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The purpose of this thesis is to look at the motivations behind the life and work of Caroline Chisholm, nee Jones, 1808-1877, and to ascertain why British historians have chosen to ignore her contribution to the nineteenth century emigration movement, while attending closely to such women as Nightingale for example.

The Introduction to the thesis discusses the difficulties of writing a biography of a nineteenth century woman, who lived at the threshold of modernity, from the perspective of the twenty-first century, in the period identified as late modernity or postmodernity. The critical issues of writing a historical biography are explored. Chapter Two continues the debate in relation to the Sources, Methods and Problems that have been met with in writing the thesis.

Chapters Three to Seven consider Chisholm’s life and work in the more conventional narrative format, detailing where new evidence has been found. By showing where misinformation and errors have arisen in earlier biographies that have been perpetuated by subsequent biographies, they give specificity to the debate discussed in the Introduction.

Chapters Eight to Ten discuss, in far greater depth than a conventional narrative format allows, the relevant political, religious and social influences which shaped and influenced Chisholm’s life, and which facilitate an understanding of her motivation and character.
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While visiting the beach where the first free settlers to Western Australia arrived, I was told that the emigrants spent a year living there, along the shoreline, during which time the men-folk cleared the land and started a settlement on the Swan River valley, now known as Perth. This innocent trip fired my imagination and filled my mind with questions. Why had the emigrants made that trip? What were the conditions they faced at home that made them want to risk such a long and arduous journey to Australia? What had they been told about the conditions they would meet with on arrival in the new colony? How had they coped on the beach? On my return home to England I embarked upon an MA in Victorian Studies. The subject I chose for my dissertation was not hard to find. It was while researching documentation on Single Female Emigration to Australia in the Nineteenth Century, that I came across the name of Caroline Chisholm and read of her considerable achievements. I was amazed that I had not heard of her before. Yet it appeared that in the mid-nineteenth century she was a very well known woman, achieving what the suffragettes were campaigning for nearly fifty years later. A number of poems were written singing her praises, and the artist Angelo Collen Hayter exhibited a portrait of her at the Royal Academy in 1852. There were many articles in The Times, The Illustrated London News, Household Words, Douglas Jerrold’s Weekly Newspaper, The Sydney Morning Herald, The Argus, The Empire, Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal, and The Lady’s Newspaper to name but a few. Chisholm’s work spanned three continents, Britain, India and Australia; she worked tirelessly for the betterment of emigrants, and more particularly, initially, single women leaving England to settle in the colonies of Australia. Florence Nightingale considered herself Caroline’s “friend and pupil” (Anstruther, 1916, 17; Harris, 1862, ii; Kiddle, 1957, 237). Practically without exception, people here in Britain today have heard of Florence Nightingale, yet very few have heard of Caroline Chisholm.

My mind was yet again tumbling with questions. Why had British historians neglected Caroline Chisholm? What motivated her to undertake such all-encompassing work? And why do we remember women like Florence Nightingale when Caroline Chisholm is long forgotten? The more I read about Caroline Chisholm, the more fascinated I became and the stronger the desire to reinstate her in the annals of history. My enthusiasm led to the opportunity of being able to undertake this thesis.

This inevitably led to the question of how to approach writing the life of Caroline Chisholm. The writing of Chisholm’s life, a woman from the past, would be a woman’s historical biography. An account of her life would need to avoid the pitfalls of fictionalisation and fabrication. However, a straightforward biographical
account, concentrating on a single subject, would not necessarily give an opportunity to look in depth at the possible motivations which helped to shape her life. At the height of her fame in the mid-nineteenth century she was a political animal with strong religious beliefs, at a time when middle and upper class women were consigned to the restricted private sphere of the home. The structure of the thesis would need to give a broader basis to show the key social and historical influences on her individual formation.

As will be commented upon later, George Eliot wrote in *Middlemarch*, “there is no creature whose inward being is so strong that it is not greatly determined by what lies outside it”. In *Mill on the Floss* Eliot wrote in similar vein. She described the failure of one of Mr. Tulliver’s plans, not because his “will was feeble, but because external fact was stronger”. Eliot’s complaint against “silly novelists” was that they ignored the truth that there were external facts and circumstances that shaped character. As will be shown in the Introduction, it is difficult in the context of a narrowly conceived historical biography to show the diffusive aspects of the subject’s life along with the impact and influence which historical events and all other people have upon that life.

The structure of this thesis has, therefore, been organised in such a way that it allows for a discussion in the Introduction of certain theoretical issues concerning biography and history. The second chapter deals with the Sources, Methods and Problems that arose in writing a life of Caroline Chisholm. Chapters three to seven consider Chisholm’s life and work in the more conventional narrative format, detailing where new evidence has been found. These chapters also highlight the difficulties of writing biography. Examples from previous biographies of Chisholm show how misinformation has been perpetuated to such an extent that it has been taken as undisputed fact.

The various aspects of biographical detail, however, do not provide an opportunity to discuss and debate those subtle and intangible developments and events, to which Eliot referred, that could have influenced Chisholm’s thinking and the way she lived her life. Chapters eight to ten, therefore, look in more detail at the relevant political, religious and societal formations that would have had some impact on her life and which may now help to facilitate an understanding of her motivation and character.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The title of this dissertation requires some explanation. Its subject is a woman who in some ways was indistinguishable from her contemporaries. She had a fairly unremarkable childhood and was brought up in a quiet, provincial town where nothing of any startling consequence seemed to happen, at least during the time she spent there. Her early life was, in other words, relatively ordinary; she was an ordinary girl who grew up to be an ordinary young woman, at least by the standards and conventions of her day. But she then went on to attain certain remarkable achievements. She showed a degree of self-assertion, independence of mind, fortitude of spirit and dedication to her life work that was extraordinary. This took her around the world, particularly to Australia and the Indian sub-continent, where much of her work was undertaken. Many people began to travel globally during the nineteenth century, some out of choice, others out of compulsion, but what Caroline Chisholm achieved on her travels – on behalf of other travellers and emigrants – was outstanding by any measure. In her life work she stood out among her peers for the scale of what she achieved and the toil that went into this. She set about her self-appointed tasks with enormous perseverance and determination, and the extent of care and compassion she showed for her fellow creatures was prodigious, even in a philanthropic age. Caroline Chisholm was an ordinary woman who led an extraordinary life.

There has in the past been a general tendency for historians to categorise the work of nineteenth century women who stepped out of the house into the field of social reform and public activity as "feminist". This "lack of clear criteria or a consistent framework for women's public activities" has led, as Annemieke van Drenth and Francisca de Haan have suggested, "to a remarkably divergent treatment of those activities by historians" (1999, 46). They cite the case of Elizabeth Fry as an example: "some [historians] call her a feminist or a pioneer of the women's movement, others do not even mention her in that context, or in the vaguest manner possible". In the case of Chisholm, she has rarely been categorised as "feminist", has on occasion been mentioned as a pioneer, but has more often been labelled as anti-feminist, philanthropist, social worker and saint. Van Drenth and de Haan, in debating the rise of caring power, have suggested a new classification of the work of nineteenth century women namely:

- **women's activism**, which includes "all social and social-political activities of women undertaken on behalf of 'others' or a better world in general: that is, helping the poor, fighting slavery, working for peace, and so forth".
women’s movement, the work of women who “organised activities of women on behalf of other women, based on an identification with ‘those of their own sex’”.

- feminism or the feminist movement, characterised by “the fight for equal rights and/or activities aimed at ending male domination and privileging, a struggle which arguments of women’s and men’s ‘equality’ as human beings, or of women’s ‘difference’ could be used” (ibid.).

The new categorisation allows for an easier interpretation of Chisholm’s work in the field of women’s activism. What this demonstrates, however, is that the previously “impossible categorisation” of Chisholm’s life and work has been a disadvantage to the way in which she has been viewed by some feminist historians.

This raises problems of how should we now think about her, and write about her life-work, and not only because she has become almost forgotten. She has indeed become hidden from history, or at least relatively so compared to other women who achieved much in the sphere of philanthropy but whose names are now among the national pantheon. Chisholm has not been accorded that iconic status, and it is difficult to know exactly why she has slipped so much into historical obscurity. The major purpose of this thesis is to rescue her from that obscurity, and to do so by reconstructing her life work in as detailed and accurate a way as possible. But how should we relate to her? How can we relate to her? Caroline Chisholm lived at the threshold of modernity, whereas we live now in the later stages of this era, in what is referred to as late modernity or postmodernity. The changes in the ways we think, act, communicate and regard the world have been enormous. But the trouble is not only that she lived in times quite different to our own and that this raises all the pitfalls and problems of chronocentrism. There are also a number of critical issues involved in writing a historical biography, and these need exploring at the outset before we enter fully into the life itself – or rather the life as it can be written about, accounted for, conceived and imagined in its biographical construction.

