a way of training manliness: manliness as curriculum.

---

[39] Crotty. *Making the Australian Male*, pp. 34-35.
[40] French & Rothery. *Man's Estate*, p. 39.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The first headmaster of the King's School was the Reverend Robert Forrest, and the former graduate of St Bees College took little time in making his mark. A priest by trade, his appointment was announced some months before the opening of the School – in June 1831 in a dispatch to governor Darling – but it was not made public until mid-January 1832 in an article in the *Sydney Gazette*.[42] It was during that period that Archdeacon Broughton spent time drafting the School's first curriculum, emulating for the most part those proud English public schools, but with a few minor adjustments. He stated that he did his best, 'avoiding only that exclusive attention to classical pursuits, which may, I acknowledge, be carried to excess and, in the present state of society, is perhaps not precedent or desirable.'[43] It is clear in Broughton's mind that the colony was far too unpolished and underdeveloped for the English public system to be imported verbatim, as English literature, modern languages, and such subjects as chemistry, geology, botany and music were all replaced by mathematics, mathematical science and mental science.[44] However, one of Forest's first formal acts was to overrule his employer. The new headmaster made wholesale changes and divided his version of the curriculum into four categories: an English department for English and English Literature; a mercantile department for writing, arithmetic and bookkeeping; a classical department for Latin and Greek Languages; and a mathematical and physical department for mathematics and natural philosophy.[45] How interesting it is that Forrest included a specific mercantile department, in what was clearly a concerted effort to cater to the particular needs and demands of the colony.

Unsurprisingly, as men of the Established Church, Broughton and Forrest disagreed little over the School's strategy for religious teachings. According to S.M. Johnstone's history of the school, the day's work began and closed with prayer, followed by lessons on the origins and history of the Christian Church; the history of the Reformation; the purposes and obligations of Christian Communion; the intention and efficacy of the Sacraments, as set forth in the Church Catechism; and lastly the

---

[42] "Government Order," *Sydney Gazette*, January 19, 1832, p. 1.
[43] 'Archdeacon Broughton to Governor Darling' 26 January 1830. *Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV*, p. 363.
[44] Johnstone. *The History of the King's School Parramatta*, p. 26.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

doctrines, ordinances, and discipline of the Church of England.[46] How clear it is that Forest admired a combination of intellectual development, moral exhortation, and religious teachings as the most promising avenues for the development of manly character. Furthermore, his reluctance to include games and sports in the daily activities of the boys points to his belonging to the same era of headmasters, as say Thomas Arnold at Rugby, through which godliness and good learning stood firm over the rising influences of muscular Christianity or athleticism.

After leaving the School in June 1839, blaming ill-health brought on by overwork, Forrest was replaced by a run of successors over a nine-year period until his eventual return during the summer of 1848.[47] Upon his initial resignation he wrote a letter of gratitude to the School, which he ended with the affectionate statement:

> It has been the first wish of my heart that every pupil in the King's School might derive from me all the advantages, mental, moral and religious, which I could afford him … We shall always feel great pleasure in receiving any one of you, as long as his conduct is that of a gentleman.[48]

Forest's definition of a 'gentleman' is clearly that which is closely tied to the gendered imperatives of godliness and good learning. A man is judged by his mental and moral fortitude, his continuous and enthusiastic commitment to intellectual improvement, and above all his devotion to God. One of the key aspects of godliness and good learning, then, was its ability to masculinise religion and religious ideals. The King's School, like all institutions dedicated to the education of young boys, blurred the lines between intellectual development and an explicit commitment to the training of manliness. This is not unsurprising given that religion was at the heart of the School's curriculum. Forrest appears to use the gentlemanly stereotype in order to valorise its most basic characteristics through the guise of God, such as self-control, honesty, integrity, temperance and self-restraint. The language used by Forrest to communicate this masculine ideal is part of what French and Rothery have described as 'a running commentary' of discourse in shaping masculinity during 'formative experiences'.[49] This discourse, which was firmly embedded in the ideas of the gentleman, also maintained the link between potential political life and the private sphere of family values.

---

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 22. Also see *HRA, XV*, pp. 360-361.
[47] Johnstone. *The History of the King's School Parramatta*, pp. 84-99.
[48] *The King's School Magazine*, September 1913, p. 108.
[49] French & Rothery. *Man's Estate*, p. 82.