First of all, there is the question of perspective and the issues carried with this. To some degree, an interdisciplinary perspective will help produce a more rounded, diversified account, introducing issues and ideas from literary studies and sociology as well as social and cultural history. But we all approach the tasks of scholarship in a particular way, bringing, as Dale Spender has pointed out, our “own penchants and priorities to the construction of the whole” (Iles, 1992: vii). Attempted interdisciplinarity may help to offset this, but it cannot wholly escape it. Many biographies are now written of women, by women. There are many recent examples that can easily be found on the bookshelves, under the convenient heading of ‘Biography’, at Waterstones, Blackwells, Ottakers or any other high-street bookshop. Some of these have
been much feted—such as George Eliot—*The Last Victorian*, by Kathryn Hughes, Georgiana—Duchess of Devonshire by Amanda Foreman, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu by Isobel Grundy and Mary Shelley by Miranda Seymour, to name just a few. But what is the nature of these biographies? How should they be classified? Are they women’s biographies or literary biographies? Definitionally, a literary biography is one that enhances our understanding of a body of cultural work through knowledge of its author’s life and experience. This concern conditions and shapes the account that is written. Perspective is integral to its production.

Secondly, there are the ethical issues involved. Recent theoretical work on biography has highlighted these, focusing particularly on questions of authenticity, judgements about the significance of someone’s life, the personal investment of the writer in the subject of the life, the biography, and the ways in which the writer can engage with, can relate to, the person about whom the work is written. For example, in writing about a woman, gender is obviously important.

The many biographies now written of women by women stem from a desire to question the neglect of women’s experience in the past and to recover lost female voices from “representation in many different traditions” (Iles, 1992, 8). What does this entail? If women seek to recover lost female voices, or to put it another way, place women in history, what is this history? The only available history into which women can be placed is the history that has, traditionally, been seen, and written, from the perspective of men. The only alternative is for women to look for another vehicle for reconstructing past lives, another way of seeing and representing their subject, another space in which to place the woman whose life is being written. As Kathleen Barry has put it, “from examining women’s lives, we can redefine the meaning of being a woman and discover what masculine history has suppressed: how women make history and therefore who women are” (1992, 33).

Before raising issues of how and why a biographer chooses a subject, there is the related ethical question of privacy to consider. By what right does a biographer enter into the privacy of another person’s life? The continual battles by Ted Hughes with Sylvia Plath’s biographers aptly highlights the unhappiness and difficulties that can be caused when the subject of a biography, relatively recently deceased, has living close relatives. As Janet Malcolm aptly comments in her account of Sylvia Plath’s afterlife: “relatives are the biographer’s natural enemies” (quoted Miller, 2001, 60). Malcolm also uses the stronger metaphor of the “biographer as burglar” (ibid. 67). If controversy does surround the subject’s life, the writer needs to
decide whether or not certain aspects require to be omitted from the biography in order to avoid upsetting living close descendants, partner or friends. Indeed the debate is still relevant, some would argue, if the subject's life is well in the past. There was a public outcry, for instance, when four of Charlotte Brontë's letters to M. Heger written between 1844 and 1845 were published in The Times on the 29th July 1913. Lucasta Miller notes that the controversy raised "issues of biographical ethics — of the propriety of exposing the private lives of public figures — [which] were hotly debated" (2001, 109). Indeed the novelist May Sinclair denounced "the vulgarity of dragging 'Charlotte Brontë's poor little secret ... into the daylight for all Fleet Street to gloat over'" (ibid. 119). This all sounds very familiar, and is echoed by present day controversy over Fleet Street's publication of private lives, particularly the private lives of the royal family as of celebrities. Such ethical and moral issues need to be fully considered when deciding upon the subject, particularly for instance if the writer is to reveal sexual preferences or deviancies. The writer would have to consider very carefully whether or not the subject's life would be enhanced by such revelations or whether such revelations are more concerned with enhanced publication prospects.

In an ideal world the interests of the publisher would not be uppermost in the choice of a subject. But should the choice of subject be limited to a woman of distinction - an extraordinary woman? What is it about a woman that makes her extraordinary? There are various ways of determining extraordinariness and exceptionality, and various levels at which it can be perceived and assessed. On one level, Chisholm far outshone her immediate siblings and half-brothers and sisters. The men of the family, brothers, half-brothers and brothers-in-law, were employed in various humble trades. Yet there is no evidence to suggest that Caroline, the youngest of seven children in her immediate family, and the youngest of her father's sixteen children, received a better education compared to others in the family. She was an ordinary child in an ordinary family. It was her achievements, and the life she led, which subsequently made her an extraordinary woman. That Chisholm did not come from an exceptionally privileged family, and was not given a higher form of education, make her extraordinary and exceptional because of all that she achieved. She was also extraordinary in that through her achievements she was accepted by men and women who were exceptionally privileged and educated. As Kali Israel notes throughout her book Names and Stories, women like Emilia Dilke were exceptional as women because they did receive a privileged education and privileged life style which enabled them to marry exceptional and privileged men. Chisholm was not exceptional in this sense. She was ordinary. Her subsequent quality of being extraordinary arises directly from this.
On another level, as Rachel Gutierrez suggests, there is no better approach to understanding social injustice inflicted on women throughout the ages, than a biography of an exceptional woman. She goes on further to suggest that:

to speak of a woman as exception because she did not fit into the stereotype is already to denounce the injustice of stereotypes. By rebelling against the stereotype an exceptional woman stands out and is contrasted with those who submit to their stereotype. She also enables the other women to develop their virtual potentialities against all odds. In feminist political terms, that woman is more than just one woman, she is a mirror, a proposition, she is an existential project (1992, 54).

Chisholm did not fit the stereotype of her day. Stepping outside social conventions and expectations enabled her, indeed made it possible for her to achieve so much on behalf of poor emigrants. That she spoke at various lectures, and at times on the same platform as men of distinction, must have encouraged other women to develop their virtual potentialities, against the odds created by the injustice of stereotypes. In this sense also, Chisholm remains a proposition, a possible existential project.

Writing the life of an exceptional woman, however, can be said to be writing an exemplary life. Robert Skidelsky notes that:

as biographers we are once more in the business of writing exemplary lives. But now the example is the life itself, not what the life enabled the person to achieve. Or, more precisely, the life is the achievement ... Quite obviously on this criterion a much wider range of lives is opened up to biography, paucity of achievement in the traditional sense being no barrier to being written about (1995, 202).

Whereas in mid-nineteenth century writing exemplary lives as models for future generations was the main criterion, to the exclusion of the private life of the subject concerned, the emphasis today is on the life of the subject and what the subject herself/himself achieved. Or to be more explicit, as Norman White wrote of Gerald Manly Hopkins, "if we reduce him to a saint, then his complexities, his total reality, are much less likely to be valued and explored" (Batchelor, 1995, 224). Chisholm has been seen as a saintly figure by most of her biographers, in Victorian as well as more recent accounts. Mary Hoban, Chisholm’s biographer in 1973, keenly supported the beatification of Chisholm in the hope that she would become Australia’s first female Catholic Saint. As White suggested of Hopkins, this view of Chisholm as a saint denigrates her achievements as a person.

Among the various perspectives feeding into the study of biography, is that involving language, style and form. Iles rightly suggests that “the processes and purposes of feminist biography make evident the different starting points, the different language, that can divide women working within academic and popular
conventions. Consequences of working from particular premises arise for the writer, the reader and the subject" (1992, 4). Iles goes on to note the difference in approach of writers who consider themselves to be biographers, authors, researchers or editors. The biographer, according to convention, "sees herself as using the results of research into a woman's life to write her story" or as Victoria Glendinning put it, writing "fiction under oath" (ibid.). By contrast, the biographer writing from the perspective of author "is happy to emphasise her own responsibility for creating the characters in her story". The author's approach is to create "characters, dramatic characters, whose lives are bounded entirely within the story; accountability for what is presented would be in terms of perspective and possibility rather than a literal concept of factuality" (Iles, 1992, 5). However, if the biographer as author is not vigilant, the fine dividing line between the historical biography and the historical novel may well be overstepped. Dorothy Thompson was only too aware of the fine dividing line when she wrote:

The historical biography has replaced the historical novel with a certain kind of popular readership, as a survey of the bookshelves in any airport or railway station will show. Whereas the historical novel traditionally offers history in the form of fiction, the historical biography too often offers fiction in the form of history (Thompson, 1998/1999, 138).

Even the acclaimed biography by Amanda Foreman, Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, walks that fine dividing line. There are many instances where the reader is not clear where the information comes from, as for example when Foreman remarks:

It never occurred to Georgiana that Bess's untiring enthusiasm for her company might be inspired by her own poverty. The idea that her generosity made Bess a de facto paid companion never entered her mind. Bess was good with the Duke, too; indeed he appeared to like her almost as much, and Georgiana congratulated herself on discovering such a perfect friend (1999, 102).

If "it had never occurred to Georgiana" then presumably she had not written of the matter in her letters and journals. The passage is not notated and the reader is left wondering how Foreman knows what went on in Georgiana's mind and what she was thinking with regard to "Bess's untiring enthusiasm for her company". The reader perhaps may speculate that Foreman drew this conclusion from the fact that Georgiana had not committed such thoughts to paper. But does this make it a 'truth'? In her enthusiasm and knowledge of her subject Foreman stepped over that fine dividing line and presumed to know what Georgiana was thinking. Foreman's biography, however, is very far removed from the fictionalised biography of Elizabeth Gaskell's account of Charlotte Brontë's life. Lucasta Miller's fascinating book, The Brontë Myth, details how Gaskell's Life followed on from Charlotte's example in the Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell, and reinvented the Brontë legend which had a marked influence on many of the Brontë biographers that followed
in her wake (Miller, 2001, 24). In the midst of writing the biography, Gaskell confessed “you have to be accurate and keep to facts; a most difficult thing for a writer of fiction” (ibid. 57). Gaskell crossed the fine dividing line by leaps and bounds in an attempt to paint “a picture of the private Charlotte which would counteract the impression given by the public figure of Currer Bell” (ibid. 61).

From Iles' discussion of the writer working from a researcher's perspective, it would seem that she does not find this approach conducive to biographical form. Iles states:

A researcher writes under pressures of a different kind - the most acute being perhaps her commitment to a reader, whose interest is academic, and whose priorities in judging her work will be bound up with criteria for scholarly presentation. It is easy to see how an overarching scholarly brief could be an inappropriate form for a biography, tending toward the monumental and militating against the presentation of a life in human dimensions: no greater, no smaller. On the same theme, it has been pointed out by more than one modern biographer that the conventional format of text followed by extensive notes spread over many pages (the latter appended to make the reader believe the former) could have quite the opposite effect from that intended, suggesting a show of uncertainty rather than of confidence. By implication also, the position of such notes draws attention away from the process of interpretation which gives shape to the biography (Iles, 1992, 6).

Iles' premise is that the researcher's perspective is at odds with a biographical approach. She does not offer a solution to the strain between the two. In many respects, however, the tension between research and biography is a productive tension. The researcher will have to obey the “constraints of evidence” but equally the researcher has the opportunity to “respond creatively to the challenge of making shape, form and meaning” in the construction of a biography which meets the “criteria for scholarly presentation” (Miller, 2001, 169).

Iles also suggests that a biographer who sees herself as an editor is one who “acknowledges the process of selection and valuation with which she is involved in constructing a text and creating a biography”. The editor in this respect “relies on her sense of what is relevant and awaits a response with interest” (1992, 6,7). However, whether the biographer is writing as a biographer, author or researcher, she is also an editor in that it is she who decides what is and what is not included within the biography. This argument, of course, is also highly appropriate to historical research.

Once the subject has been found, the biographer has decided upon the perspective, and concluded how to approach the subject’s life, a further major problem has to be addressed. By virtue of singling out a subject for the basis of a biography, the subject becomes something other than what they were in real life. The subject becomes the central purpose of the work, yet in real life the subject was seen in conjunction with
those around her. In *Middlemarch*, for example, the connectedness of history in this sense is one of its central themes, showing us that what happened yesterday is relevant to what happens today and that tomorrow needs to be aware of last week, last year and last century (Hardy, 1982, 108). Through her fictional characterisation George Eliot is able to depict the relationship of public and private worlds, and not only show how public life has an effect on the private world, but also how private experience can have an influence on the wider public world. If this is not abundantly clear to the reader, Eliot reiterates her thoughts on the sense of history at the conclusion of *Middlemarch*. She wrote that the effect of Dorothea’s “being on those around her was incalculably diffusive and that the growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts”. Within the context of an historical biography or woman’s biography it is extremely difficult to show the “incalculably diffusive” aspects of the historical subject’s life, along with the impact and influence which the actions of other subjects and historical events have upon that life. Without the aid of personal letters, diaries or journals, as is the case with Chisholm, the task is made extremely hard. You can then only make assumptions as to how the public world relates to the private world, and how influences within the private world may cause consequences within that world, and may even have repercussions within the wider context.

Chisholm made a number of highly significant choices during her life. Those choices, it is highly likely, were because of social pressures, the pressures of the public world. Chisholm, for instance, elected to marry. By marrying she conformed to social conventions. We can make an informed assumption that her knowledge of the socially accepted norms of the historical period made her aware of the woman’s role as a married woman. It was this awareness, and presumably her dislike of the contemporary view of a woman’s role, that led her to stipulate that if Archibald were to marry her he had to accept her unassailable desire to carry out philanthropic work. At that time, this was a brave decision. It would have made her different from her contemporaries and peers and as such distinguished her from the socially accepted feminine norm. Chisholm’s decision to marry, and undertake philanthropic work, was suggested as a fine example to Florence Nightingale by her Aunt Mai in the heated debate over Nightingale’s marital status. Chisholm’s decision was diffusive in this context. Nightingale saw no virtue in marriage. She wrote in *Cassandra* that “a man gains everything by marriage; he gains a ‘helpmate’, but a woman does not”. This was generally true, but not invariably. It was true only by social convention. Chisholm inverted social convention: Archibald was Caroline’s ‘helpmate’ (Nightingale, ed. Poovey, 1991, 219).
That Chisholm would have undoubtedly been seen as outside the socially accepted norm is only too apparent when we read Mrs. Ellis’s chapter headed, “Behaviour to Husbands”, in The Women of England published in 1841. Mrs. Ellis wrote:

In the case of a highly-gifted woman, even where there is an equal or superior degree of talent possessed by her husband, nothing can be more injudicious, or more fatal to her happiness, than an exhibition of the least disposition to presume upon such gifts. Let a husband be once subjected to a feeling of jealousy of her importance, which, without the strictest watchfulness, will be liable to arise, and her peace of mind and her free agency are alike destroyed for the rest of her life; or, at any rate, until she can convince him afresh, by a long continuance of the most scrupulous conduct, that the injury committed against him was purely accidental and foreign alike to her feelings and inclinations. Until this desirable end is accomplished, vain will be all her efforts to render homage to her husband as a superior. He will regard all such attempts as acts of condescension, assumed for no other purpose than that of showing how gracefully she can stoop. In vain may she then endeavour to assist or direct his judgement; he will in such a case most naturally prefer to thwart her, for the purpose of proving his own independence and his power.

Not only is it apparent from Mrs. Ellis’s counsel of subordination to men that Caroline placed herself outside the socially accepted norm by making such a marital request to Archibald. Mrs. Ellis also makes it equally apparent that by accepting Caroline’s request, Archibald likewise put himself outside the contemporary conventional role of husband. Archibald supported Caroline, both physically and financially, throughout their married life. Chisholm’s decision therefore had an “incalculably diffusive” effect on Archibald’s life and, later, that of their children, as well as the many emigrants she was to help in the future.

To look at Chisholm’s decision in this way is to reinterpret what has been said in previous biographies of her that merely commented on the fact that Chisholm had made such a request of Archibald. Such interpretations put Chisholm’s decision into historical context, and will help towards a new reading of her life. In writing a biography of Susan B. Anthony, Katherine Barry was able to “discover her [Anthony] as an acting subject”. Barry did so “by exploring the choices she [Anthony] made – the large and small ones, as well as the significant and insignificant ones.” “Choice”, Barry believes,

is action; it reveals human engagement with the world and others around us. It is the social plane where one interacts from intentionality with received reality. Making choices moves the individual from receiving reality to acting upon it and thus translating received reality into her life. Choice has to do with the future; it is constantly renewed forward motion toward something. The future and how a woman interacts with it are shaped by and require projecting from the past (1992, 34).

Chisholm’s engagement with the world is revealed through her choices and decisions. Through them she attained her free agency and sought her peace of mind, as her own desirable ends, rather than any rendering of homage to her husband as her moral and intellectual superior.
To examine Chisholm's choices in more detail than has been done previously moves forward from seeing her as the sole subject within the biography and enables the reader to have a better understanding of her. This is the connectedness of which Eliot was only too aware when writing *Middlemarch*. As a novelist she could make the choices for her subjects, such as Dorothea and Rosalind. Eliot allowed Dorothea the choice of marriage to Casaubon. Dorothea accepted Casaubon's proposal in the misguided belief that such a marriage would fulfil her intense yearning to do good in the world. Eliot, through use of the Prelude, the arrival of Casaubon's letter of proposal and Dorothea's reaction to it, reminds her readers of the true difficulty of her [Dorothea's] situation. Because she is a woman, "with a woman's feelings and a nineteenth-century woman's prospects, her ardour must - in the words of the Prelude - 'alternate between a vague ideal and the common yearning of womanhood': so that either the latter replaces the former, and disappointment is obvious, or it disguises itself as the former, and disappointment lies in wait" (Lerner, 1972, 229). Eliot did not allow Dorothea the luxury to believe in an opportunity to "do good in the world" along the lines of Chisholm's success in this field. Dorothea was only allowed to believe that she could fulfil her yearning through the assumption that she would be working on Casaubon's life long historical project.