48

More importantly for the King's School and its role in constructing ruling-class masculinity, was its headmaster's ability to emphasise the link between the gendered imperatives of religious education and public and political life. Forrest's immediate replacement, the reverend William Clarke, wasted little time in continuing his predecessor's educational objectives – as did his own two successors, but it was Clarke who was the most outspoken, which is not unsurprising given his position in the newly formed Diocesan Committee.[50] In what was an organisation specifically designed to further the interests of colonial New South Wales by promoting Christian knowledge, Clarke stressed the importance of religious instruction and its critical role in a man's ability to perform on the political stage:

> Surely this Country is the very last in which experiments in education, which are experiments upon morality, should be allowed. Instruction, without a proper religious balance … can never fit man for such a conduct and bearing in life as shall make him a firm patriot in the hour of political danger.[51]

The language used by Clarke matches that of Forrest: the relationship between religious instruction as the basis of morality and being a man is explicit. This also links back to the colony's wider concern for manners and respectability, whilst at the same time drawing a distinction between what is, and what is not essential for the manly task of public responsibility. As headmaster of the King's School, it is not be too much to suggest that Clarke had his own students in mind when delivering this speech.

From the very little we do know about student experience during the early colonial period, it certainly matches its early headmasters' affinity for godliness and good learning and its links to manliness and public responsibility. Indeed, opposed to the didactic imperatives of sports and other physical activities, students regularly point to intellectual and religious development as key to their growth as young men. For example, in detailing a desire to succeed in his studies, William C. Windeyer wrote to his mother in March 1851:

> I think that I have at last gained the objet of my wishes, that is to be able to improve myself in elocution. Mr Shilling the new master is I believe a

---

[50] 'Sermon by Headmaster Clarke' 24 June 1840. *Report, Sydney Committee, S.P.G and S.P.C.K, Volume IV*, p. 305.
[51] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

> very good hand at it, and we are all to get off speeches to be made at the next examination, we are to have in June, I expect I shall have to deliver one, Mr Forrest seems to think that I shall do well. I am very much pleased to do it … I have no doubt I shall have to come out at the next examination, this recitation just suits me. I feel carried away when I am in a noble piece, out of myself, my hand almost trembles with the thoughts of it as I write. Dearest Mother, I remember my dearest Father once heard me say I will be a hero. He said, being pleased, ah my boy no man was ever great without hard work. I find it so. I have raised myself some reputation but to sustain it is harder, one blow and effort must follow another. This recitation will I think add to my laurels. To be a fine speaker is to be powerful. I wish to be so, to direct, to improve, to raise my country is my ardent wish, my prayer. Mother I hope and trust I am not conceited in this but nothing I think of more. I thank God he has given me such powers as he has, nothing is of myself; it is His power and only His.[52]

William's emotional description of the lead up to his examinations reveal a keen investment in his academic performances. It is as if his reputation amongst his fellow peers, and indeed his future as a man, depend upon it. However, not just any man – a 'hero', and one 'powerful' enough to raise one's country – in effect, a ruling-class man. The pressure he felt to do so is not unsurprising given ruling-class responsibility as the 'natural rulers' of the colony. Political success depended upon his ability to demonstrate the fitness to rule, which appears to emphasise the gendered qualities of personal autonomy, independent judgement and self-command.

Moreover, in true spirit of godliness and good learning, William's intellectual achievements are deemed possible only through his devotion to the temple of God. His commitment to such achievements, over more sporting and physical pursuits, are revealed later in the same letter:

> I received your letter late last night and the 1/- which pays for my entrance into the new Cricket Club, even if I do not play I like to support the game. I might like a game now and then. I am in hopes there will be a debating society got up amongst us.[53]

The cult of athleticism is certainly on the rise by the mid nineteenth-century in the antipodes, but it had yet to fully infiltrate the mind of William, evident in his lack of desire to play cricket and his longing for more sobering activities such as debating. Importantly, this shows us that the cult of athleticism and godliness and good learning are historically specific, with the latter peaking in early colonial New South Wales

---

[52] 'William C. Windeyer to his Mother' March 1851, in Waddy. *The King's School, 1831-1981*, pp. 57-58.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

because of its devotion to delivering moral, political and religious order to a harsh, violent and distant antipodes.

Conversely, a boy aged ten by the name of John Blackman exhibits what happened to a student who failed to display the same commitment as William C. Windeyer. In an article in the *King's School Magazine* published in 1907, John recalls an incident with headmaster Forrest that ended in him 'bolting' from the School in 1834:

> The cause of my 'bolting' was in consequence of my being coated by Mr Forrest with a long, thin ebony ruler on the hands one Sunday night, for not long being able to repeat a whole Watt's Hymn. On another occasion I had been kept in, for a week or two, for not mastering the syntax of the eternal Eton … I then made up my mind that I would 'bolt', and show my wounds to my father, who would see my excuse for 'bolting' home … I felt very sorry at giving up the acquaintance of my manly, native-born, and generous schoolmates. I was the only English-born when I entered the King's School in January, 1834.[54]

The stricter side of Forrest reveals just how crucial student devotion was to the ethos of the School, including what must have regularly happened to students if they abandoned such devotion, and what many students resorted to in order to escape further punishment. John did not return to the School after a similar episode in late 1834. However, that he viewed his 'native-born' schoolmates as 'manly' tells us that while he was convinced of the School's methods in training manliness in the antipodes, it was simply not the place for him to do so: 'I had quite a bevy of school fellows expressing, in a jocular manner, "Blacky, you will bolt again, won't you," and so on. My answer was, "No, you will not see me after the holidays." I made a lucky change.'[55]

But if William C. Windeyer and John Blackman reveal both ends of the spectrum in terms of student experience, whilst at the same time confirming the same hypothesis regarding the School's ruthless dedication to godliness and good learning, the reminisces of a student by the name of James Hassall uncover a rather neutral experience by comparison. He writes that:

> School opened at seven a.m. and closed at nine p.m., but, morning, noon, and night, we had to learn the everlasting Eton Latin Grammar – parrot-like, as we learnt the Church Catechism. Of course there were boys that

---

[54] *The King's School Magazine*, September 1907, p. 95.
[55] *Ibid*., p. 96.

> read the Greek and Latin classics, but as I had not advanced so far I must confine my reminiscences to outside events.[56]

Again, intellectual and religious instruction are reported as staples of the curriculum at the King's School. Importantly, he also wrote of the legacies of some of his former schoolmates:

> I have never forgotten the names of the boys who were at the school in my time. I know that two of them afterwards entered the army and were for a long while in India. Two others were doctors there. Two became clergymen and remained in England. One was for a time Premier of New South Wales. As a body, I believe, most of the boys turned out well and to the end of their lives preserved a great respect for their old master, Mr Forrest, and were proud to call themselves 'King's School boys'. Many of their descendants have been educated at the same school.[57]

Not only did these young men go on to fill many positions of authority throughout New South Wales and the Empire, they also appear to have remained proud of the their educational roots, affectionately associating themselves as 'King's School boys'. Their success as ruling-class men, however, combined with the experiences of Hassall, Windeyer and Blackman, reveal to us the broader impact of the King's School in constructing ruling-class masculinity in the colony. This is because, as French and Rothery point out, boys are primarily sent to school for the best possible 'introduction to the social state of manhood.'[58] In this sense, the success of the King's School was the direct result of its ability to perform such a task within a wider colonial context, which, by extension, confirms Tosh's notion that schools as gendered institutions do indeed prepare boys for the wide world in ways the domestic sphere may not always match.[59]

As this chapter has shown, it was the explicit attempt to create an elite masculine identity, and to prepare boys for political responsibility in the colony, with which the King's School in Parramatta was primarily concerned. In the process, and heavily embedded to the discourse of the stereotype of the British gentleman, the School simultaneously valorised a set of manly characteristics. This ideal was, of course, driven by a commitment to intellectual achievement, but its most important aspect was an unwavering devotion to moral improvement through the virtues of religion. If

---

[56] Hassall. *In Old Australia*, p. 15.
[57] *Ibid*., p. 19.
[58] French & Rothery. *Man's Estate*, p. 42.
[59] Tosh. *A Man's Place*, pp. 103-106.

the King's School aided in the construction of ruling-class masculinity, then, it renegotiated the stereotype of the gentleman by valorising particular attributes akin to the class which successfully claimed, and defended, the right to political ascendency. In this way, the King's School not only helped recreate the social and gender boundaries of the metropole, but also further consolidate ruling-class authority.