Although Eliot was writing *Middlemarch* from 1869 to 1871 she focused on a period forty years prior to that time - 1829-1831, just prior to the 1832 Reform Act. Chisholm reached the age of twenty-one in 1829, an age akin to the Brooke sisters, but Eliot herself was eleven years younger than Chisholm. Both Chisholm and Eliot, however, came from very similar family backgrounds where sheer hard work by the father had allowed an upward movement of the family in Georgian and Regency England (though more a financial than a social movement in the case of Chisholm's father.) Both Chisholm and Eliot spent their childhood in the Midlands. Their fathers owned freehold properties, which makes it harder to place them socially than those who rented their farms. By the time Eliot was writing *Middlemarch* in 1869 she was looking back at a vanished world. She had grown up in that world and was writing *Middlemarch* from her own experience. Although a fiction, Eliot draws on historical data within which to place her characters - her work evokes the historical context of her fictional characterisation. Comparatively, the biographer needs to evoke the historical context for the subject, who once actually lived, in order to write her story, a story which is a 'fiction under oath' to remain as true as historically possible to that subject.
Writing fiction Eliot did not have to face the basic problem that confronts both biographer and historian. That basic problem is the authenticity of documentation. Richard Holmes summed up the problem:

> memory itself is fallible; memoirs are inevitably biased; letters are always slanted towards their recipients; even private diaries and intimate journals have to be recognised as literary forms of self-invention rather than an "ultimate" truth of private fact or feeling. The biographer has always had to construct or orchestrate a factual pattern out of materials that already have a fictional or reinvented element (Holmes, 1995, 17).

As noted above, Chisholm left very few personal letters, and no journals have been found. There are, however, numerous letters and articles of Chisholm's that were published in various newspapers, both in Britain and Australia. Various lectures that Chisholm made were also reported widely in both countries. In addition, Chisholm wrote occasional pamphlets and a novelette that was published in an Australian paper. It would be very surprising if Chisholm had not slanted such documentation towards the recipients - a wide variety of recipients, men and women, the poor emigrants, the wealthy aristocracy, the clergy, ship builders and government ministers, in Britain and Australia. It is very interesting to note just how Chisholm slanted her work, particularly when she was writing to male government ministers. Chisholm, as her writing makes only too clear, was well aware that moving into the political arena was a departure from women's traditional role. She justified her move into the political world in almost apologetic tones but clearly stated that she had done so because those who should have been looking after the interests of the poor emigrants (those in government) were not doing so. This is precisely what Chartist women were doing in 1838. As Malcolm I. Thomis and Jennifer Grimmett note in Women in Protest:

> The emergence of women as determined Chartists in 1838 was no eruption of self-confident females looking for fresh fields to conquer and moving with enthusiasm into the new sphere of politics. Women had been too long and too unquestioningly excluded from politics for this to be possible, and when they came into politics they came in with the certain knowledge that this was a departure from the traditional role and would be so regarded. They explained this change, not in terms of discontent with their previous lot but in their inability any longer to sustain it. Had they possessed any choice, they said, their preference would have been to avoid politics and seek the quiet domestic existence which society had ordained for them, but the options, they believed, were closing (1982, 111).

Like female Chartists, Chisholm believed she had no option. The plight of the emigrants needed to be brought to the attention of colonial and home governments. Chisholm used the social convention of the time to justify her involvement in the political arena (see chapter ten).

It is not only Chisholm's slant towards the recipient of her articles and letters that needs to be taken into account, but also the interpretation of evidence and reliance upon earlier biographies. As Virginia Woolf remarked in the fourth volume of her Collected Essays, the facts of biography "are not like the facts of
science – once they are discovered, always the same. They are subject to changes of opinion; opinions change as times change" (quoted Miller, 2001, 123). There is no such thing as a definitive biography. However much research is undertaken there is no guarantee that further documentation will not be found, and every generation looks at the past from different angles and viewpoints, finding new ways of interpretation. The fact that there were a number of biographies, mini biographies and a memoir written of Chisholm, both in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, also raises the question as to the virtue of writing a new biography of Chisholm. Would a new biography of Chisholm add anything further to our understanding of her life? These are matters that will be addressed in further detail in chapter two, but the thesis itself attests to an answer in the affirmative.

As to the reliance of earlier biographies and evidence, E. H. Carr in his book What is History? summed up the difficulties when he wrote: “facts are available to the historian in documents, inscriptions and so on, like fish on the fishmonger’s slab. The historian collects them, takes them home, and cooks and serves them in whatever style appeals to him” (1987, 9). The fish are not only available on the fishmonger’s slab, they are also found in lakes, oceans, ponds, rivers and streams. Which waters the historian trawls, and what baits he uses, will determine what he is likely to catch.

A sifting of the evidence in the various biographies of Chisholm has highlighted minor, but nonetheless inaccurate interpretation and/or misinformation, particularly with Mackenzie and Hoban’s work (see chapter two). This again reiterates Carr’s premise on the reliability of evidence, and raises the question as to the reliability of previous biographies. Mackenzie’s Memoir of Chisholm, published in 1852, is written from a Victorian perspective as an eulogistic exemplary life story that does not encroach on the private world of the subject. Mackenzie is ambiguous as to the few details he does give of Chisholm’s birth. This has created misunderstandings as to her birthplace. These misunderstandings have been reiterated in each and every successive biography of Chisholm. They have been repeated so many times, they have almost become established as fact. Many local historians would rather believe this than accept new evidence that categorically establishes Chisholm’s birthplace as Northampton. The fishes that are taken home from the fishmonger’s slab are not only served in any way the historian wishes. What is sold as bass may prove to be cod. Indeed, what Miller’s book reveals only too clearly is the way in which misleading information, given as bass by Gaskell in her Life of Charlotte Brontë, was used by succeeding biographers without their realising that the fish served up was cod.
Chisholm lectured, worked and wrote pamphlets, newspaper articles and a novelette whilst living on three continents, Britain (Europe), India and Australia. It is therefore important that she be placed within the historical context and cultural experiences of these three areas within the thesis. New directions in the study of historiography however have highlighted the effects of changing historical perspectives on the history of the three continents. The histories of India and Australia were seen in Chisholm’s time from an imperial viewpoint – their histories were written of in terms endorsing British imperialism and the British conquest of the world. Penny Russell in Pastiche I has chronicled the changing attitudes to Australia’s history. Russell wrote of a progression from “white settlement to federation – the making of a nation” and of “radical nationalists” whose viewpoint was the triumph of a “rough-hewn” Australian spirit. From both perspectives it was seen as a “single, unifying and universalising narrative”. Russell goes on to highlight the shifts in attitude in Australian history. For instance, labour historians challenged the myth of a “united and egalitarian country” with their focus on the rise of the Labour Party and class struggle. Historical emphasis then shifted toward the urban experience, looking at leisure and domestic life, and shifted yet again to look at white settlement from the opposite side of the coin, from the perspective of “invasion, conquest, war and resistance”. Colonial, heroic pioneers, were “revealed as brutal colonisers who oppressed and silenced Aborigines and, in a different metaphor of colonisation, also oppressed and silenced women, children and minority ethnic groups such as the Chinese” (Russell, 1994, 1). India’s historical viewpoints have similarly shifted in perspective from the history of the Raj, trade (the East India Company) and Empire, to a country oppressed by their British rulers.

In a study of Chisholm such shifts in perspective needs to be given full consideration. To do so however creates a tension. On the one hand, as Kathleen Barry suggests, the requirement for biography is to “be true to our subject, that we not only recreate the phenomenology of daily life to uncover the subjectivity of the self, but that we locate our subject in her own historical context and that requires historical reperiodization” (1992, 25). On the other hand there needs to be an awareness of the changing historiographical emphasis which locates Chisholm’s efforts to find work for the emigrant in the surrounding areas of Sydney and Melbourne as those of the “colonial heroic pioneer” who displaced the Aborigines. As Russell also suggests, Chisholm’s actions in finding work for the single female emigrant as servant, and/or finding that position in an area where it was known men were looking for wives, could be construed in such a way that Chisholm was oppressing and silencing women. Can this tension be resolved? And if so, how?
Rachel Gutiérrez suggests that “biography of any woman is part of history, history seen from the feminist perspective. The biographer should be totally involved not only with his or her character but also with woman’s real world” (1992, 55). For this thesis to be totally involved with Chisholm’s “real world” as a woman, she needs to be seen totally in her historical context. Chisholm as a Victorian woman working in Australia was concerned for the lives of single female emigrants. Her immediate concern was to find the women work and lodgings, for many of the single females had no money, relatives, home to go to, nor any specific training. Work in Sydney was scarce and Chisholm, a Captain’s wife, had no financial resources. In the historical periodization in which Chisholm lived she did what she was able within the limitations of that historical context. That was Chisholm’s “real world”. The tension, however, between Chisholm’s “real world”, the historical context, and the issue of historical colonialist perspective is eased when the biographical approach looks at the choices that Chisholm made and the social and political pressures that influenced her in making those choices. In debating the reasoning behind Chisholm’s decisions and actions, awareness of new approaches to colonialist historical perspectives will ensure that the influences upon Chisholm is viewed in the wider context.

In this respect, post-colonial theory is right to raise questions and heighten our awareness of the immoral and oppressive effects of colonialism. Nobody who reads Shashi Deshpande’s chapter “Them and Us” in Shirley Chew and Anna Rutherford’s book Unbecoming Daughters of the Empire will argue that colonialism did not affect and “shape language, education, religion, artistic sensibilities and, increasingly, popular culture” (Gilbert and Tompkins, 1996, 2). Deshpande poignantly writes:

> We found out that the history of our country began in a sense only when the British arrived, putting an end to chaos and decadence, and that it was the start of an era of benevolent rule. They - the British - did wonderful things like giving us railways, English schools and colleges and courts of justice, while we Indians did terrible things like the Sepoy Mutiny and the Black Hole of Calcutta. ....