Conclusion

Defining Early Colonial Ruling-Class Masculinity

In 1845, an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* detailed a plan by governor George Gipps to appoint magistrates from the regional town of Gunning, near Yass. It came after locals expressed their 'want of one or two gentlemen being appointed to be Justices of the Peace, and whose estates lie contiguous to the town land.'[1] Given the pastoral boom of the 1840s, Yass' economy and population boomed along with it. Consequently, given the number of newly established landed properties, there was a great need for political representation in the area. Said the author of the article:

> The inhabitants of the distant parts of the colony, whenever they, or the public weal required a gentleman, or a number, (say two or three), of the higher class of resident graziers to be placed in the commission of the peace; in fact, the people had no more to do than to recommend the gentleman or gentlemen in whom they could place the greatest confidence, and he (the Governor) would not hesitate a moment to appoint the party so recommended to be a Magistrate.[2]

Buoyed by Gipps' decision to heed the public's call for magistrates, the author's discussion of their appointment shows clearly the responsibility that many landowners faced given their societal position as the 'higher class of resident graziers'. As historian Linda Young has noted, these 'aristocracy-equivalent … leaders of society' were promoted into positions of influence far beyond what they could have exercised at home.[3] It has been the aim of this thesis to bring the gendered repercussions of that responsibility into view.

Faced with the task with which this responsibility imposed, then, a particular form of manliness developed in the antipodes. Deeply embedded in economic and political success, this masculine ideal was characterised by the ability of elite men to renegotiate the stereotype of the British gentleman in a colonial context. Given the harsh, fluid and highly homo-social nature of early colonial New South Wales, the stereotype of the British gentleman rested on a shaky base, and therefore only operated in the antipodes in uneasy and contradictory ways. Renegotiating this

---

[1] "To the Editors of the Sydney Morning Herald," *Sydney Morning Herald*, April 16 1845, p. 3.
[2] *Ibid*., p. 3.
[3] Linda Young, *Middle-Class Culture in the Nineteenth Century: America, Australia and Britain*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 53.

stereotype, which is underlined by the internalisation of a particular set of characteristics, allowed ruling-class men to not only achieve economic success but also prove their fitness to rule. Ruling-class masculinity, therefore, is a historically realised configuration that emerged in order to cater for the particular ways economic and political authority was achieved and consolidated by elite colonial men.

Importantly, this masculine ideal was re-enacted in the antipodes via the use of language and discourse, which we have been able to see play out through the family and school. Entrenched in the values and virtues of the British gentleman, this discourse was reinforced by the colony's obsession with manners and respectability. It is this passion for moral and civilised behaviour that became hallmarks of the institutions that ruling-class men used to consolidate their positions of authority in the colony. Given that these institutions were heavily conditioned by the social and cultural environments within which they operated, they were also the sites through which manly character was shaped and embodied. The gendered identity ruling-class men re-enacted in the antipodes, then, was a renegotiated form of the British gentleman. This masculine ideal valorised aspects of the British gentleman as well as that which ruling-class social status rendered as necessary or desirable, such as personal autonomy, independent judgement, endurance, diligence, self-restraint, prudence, economy and an enterprising spirit. However, as John Tosh reminds us, masculinity is not simply 'a set of cultural attributes but rather a social status, demonstrated in specific social contexts.'[4] Again, then, ruling-class masculinity is a social status, constructed in a historical context in order to meet the particular demands of the class that successfully claimed and defended political and economic authority in the antipodes.

Raewyn Connell's concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' has helped this thesis theorise this process, but only partially.[5] This is because, as Henry French and Mark Rothery point out, Connell's model 'conflates the underlying hegemonic patriarchal distribution of power and authority in society, with the less rigid and constraining

---

[4] John Tosh. "What Should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain," *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994): 184.
[5] R. W. Connell. *Masculinities*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), pp. 76-81.

societal stereotypes about appropriate male behaviour.'[6] Importantly, hegemonic masculinity overlooks the power and significance of language and discourse. Consequently, this thesis has questioned the validity of hegemonic masculinity by advocating, instead, for the discursive construction of ruling-class masculinity. Indeed, it was the ability of elite colonial men to *re-enact* this stereotype, to shape and mould it in particular ways through discourses of manliness that contributed to the historically realised construction of ruling-class masculinity. So while hegemonic masculinity is useful in terms of its ability to explain the historical nature of masculinity, and the consistent and ruthless ability of men to uphold patriarchal power, it fails to clarify how gendered identities are discursively negotiated and then re-enacted in everyday life. It is therefore French and Rothery's template of three causal layers that allows us to view this process of construction more clearly.[7]

As chapter one illustrated, the importance of the family in constructing ruling-class masculine identity can be viewed through the guise of the Macarthur family. A close analysis of their correspondence reveals an explicit attempt to construct a particular form of colonial manliness, and to posit this ideal within the family as a site of moral stability. It is evident that John Macarthur's attempts to secure his family's social and economic position in the antipodes exposed the vulnerability of the gentlemanly stereotype at this time. But after a period of conflict and challenge, Macarthur appears to have been able to cater for the particular ways economic success was achieved in the colony. This not only led to what appeared to be a natural progression into politics, but also a distinct discourse about appropriate male behaviour. It is this discourse that Macarthur uses to warn, impose upon and train James and William Macarthur to be successful ruling-class men. Through the determination of their father, then, James and William also forged successful careers as landowners turned magistrates, and it is this capitalist colonial identity that essentially became the archetypal figure of the colonial ruling-class gentleman. Enacting this masculine ideal allowed the Macarthurs to not only secure their own social, political and economic future, but also that of their family's which, by extension, served to further consolidated the collective authority of the ruling-class.

---

[6] Henry French & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 11.
[7] *Ibid*., pp. 11-15.

The second chapter demonstrated the role of the King's School in Parramatta in constructing ruling-class masculinity. An exploration of the founding of the School revealed the intentions of the elite to consolidate their political authority by training their youth as the next generation of rulers and magistrates. As we have seen, the School functioned in this way because of its ability to inculcate gender norms and expectations, which was achieved primarily through its curriculum: 'godliness and good learning'. It is through this system of schooling that the School made an explicit attempt to prepare boys for political responsibility in the colony which, similar to the family, included the internalisation of a particular set of manly attributes. Indeed, these attributes were valorised by the School as essential and necessary if ruling-class boys were to become the natural leaders of colonial society. This appears to have been achieved in the School by a commitment to both intellectual and moral achievement, which was constantly – and strictly – orbited by an undivided devotion to the virtues of religion. The power of the King's School in constructing ruling-class masculinity, then, was its ability to align with the particular needs of its ruling-class members.

Approaching early colonial ruling-class men with questions of gender and masculinity provides new opportunities for research in the broader field of Australia's explicitly gendered past. While this thesis' concentration on the construction of masculinity in the family and school has helped close the historiographical gap, it has also opened up avenues for further study. For example, what was the role of women in constructing ruling-class masculinity, as mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, maids and servants? Secondly, we need a deeper understanding of the ways in which ruling-class masculinity interacted with a range of other masculine forms, such as the male convict or indigenous male. Lastly, while Martin Crotty's research on the formation of Australian middle-class masculinity details to some extent the fall of the early colonial gentleman, this needs to be unpacked further.[8] As Raewyn Connell has briefly suggested and detailed, this process was 'immensely complex', and was not only underlined by the transformation of the convict and peasant classes into

---

[8] Martin Crotty. *Making the Australian Male: Middle-Class Masculinity, 1870-1920*. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001).

industrial and urban working classes, but also by challenges to the gender order by women and the power relations of empire.[9]

As Alan Atkinson has observed, so much of how early Australians came to terms with their antipodean environment was through the use of 'words':

> The first European men and women in Australia settled down among themselves bound by a fabric of words, words which passed among them and words they turned over in their minds in conjuring up their own ideas about the new country and their collective place in it … These offered some enlivening parallels with human existence, and common language was embroidered accordingly.[10]

It is this use of words that has been so glaring throughout much of the archival material used by this thesis. For example, John Macarthur's private familial letters reveal an anxious but clear discourse about appropriate manliness and manhood in the colony; which is similar to those educational authorities such as Archdeacon Broughton and headmaster Forrest, who both used explicitly gendered language to describe the sorts of men they were confident the King's School would someday produce. Words, then, coalesced and shaped into language and discourse, have been a focal point of the ways in which this thesis explored the construction of ruling-class masculinity. It is my sincere hope that as we continue to expand our historical knowledge, others will be encouraged to do the same as they, too, use the subject of masculinity to help understand Australia's interesting, insightful, and complex past.