> ... the British Empire ... laid its dictates on us. It was as if we saw ourselves with the vision of that 'Other', the outsider. Therefore, we were not the norm; they were. This is to rationalise now, at this distance of time. Then, one only knew that to speak English (and not the way we did), to wear English clothes (I can still remember the topics of those days, surely more of a status symbol than a protection from the sun and rain), to be large, white and Christian was somehow to be superior. To be Indian, to be brown and to be a Hindu was wrong (Deshpande, Chew & Rutherford, 1993, 103-5).

The quotations from Deshpande’s essay encapsulate the feelings and emotions felt by the colonised and show, perhaps more clearly than any theoretical discussion, the reality of what it was to be a subordinated part of the red blobs on the map that was the British Empire. The extracts show how the British (and other colonisers) imposed their rule and enabled power to be maintained by the psychological insistence of
superiority over the inferior “Other”, the colonised. There was no room for social relations between the colonised and coloniser when the one was (supposedly) so superior to the other. The quotation also shows how British history and British literature consumed and replaced the literature and history of the colonised, which in turn had an effect upon the culture of the colonised nation. Deshpande’s observations graphically illustrate how the coloniser imposes rule and allegiance to colonial rule. The flag of the coloniser was placed in the hands of little children of the colonised and those children enthused and encouraged to wave the flag as the head of state of the coloniser triumphantly passes by.

We do not know if Chisholm placed the British flag in the hands of the little Indian children. We do know that she founded the Female School of Industry for the Daughters of European Soldiers in Madras. We also know that that school was based in Black Town, the Indian community quarters. Was this because she could find no suitable accommodation for the school in White Town – the white community quarters in Madras? Or was there some other political influence that made Chisholm choose Black Town for the school? Again only by questioning Chisholm’s choices, looking at the political and social pressures of the time in a biographical approach to her as a subject, can we understand her motives and actions and see those actions within a post-colonial perspective.

The India of which Shashi Deshpande writes was a colony of the British Empire in the sense that it was colonised by the British. Australia, Canada and New Zealand were white settler colonies. The term post-colonial in this sense is problematical. Williams and Chrisman write:

That they [Canada, Australia and New Zealand] were not simply colonies was formally recognised at the time by Britain in granting them Dominion status. Economically and politically, their relation to the metropolitan centre bore little resemblance to that of the actual colonies. They were not subject to the sort of coercive measures which were the lot of the colonies, and their ethnic stratification was fundamentally different. Their subsequent history and economic development, and current location within global capitalist relations, have been very much in a metropolitan mode, rather than a (post-) colonial one (1993, 4).

The significance of Williams and Chrisman’s argument is that the white settler colonies were simultaneously coloniser, colonised and post-colonial. The white settlers in Australia took the land from the Aborigines, but were themselves the colonised in that the home government was politically and economically involved. At the same time the Executive and Legislative Council’s of the six colonies of Australia also held power. The white settlers cultivated the land displacing the Australian Aborigines who were semi-nomadic hunters and gatherers. The act of settling the land and dispossessing the Aborigines from their homeland fractured
the Aboriginal culture. The dispossession of the indigenous peoples is different from the colonised of, say, India, where the colonisers ruled the colonised. As Lorimer writes “during the 1850s and 1860s, the colonies of white settlement seemed destined for self-government, and India and tropical crown colonies seemed a necessary but onerous burden assumed out of economic interest, and carrying with them the moral duty of civilising alien races in British ways” (Lorimer, 1978, 13).

There is, yet again, a tension between Chisholm in historical context and Chisholm, from the viewpoint of post-colonial theory, the heroic pioneer who displaced the Aborigine. Undoubtedly the atrocities that were done in the name of colonisation were wrong. We cannot pardon Chisholm for her part in this. We can look at her judgements within an historical context and look at the political and social attitudes of the time and see her actions within those parameters. We can also be aware of Chisholm’s actions from the post-colonial viewpoint, and see her actions from our own perspective. We do need, however, if we scrutinise the nineteenth century with a twenty-first century magnifying glass, to temper our outlook with an understanding of the period we are looking at. As Haines notes, the nineteenth century did not have the benefit of the “canons of modern political and cultural theory” (Haines, 1997, 251).

As the discussion thus far has suggested, a biography of an ordinary woman, who lived an extraordinary life, is finally impossible to categorise, at least in any final, definitive way, hence the title of this thesis. We can at least benefit from new approaches to historiography. We have come a long way from the mid-twentieth century approach to history as a study of political and diplomatic history. Advances in our theoretical understanding of biography, and particularly, women’s biography, which likewise have developed tremendously over the last decade, also contribute to our historical interpretation of Chisholm. As Miller suggests, such interpretation should bear in mind the “close aesthetic kinship between biography and the novel” and the importance of keeping alive “some consciousness of the distinction between historical facts and fictional inventions” (from every perspective). And perhaps more than ever before, we are now aware that, as Miller further suggests, “biographical truth may be an ideal that is only ever provisionally achieved” (2001, 153).

---

1 Fanny Nightingale, Florence’s mother, desperately hoped that her daughter would marry. In August 1852 Aunt Mai wrote: “I believe in all conscience she [Fanny] would be most willing that you undertook a mission like Mrs. Fry or Mrs. Chisholm, but she thinks it necessary for your peace and well being that there should be a Mr. Fry or Captain Chisholm to protect you and in conscience she thinks it right
to defend you from doing anything which she thinks would be an impediment to the existence of Mr. F. or Captain C" (quoted Woodham-Smith, 1992, 101).

Margaret Kiddle, biographer of Chisholm, refers to a journal in 1950. However the journal no longer appears to be in existence. Hoban's biography, 1973, could not trace the journal and it has not come to light in spite of present research.

Namely: New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia.
CHAPTER TWO

SOURCES, METHODS, PROBLEMS

Sources and Methods

The last paragraph of a 1977 article by Beverley Kingston foreshadows the general problems raised in this particular biographical study. Kingston wrote:

It seems unlikely, so soon after Mrs. Hoban’s exhausting volume,1 [1973] that we will be offered a thoroughly modern interpretation of the life and work of Caroline Chisholm. It seems even more unlikely that there would be a person equipped with the biographical skills, the necessary patience to sift the not-very-rewarding evidence yet again, and an awareness of the massive complexity of the background and the task. For the type of character and personality of Mrs Chisholm is of the type which no longer attracts that kind of attention. That phase is over when any woman was thought to be progressive and radical merely because she dared to venture into the world of men. At the time of writing it seems likely that among women, even more perhaps than among men conservatism and radicalism are strongly held and deeply ingrained feelings, subtle though their manifestations may be, the modern critics of the Chisholm legend have sensed her essential conservatism and have attempted to link it to feelings about women generally in Australian society. But who will show us that process in reverse, explain to us the kind of society which created and re-created the Caroline Chisholms? (1977, 315).

Kingston is suggesting that a new biography of Chisholm requires a shift from a biographical construction of an exemplary life in which the role of the biographer is basically that of a eulogist singing the praises of a saintly figure, to an approach that attempts to create a better understanding of the person inside that hallowed image. In other words, the move is from the extraordinary to the ordinary woman. This is what is entailed in “a thoroughly modern interpretation of the life and work of Caroline Chisholm”. All well and good, no doubt, but we must be careful about the intrusion of our “modern” sensibilities. “We” may no longer think “any woman ... progressive and radical” because “she dared to venture into the world of men”. This change in appraisal, progressive though it obviously is, should not act as a historical judgement on someone who did venture into the public world of men when such an act did represent a “radical” departure from her established and appropriate sphere. And if “Mrs Chisholm’s” character and personality is “of the type which no longer attracts” the attention of the fine tooth-combing, detailed fact-sifting approach of previous biographers, that is neither the problem of “Mrs Chisholm” nor of her previous biographers. It is a problem arising from what “a thoroughly modern interpretation” of her life and work would look like.

Biographies cannot be other than written in a given present, but they should not see their subject solely through the optic of the present. They should seek somehow to bridge past and present, a task of course that
is far easier said than done. The view taken here is that the move from the construction of saintliness to the construction of an “extraordinary” achievement generated within a historically defined and conditioned life, a life characterised by its “ordinariness”, albeit with a tenacity of spirit, dedication and determination, is one which serves us better in bridging past and present. The exemplary biographies of Hoban and Bogle belittle Chisholm as a person. We can only properly understand Chisholm’s “extraordinary” achievement by approaching her in her “ordinariness” as a person. But of course, to appropriate Miller’s argument concerning previous Brontë biographies, you cannot “sweep away all previous ‘false’ versions of the story” and so resurrect the “true” Chisholm in their place, “as if the dead could be brought, definitively, back to life” (2001, x). In our own lives we are the makers of our own stories, however uncertainly and unevenly. After our death, however, by whatever twist of fate or fortune, this construction of the life narrative may be taken over by others, as has been the case with Caroline Chisholm. What will we gain by a “thoroughly modern” approach if we fail to understand the “kind of society which created and re-created the Caroline Chisholms”? We will only become locked all the more into the “kind of society” that has “created and re-created” the Beverley Kingstons of our times. The problem is the mediation of a past life by the present embedded reconstruction of it. To begin to tackle the problem we can firstly not only sift “the not-very-rewarding evidence yet again”, but also, secondly, sift the not-very-rewarding biographies that previously built on that evidence in order to understand a little better the background of the biographers and the “kind of society” they came from. By doing so perhaps it will lead to a finer understanding of their particular constructions of the historical figure known as Caroline Chisholm. This chapter will therefore proceed from a consideration of the problems of secondary sources to a consideration of the problems of method associated with research for primary documentation.