---

[9] Connell. *Masculinities*, pp. 191-196.
[10] Alan Atkinson. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume One: The Beginning*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 169.

Bibliography

Newspapers

The Sydney Gazette
The Sydney Morning Herald

Archival Collections

State Library of New South Wales

Macarthur Family Papers, A2898, A2899, A2900, A2906.

William Grant Broughton, *A charge delivered to the clergy of New South Wales*, 252.1/B.

New South Wales Governor's Despatches, 1813-1879, Volume V, A1191, A1321.

Report, Sydney Committee, S.P.G and S.P.C.K, Volume IV, D84/292.

The King's School Magazine, D92/1210.

Published Primary Sources

Historical Records of Australia, Volume XV. Sydney: John Spence, Acting Government Printer, 1922.

Historical Records of New South Wales, Volume IV. Sydney: Charles Potter, Government Printer, 1896.

Macarthur Onslow, Sibella. *Some Early Records of the Macarthurs of Camden*. Sydney: Rigby Limited, 1973.

Unpublished Theses

Atkinson, Alan. "The position of John Macarthur and his family in New South Wales before 1842." Masters Thesis, Sydney University, 1971.

———. "The political life of James Macarthur." PhD Thesis, Australian National University, 1976.

Barnett, Chelsea. "Masculinity in Australian Film, 1949-1962." PhD Thesis, Macquarie University, 2015.

Secondary Source Material

Atkinson, Alan. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume One: The Beginning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

———. *Camden: Farm and Village Life in Early New South Wales*. North Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2008.

———. *The Europeans in Australia: A History, Volume Two: Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Austin, A. G. *Australian Education, 1788-1900: Church, State and Public Education in Colonial Australia*. Carlton: Pitman Publishing, 1972.

Aveling, Marion. "Imagining New South Wales as a Gendered Society, 1783-1821," *Australian Historical Studies* 25 (1992): 1-12.

Barcan, Alan. *A History of Australian Education*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Bickel, Lennard. *Australia's First Lady: The Story of Elizabeth Macarthur*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1991.

Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Burton, Antoinette. *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home and History in Late Colonial India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Cable, K. J. 'Macarthur, George Fairfowl (1825–1890)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-george-fairfowl-4060/text6467.

Campbell, Craig & Helen Proctor. *A History of Australian Schooling*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2014.

Carey, Hilary. "Bushman and Bush Parsons: The Shaping of a Rural Myth," *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 11 (2013): 1-26.

Carter, Philip. "Polite 'Persons': Character, Biography and the Gentleman," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (2002): 333-354.

Cleverley, John F. *First Generation: School and Society in Early Australia*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1971.

Cohen, Michèle. ""Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 312-329.

Connell, R.W. & T.H. Irving. *Class Structure in Australian History: Documents, Narrative and Argument*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1980.

———. *Gender and Power*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

———. *The Men and the Boys*. Sydney: Wiley Publishing, 2000.

———. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.

——— & J. W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender & Society* 19 (2005): 829-859.

Conway, Jill. 'Macarthur, Elizabeth (1766–1850)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-elizabeth-2387/text3147.

Crotty, Martin. *Making the Australian Male: Middle-Class Masculinity, 1870-1920*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Davidoff, Leonore & Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*. London: Routledge, 1987.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. "'Women's History' in Transition: The European Case," *Feminist Studies* 3 (1976): 83-103.

Demetriou, D.Z. "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: a critique," *Theory & Society* 30 (2001): 337-361.

Donaldson, Mike & Stephen Tomsen. *Male Trouble: Looking at Australian Masculinities*. Sydney: Pluto Press Australia, 2003.

Duffy, Michael. *Man of Honour: John MacArthur, Duellist, Rebel, Founding Father*. Sydney: MacMillan, 2003.

Ellis, M.H. *John Macarthur*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson Publishers, 1978.

Evans, Tanya. *Fractured Families: Life on the Margins in Colonial New South Wales*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2015.

Featherstone, Lisa. "Sex and The Australian Legend: Masculinity and the White Man's Body," *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 10 (2008): 73-90.

Fitzgerald, Ross & Mark Hearn. *Bligh, Macarthur and the Rum Rebellion.* Sydney: Kangaroo Press, 1988.

French, Henry & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Garton, Stephen. "Return Home: War, Masculinity and Repatriation." In *Gender and War: Australians at War in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Joy Damousi and Marilyn Lake. 191-294. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Gilding, Michael. *The Making and Breaking of the Australian Family*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1991.

Harvey, Karen. "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 296-311.

Hassall, James. *In Old Australia: Records and Reminiscences From 1794*. Brisbane: R. S. Hews & Co., 1902.

Heydon, J. D. 'Macarthur, James (1798–1867)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-james-2389/text3151.

Hogg, Robert. "'The Most Manly Class that Exists': British Gentlemen on the Queensland Frontier," *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 13 (2011): 65-84.

———. *Men and Manliness on the Frontier: Queensland and British Columbia in the Mid-nineteenth Century*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Hughes, Robert. *The Fatal Shore*. London: Vintage, 2003.

Johnstone, S. M. *The History of the King's School Parramatta*. Parramatta: The Council of the King's School: The King's School Old Boys' Union, 1932.

Karskens, Grace. *The Colony: A History of Early Sydney*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2010.

Ker, Jill. "The Macarthur Family and the Pastoral Industry," *Royal Australian Historical Society Journal and Proceedings* 47 (1961): 131-155.

King, Hazel. *Elizabeth Macarthur and Her World*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1980.

Kociumbas, Jan. *Australia Childhood: A History*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1997.

Lake, Marilyn. "The politics of respectability: Identifying the masculinist context," *Australian Historical Studies* 22 (1986): 116-131.

———. "Frontier Feminism and the Marauding White Man," *Journal of Australian Studies* 29 (1996): 12-20.

Macarthur, James. *New South Wales: Its Present State and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Macintyre, Stuart. *A Colonial Liberalism: The Lost World of Three Victorian Visionaries*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1991.

———. *A Concise History of Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

McKenzie, Kirsten. *A Swindler's Progress: Nobles and Convicts in the Age of Liberty*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010.

Moore, Clive. "Guest Editorial: Australian Masculinities," *Journal of Australian Studies* 22 (1998): 1-16.

———. "Colonial Manhood and Masculinities," *Journal of Australian Studies* 22 (1998): 35:50.

Musgrave, P. W. *Society and Education in England Since 1800*. London: Butler and Tanner Ltd, 1968.

Nicholas, Stephen. *Convict Workers: Reinterpreting Australia's Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Newsome, David. *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal*. London: William Clowes and Sons Ltd, 1961.

Peel, Mark. "A New Kind of Manhood: Remembering the 1950s," *Australian Historical Studies* 27 (1997): 147-157.

Roe, Michael. *Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia, 1835-1851*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Russell, Penny. "'Unhomely Moments': Civilising Domestic Worlds in Colonial Australia," *The History of the Family* 14 (2009): 327-339.

———. *Savage or Civilised?: Manners in Colonial Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010.

———. "Travelling Steerage: Class, Commerce, Religion and Family in Colonial Sydney," *Journal of Australian Studies* 38 (2014): 383-395.

Shephard, Alexandra. "From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentleman? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 281-295.

Shoemaker, Robert B. "Reforming Male Manners: Public Insult and the Decline of Violence in London, 1660-1740." In *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen. 133-150. Harlow: Longman, 1999.

Steven, Margaret. 'Macarthur, John (1767–1834)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-john-2390/text3153.

Teale, Ruth. 'Macarthur, Sir William (1800–1882)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/macarthur-sir-william-4061/text6469.

Tosh, John. "What Should Historians do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain," *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994): 179-202.

———. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. London: Yale University Press, 1999.

———. "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800-1914," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 330-342.

Turney, Clifford. *Grammar: A History of Sydney Grammar School, 1819-1988*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1989.

Uhlmann, Allon J. *Family, Gender and Kinship in Australia: The Social and Cultural Logic of Practice and Subjectivity*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Waddy, Lloyd. *The King's School, 1831-1981*. Sydney: Macarthur Press, 1981.

Ward, Russel. *The Australian Legend*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Woollacott, Angela. *Gender and Empire*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Young, Linda. *Middle-Class Culture in the Nineteenth Century: America, Australia and Britain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.