Eneas Mackenzie was the first to write a memoir of Chisholm, written in her own lifetime. Mackenzie’s work was entitled “Memoirs of Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, with an account of her Philanthropic labours, in India, Australia and England. To which is added a History of the Family Colonisation Loan Society, with its Rules, Regulations, and Pledges. Also the question answered who ought to Emigrate” (hereinafter shortened to Memoirs). The Emigrant’s Guide to Australia with a Memoir of Mrs. Chisholm (Emigrant’s Guide) was published by Mackenzie in London in 1853. Little can be traced of Mackenzie himself. He was the son of Eneas Mackenzie who was born in Aberdeen but moved with his family to Newcastle when an infant. After a short career as a shipbroker in Sunderland, Mackenzie senior became a
private tutor and then opened a school in Newcastle. In 1809 he wrote a history of Egypt. In 1810 he entered into a partnership with John Moore Dent, founding the firm of “Mackenzie and Dent”, printing and publishing works to be sold in periodical parts. Many of the works sold by the company were written, or at least compiled by Mackenzie. The works included histories of Northumberland, Durham and Newcastle. Mackenzie senior was a strong radical, and was Secretary of the Northern Political Union. He was the principal founder of the Newcastle Literary, Scientific and Mechanical Institute in 1824 (Hunt, 1975, 63, Northern Tribune, 1854, Vol. 1, 191). Mackenzie senior gave up his Presbyterian faith to join the Baptists. He was an ardent social reformer and political agitator and as the motto of the Newcastle Press would indicate, the father obviously had a considerable influence upon his son, Chisholm’s biographer (Hunt, 1975, 114/119).

Mackenzie junior did not continue with the profitable part publications of his father’s company, but started a radical newspaper, The Newcastle Press, in 1832. The motto of the paper was “Liberty and Equality ... Universal Suffrage: Annual Parliaments; and Vote by Ballot.” The paper collapsed because of labour difficulties brought about by Mackenzie’s appointment of a large number of apprentices and the restraints imposed upon his journeymen and their ensuing grievances. Mackenzie was boycotted and the Press ceased publication in the summer of 1834. Mackenzie junior purchased the Newcastle circulating library from the radical printer, John Marshall, when Marshall became bankrupt in 1831. The library had been badly managed prior to Mackenzie’s purchase, but he soon re-established the library and 9,000 volumes were listed in 1832. By 1833 Mackenzie junior had handed over the running of the library to his mother, Elizabeth, prior to his emigration to Australia in 1834 (Knott, 1972, 244). He returned to England in 1845 (Chisholm and her family returned to England in 1846) and published educational books in London and wrote guides for Australian emigrants (Hunt, 1975, 63/64).

In his biography Mackenzie junior eulogises Chisholm and her work, yet he:

attended more to positive public facts than to minute personal illustrations as during the lifetime of an individual, more especially a lady, there is ever a feeling of delicacy against gratifying a mere morbid taste by rudely peering behind the veil of domestic life. The recounting the public acts of this amiable female allows no scope for cutting sarcasms and anatomising by the pen (Mackenzie, 1852, iv).

It would not have been thought of as unusual that Mackenzie should feel it indelicate to “gratify a mere morbid taste by rudely peering behind the veil of domestic life”. At the time of writing the public and
personal were kept well apart, especially where women were concerned. It was a time when history was written from the male, public, military perspective, and when biography was written as an exemplar. The achievement of the subject was what mattered, not the “minute personal illustration” and in the kind of society in which Mackenzie lived “girls learned early in life that they were less important than boys” (Perkin, 1993, 6). The “domestic” therefore was of little interest. The quotation also seems to indicate that Chisholm had been the victim of some “ungentlemanly” intrusion into her personal life. Mackenzie is gently chiding, defending Chisholm, but not revealing any wider information. In the few sentences above Mackenzie tells us what he thinks of Chisholm, “this amiable female”. Mackenzie believed all Chisholm’s works were “‘works of mercy’ justly worthy of praise” (Mackenzie, 1852, v).

Mackenzie obviously wrote Memoirs away from his home, and it appears that originally the work was to be serialised. He wrote that he wished to be excused “any slight errors in style, arrangement or typography that may have escaped our notice in passing through the press”. He was “urged to our present undertaking for the pages of a serial publication” and it had “been printed at a distance from our residence” (Mackenzie, 1852, ix). As a consequence one can perhaps forgive Mackenzie for not giving Caroline’s birth date or marriage date for he clearly does not wish to give “minute personal” detail. It is unforgivable of him, however, not to correct the typographical error of giving her husband’s name as ‘Alexander’. Sadly this error was repeated twenty-five years later in Chisholm’s obituary in the ILN.

Mackenzie particularly drew attention to Chisholm’s work with regard to the protection of single women from the “unscrupulous voluptuary” (Mackenzie, 1852, vii). He recalled, in no uncertain terms, the “laxity of national morals ... during the reign of a former monarch” when women were “considered mere automatons of dress and passion”, when “female intellect was derided and shunned, that this ‘noblest work’ of nature might be continued in slavish animal degradation”. Mackenzie was not surprised that this “miasmatic moral depravity was wafted to our colonies where it could riot even more freely”. It pained him to think, “the unprotected children of poverty or of crime were deemed the rightful spoil of degraded minded men, while the lax morality of the colony rendered them callous to feeling, to honour, and manliness.” ² But “morality rejoices”, Mackenzie wrote, “in the brilliant and elevating change effected by the glorious example of a female monarch, as now the domestic, social, and intellectual virtues are cultivated, reverenced and esteemed as a duty that womankind not only owes to herself but to society” (Mackenzie, 1852, 24-26). Mackenzie was reiterating the current thinking on moral attitudes and the position of women as a
civilising/moralising force. Tilt, a contemporary, wrote that “in civilised nations matrons give the tone to society, for the rules of morality are placed under their safeguard” (Tilt, 1852, 261). It was this new Victorian view of womanhood that Mackenzie praised and “rejoiced in”, and it was this Victorian view of womanhood that Chisholm took with her to the colonies. On emigration Mackenzie wrote that Chisholm had:

found the stream polluted, and she has purified it. The weak she has protected, and the poor she has sheltered tenderly and affectionately. With a woman’s courage and resolution she has asserted the dignity of her sex ... The woes and pains of those in affliction were soothed with a nobleness of mind, a disinterestedness of purpose, and a sublimity of virtue, that acts powerfully on our sympathies. We record them that they may be admired and imitated (Mackenzie, 1852, vi/vi).

Mackenzie’s sheer adulation for “this excellent ... admirable lady” cannot be misunderstood (ibid. 34/128). He admires her perseverance: Chisholm “preserved nobly” (ibid. 38) “amid personal sacrifices made every hour of her life, she still earnestly perseveres” (ibid. 152). He also admires her “indefatigable ... zeal on the subject of emigration” (ibid. 136) and wishes her work to encourage others: “to this duty did Mrs Chisholm, in the large benevolence of her heart, applied herself, and the result is one so cheering in its consummation as to stand a noble precedent for others to attempt a similar work of mercy” (ibid. 119). Mackenzie was unequivocal in his view: Chisholm was a “PHILANTHROPIST ! a word mighty in significance, encircles with humanising radiance the name of CAROLINE CHISHOLM.” You cannot miss the implication of Mackenzie’s words. His stance was very much in accord with the “belief in biography as a moral force capable of changing the lives of its reader” which was influential in the 1850s (Miller, 2001, 81).

Mackenzie closes the biography with the words:

Her plans are not confined to the contracted circle of individual interest but it is the duty and work of a government that she is, and has been for some time assiduously labouring to accomplish. On the page of Colonial History, Mrs. Chisholm’s name is now brilliantly written. In the biographical records of the friends of mankind, she has worthily earned a prominent position.

In her God-like mission, self has been absorbed in fervid devotion to the Christian duties of charity and mercy. Her zeal has been apostolic, and with purity of faith, love of mankind, and reliance on God, she has toiled until triumphant. Bequeathing results that will make thousands yet unborn, in their prayers to heaven, call down blessing on the name of the philanthropist CAROLINE CHISHOLM (Mackenzie, 1852, 152).

What is clear is Mackenzie’s view that she had a “God-like mission”. The use of the word “apostolic” (which today would make us think of papal connotations) was more than probably used by Mackenzie in the
sense that Chisholm was an "ardent early supporter of a cause, reform movement" (definition Collins dictionary, 1985). Although Chisholm had moved out of the 'private' realm of the home into the male domain of the 'public' sphere, to Mackenzie she was still continuing the "domestic, social and intellectual virtues" that the Victorians so admired in their women. The Victorians put the woman on the pedestal, as is so clearly seen in Mackenzie's work, yet at the same time kept firmly in her place, subservient to the male. Mackenzie's acclaim for Chisholm in "protecting the weak and sheltering the poor" is seen as an extension of her female role in the private sphere, protecting and sheltering her family. These are virtues that he wished to be admired and imitated. Mackenzie's radicalism, encapsulated in the motto of his Newcastle paper shows that he would also have wished for others to emulate her ardent support for moral and social reform.

Mackenzie's *Emigrant's Guide* continues the same underlying tone: "Health, decency and morality are now provided for in a manner heretofore unknown ... The instrument, in God's hands, of this moral reformation is CAROLINE CHISHOLM" (Mackenzie, 1853, 4). There are, however, discrepancies between the two works and this will be discussed below. The *Memoir* of Mrs Chisholm in the *Emigrant's Guide* is an essay of thirty-two pages in length. The *Guide* gives advice as to who should emigrate, information on the different emigration societies, choice of ship etc. Mrs. Chisholm wrote a chapter of advice on "Outfits" and a short section on "Bush Cookery".

Patricia Grimshaw, writing an introduction to the reprint of Kiddie's biography in 1990, suggested that Mackenzie "knew Chisholm well, as a member of her Colonisation Society, and was acquainted with many of her friends". He was no doubt aware of Chisholm and her work in Sydney before he returned to England in 1845, as there were numerous reports of her work in the Sydney newspapers. I can find no trace, however, of the friendship between Chisholm and Mackenzie prior to his involvement with the FCLS in 1850 (Hoban, 1984, 244), and although he may well have known Chisholm through the Society, one doubts just how well he knew her. In the Preface (*Memoirs*) Mackenzie thanks Samuel Sidney "for many facts which he generously placed at our disposal" (Preface, viii) and talks of his "investigations of the facts placed before the public" (ibid. v). If Mackenzie had known Chisholm that well, one would have thought he would have had more access to Chisholm and would not have had to rely upon Sidney's facts. It would seem churlish not to have given Mackenzie the benefit of doubt when excusing the glaring typographical error of her husband's name, but was it a typographical error? Certainly Mackenzie is very ambiguous in
his references to Chisholm’s birthplace. Either Mackenzie took very seriously his desire to “attend more to positive public facts than to minute personal illustrations” or he did not know Chisholm as well as Grimshaw believed, for his work, as demonstrated, contains some muddled and ambiguous information.

Samuel Sidney, whose help Mackenzie sought when writing his biography, was also an ardent supporter of the cause of emigration. He was born Samuel Solomon in Birmingham in 1813, the son of a well known surgeon. He studied law and became a solicitor, before turning to a life of journalism, at which time he changed his name from ‘Solomon’ to ‘Sidney’. Samuel’s brother John lived in Australia from 1838 to 1844. It is through his brother’s reports that Samuel became fascinated with the colony. Amazingly Samuel himself never visited Australia! Although he was an avid supporter of Australia, he also took a keen interest in agriculture and equine concerns. He was hunting correspondent for the ILN from 1847 to 1857. Sidney contributed to Household Words and many of the articles were concerned with emigration (Lohrli, 1973, 420-423). Sidney’s emigration publications included Sidney’s Emigrant Journal, a weekly journal published between October 1848 and July 1849. In 1848 Sidney published Sidney’s Australian Handbook. This was reprinted nine times by November 1849. Sidney’s Emigrant’s Journal and Traveller’s Magazine was produced monthly for six months during 1849 and 1850. In 1853 Sidney published The Three Colonies of Australia - it was a large four hundred-page volume. Later he became an assistant commissioner for the Great Exhibition in 1851. He was very successful with his novel Gallops and Gossips in the Bush of Australia, (1854) - the reprint of his articles in Household Words. His work The Book of the Horse published in 1873 was his most important work. He died in 1883. (Brissenden & Higham, 1962, 15; Haines, 1997, 170/71, 179/180, 339 n 17.)

The ILN wrote a glowing report of The Three Colonies of Australia in their issue of November 6th 1852: “It is beautifully illustrated and speaks to the eye, no less than to the mind”. At six shillings a copy, however, it was not a book that would have given ready access to the poor. The report commented upon the “delightful” chapter on Mrs. Chisholm with an “account of her disinterested and noble exertions, together with some amusing and graphic notes of her own. Everyone, who knew it not already, can see that she not only possesses an excellent heart, but that she is also a person of extraordinary fortitude, and a most enlightened understanding. She well deserves the title of protectress of the unfortunate and defender of the poor”. It is significant that the ILN reporter was so impressed with the work on Chisholm that he quoted
several paragraphs from the book and the review of Sidney’s book leaves us in no doubt of their high opinion of Chisholm.

Sidney too is eulogistic of Chisholm and her work. In Sidney’s *Emigrant’s Journal and Traveller’s Magazine* of August 1849 he writes:

> The distinguishing characteristic of Mrs. Chisholm is philanthropy - extending to all classes and all sects - directed by a degree of common sense that almost amounts to genius, united with an energy, a zeal, an untiring perseverance that renders nothing she undertakes impossible.

> Her philanthropy is not a mere amusement to be taken up at odd hours, like a new romance - to be laid down as quickly as it was taken up - to be satisfied by a distribution of cheap tracts, or, at most, of cheap superfluous guineas - by capricious visits to poor cottages, whose misery renders the change from the luxurious drawing-room a pleasing excitement. It is a part of her life - of her daily duty. For the cause she embraced she has chosen to abandon the luxuries, nay, the comforts, to which her fortune and station entitled her; to wear stuff instead of silk; to work hard, to live hard, to save, that she may spend upon her poor....

> Thousands have reason to bless Mrs. Chisholm. We find her not like Mrs. Fry - descending from the drawing-room to the prison, to return, carriage-borne, to that drawing-room, when her errand of mercy was done - but in the small room of a small house, in an obscure suburb, writing at a rickety table, amid piles of colonial documents, answers to her thousand correspondents” (285/6).

It would seem that Sidney was not so impressed by the work of Hannah More and her distribution of “cheap tracts”. More faced criticism for her educational programme and her belief that it was a “cruelty and not [a] kindness to educate people above their station in life” (Collingwood, 1990, 77). Neither is Sidney impressed by the philanthropy of “Ladies” who distribute “cheap superfluous guineas - by capricious visits to poor cottages, whose misery renders the change from the luxurious drawing room a pleasing excitement.” Likewise it would appear that Sidney was not impressed by Mrs Fry and her work at Newgate Prison, from which she would return home in the comfort of her carriage to the luxury of her comfortable home.

Sidney cannot understand why tears are wept “when a millionaire endows a church or founds a hospital” which causes no self-sacrifice whatsoever, yet “a head and heart that might with happiness to the world found and govern a colonial empire, toils and moils over the petty economy of household details in order to save for her poor emigrants”. He wonders why Caroline and “her noble-minded husband” who had refused any “pecuniary compensation for their sacrifices” had not been “offered some signal mark of regard for so much wisdom and virtue combined”. He compares the lack of acknowledgement of Chisholm’s work to the knighthood that Charles Trevelyan received “together with a bonus of a few thousands sterling” for a year's
hard work at his duty in Ireland. You cannot accuse Sidney of being subtle in his suggestion that Chisholm’s work should be officially recognised (Aug. 1849, 286).

There is evidence to suggest that Sidney was more of a friend to Chisholm than Mackenzie. For instance he was named as a friend by the *ILN* when he attended a farewell meeting for Chisholm on her departure on the Ballarat on the 10th April 1854 prior to her return to Australia (*ILN*, 15.4.1854, 337). Sidney was also involved with the Family Colonisation Loan Society and would deputise for Mrs. Chisholm at emigration meetings. Sidney himself confessed his friendship and indebtedness to the Chisholms, to whose friendship he attributed his “great and rapid advance in which I may call my colonial education” (Sidney, 1853, iii). As Assistant Commissioner for the Great Exhibition in 1851, he may well have been instrumental in the organisation of Chisholm’s visit during the first three days of the Exhibition with the FCLS emigrants just prior to their departure on the Blundell for Australia on the 10th May 1851. The entrance price at that time was £1 per person, Chisholm successfully petitioned Prince Albert requesting that the emigrants attend paying only one shilling each (*ILN*, 10.5.1851, 378).

Mackenzie had obviously followed Sidney’s style of writing. Sidney’s idealising praise perpetuated the Victorian ideological view of womanhood; he put Chisholm on the ‘pedestal’. Although she had moved into the public male domain, she was figurative mother of the woman’s private world, looking after the interests of her children, the emigrants. The emigrants’ friend. Sidney, although originally a supporter of the Wakefield system of colonisation and land monopoly, became an ardent believer that “land monopoly was the great bar to the popularity of Australia among the working classes” (Sidney, 1853, ii/iii). Sidney attacked Wakefield’s colonial land monopoly in print and at public meetings, and was for a time excluded from any part of the Colonisation Society of Charing Cross, of which he was a member. No doubt Sidney’s admiration for Chisholm considerably increased when he realised that Chisholm had always been an ardent supporter of ‘unlocking of the land’ (Sidney, 1853, iii).

Eneas Mackenzie and Samuel Sidney are very much products of their own time. Their biographies of Chisholm were in tune with current thinking of the period. As Miller remarked, “the Victorian habit of hagiography was not merely a question of sycophantic respect for the dead, since biography was a didactic tool and, as such, it needed to provide aspirational ideals rather than warts-and-all reality” (2001, 81). Indeed when Harriet Martineau reviewed Gaskell’s *Life of Charlotte Brontë* in the *Westminster Review* in
July 1857, she echoed "the views of many when she compared contemporary biography to the saints’ lives of the Middles Ages, and to Plutarch’s biographies, ‘the instructors of the pagan world.’” Martineau went on to observe that such “works... were intended as a spur to action: in the heroes, and the confessors, and martyrs, men saw before them examples of what they, too, might become” (ibid. 81).

**Samuel Smiles** whose work *Self-Help* was published in 1859, was, as Miller comments, one of the most influential Victorian popular biographers. Miller further remarks, Smiles:

> preached the benefits of independence, energy, industry and thrift, promising readers that it was in their own power to improve their lot. Exemplary lives were an important part of his philosophy; ‘Good rules may do much’, he wrote, ‘but good models far more, for in the latter we have instruction in action — wisdom at work. Preferring ‘life rather than literature, action rather than study’ he valued biography as a source of moral inspiration and as a practical tool: ‘Biographies of great ... men ... most instructive and useful as helps, guides, and incentives to others’ (ibid. 81/82).

It is of interest, therefore, to find that Samuel Smiles, under the chapter heading of “Example — Models” also used Chisholm’s life and work as an example. He wrote of Mrs Chisholm’s remarks to Mrs Stowe on the secret of her success [that she] applies to all life. “I found” she said, “that if we want anything *done*, we must go to work and do: it is of no use merely to talk — none whatever”. Smiles continues:

> It is poor eloquence that only shows how a person can talk. Had Mrs. Chisholm rested satisfied with lecturing, her project, she was persuaded, would never have got beyond the region of talk; but when people saw what she was doing and had actually accomplished, they fell in with her views and came forward to help her. Hence the most beneficent worker is not he who says the most eloquent things, or even who thinks the most loftily, but he who does the most eloquent acts (Smiles, 1880, 365/366).

Smiles is obviously not impressed by Mrs. Chisholm’s diction, but nonetheless admires her tenacity and included her work as a source of moral inspiration.

The biographers writing between the mid-nineteenth century, and prior to Kiddle’s work in the mid-twentieth century, tended to write shorter biographies and articles and in the main drew heavily upon the information in Mackenzie’s initial biography.

**Trelawney Saunders**, of Charing Cross, published a small biography in London in 1852. *The Story of the Life of Mrs Caroline Chisholm, The Emigrants’ Friend, and her adventures in Australia* was priced one penny, and would have been readily available to intending emigrants. The pamphlet used material from
Sidney’s Emigrants’ Journal (2nd Series) and Mrs. Chisholm’s own Report of the Emigrants’ Home, Sydney; as well as the Blue Books on Colonisation issued in NSW and on Irish Colonisation before the House of Lords. The pamphlet appears to have been written to answer the question “Who is Mrs. Chisholm?” The answer given states:

... [she] is a lady who is not rich, or related to any great people; but she has been engaged nearly all her life in helping labouring and poor people, by teaching them how to help themselves: and she has succeeded so well, that there are thousands who look upon her with feelings of as much affection as if she were their mother (Saunders, 1852, 1).

The tone of the writing and the price of the pamphlet indicate that it was probably aimed at the poorer end of the market. Saunders, like Mackenzie, Sidney, and Smiles, sees Chisholm’s work as an “aspirational ideal.”

By the 1920s, as Miller records, “biography had become more intimate, more concerned with fashionable Freudian psychology” (2001, 244). Edith Pearson writing in 1914 included a short essay on Chisholm in her collection of essays and poems in Ideals and Realities. However, in line with her interests in ideals, the first chapter starts with a quotation from Carlyle: “For human things do require to have an Ideal in them” (1914, 1). It is easy to speculate that Pearson was perhaps harking back to the earlier biographical form. Yet her chatty essay recounts information supplied by Chisholm’s daughter Caroline, with whom Pearson claimed she had spoken, and the essay peers “behind the veil of domestic life”. Yet the creditability of the essay is somewhat belied by its chattiness, and the chattiness of the book itself by the ‘spiritually-minded’ Pearson. Although Pearson’s essay contains minor inaccuracies, she nonetheless imparts some details of Chisholm’s private life that are not found in other biographies. Some details have been substantiated, while others have been difficult either to prove or disprove.

The work of G. Elliot Anstruther, Organising Secretary of the Catholic Truth Society, was published in England in 1916, as part of the “Women-Workers” series, priced one-penny (Grimshaw, Kiddle, 1990, xxvii). Anstruther’s work draws upon articles in the ILN, The Westminster Review, and Chamber’s Journal as well as the works that Chisholm herself had written. This is a very short biographical work and, as one would imagine, mentions Chisholm’s religious beliefs. Anstruther makes clear however, that her “philanthropic undertakings, were far from the spirit of proselytism” (1916, 4). The brief biography is in line with the new biographical approach in that it had become more intimate and talks of Chisholm’s birth and early years, but the concluding paragraphs hark back to the eulogistic approach with references to
Michelet's reference to Mrs. Chisholm as Australia's "saint" and "legend".

As far as can be ascertained the above are the last biographical sketches that were written in Britain prior to Kiddle's work in 1950. The Australian biographers before Kiddle were Margaret Swann, and Eleanor Dark. Swann was interested in local history and was at one time President of the Paramatta Historical Society. She gave a lecture to the Royal Australian Historical Society on the subject of Chisholm in 1919, and produced her seventy-five-page book Caroline Chisholm – Friend to the Unemployed and Migrants, New South Wales and Victoria 1838 to 1866 in 1925.

As in Chisholm's lifetime, in 1925 the want of labour in Australia was desperate. Swann, as Grimshaw rightly suggests, "was clearly impressed with a specifically Australian reading of Chisholm's work" (Kiddle, 1990, xxviii). Swann felt it "only natural that we [Australia] should extend a hearty welcome to the surplus population of the Motherland when they come to found homes upon our shores ... in the vast unpopulated tracts in Australia" (Swann, 1925, 1). Swann was concerned that Australia was rich in everything that goes to make "wealth and prosperity, except the one essential element - labour". Australia needed labour to develop its resources, and "the welcome she [Australia] gives them [the immigrants] is a very practical one, for everything possible is done to smooth their way, and to guide them until they become accustomed to their new surroundings" (ibid. 2). Swann reiterates Chisholm's own words in a letter to the Sydney press in July 1862 in which she states: "The great want of this country ... is population. We want a body of people to develop the great resources of this country. ... What mind can contemplate such a country as this ... immense tracts of uncultivated land ... without painfully reverting to his suffering, starving country people at home, to wish that they were here" (ibid. 17). Swann is impressed with Chisholm's encouragement of self-help: "Do not ... ask what will the Government do for us? but let your question be: "What shall we do for ourselves" (ibid. 54). Swann significantly details at some length Chisholm's political lectures in Sydney in the late 1850/60s and is obviously impressed by her public works and highlights the fact that Chisholm often felt called upon to justify her right to speak at lectures and to write to men in power. Swann considered that Chisholm was attacking the ideology of the time whereby a woman had no right to enter public politics. She defended Chisholm against an attack by a member of the audience at an 1852 meeting of the NSW Legislative Council who argued that a "woman should use her housekeeping talents only" - to remain firmly in the home attending to household duties. Swann suggested that the
“speaker did not realise that it was her very womanliness and motherliness which prompted Mrs. Chisholm to sacrifice her own comfort in order to accomplish such tasks as the protection of women and children, the reunion of separated families, and similar work” (ibid. 47). In her attempt to justify Chisholm’s work Swann uses more modern phraseology but nonetheless supports the views of Mackenzie and Sidney - the angel in the house moving into the public sphere to continue her ministering to the weak and unprotected. Yet conversely Swann saw Chisholm’s lectures, the fact that Chisholm felt it her human right to address an audience on emigration and to write to men in power on the subject, as an attack on the Victorian idea of the woman firmly ensconced in the private world of the home. Swann saw Chisholm as the woman who “was thought to be progressive and radical merely because she dared to venture into the world of men”.

Eleanor Dark was a woman of literary talent. She was born in Sydney in 1901, and published her first poems at the age of twenty. In 1936 she won the Australian Literary Society’s Gold Medal for her work Return to Coolami. Eleanor Dark was concerned with issues of social justice, and many of her novels were about the meaning of democracy and the motivation for war. Sexual and racial politics were also a substance of much of her fiction (Eldershaw, 1988, 160). Dark contributed an essay on Chisholm to The Peaceful Army: A Memorial to the Pioneer Women of Australia 1788 to 1938. The book was published to celebrate Australia’s sesquicentenary in 1938 and was written specifically to give credit to the contribution that women had made to the development of the country and the culture (ibid. vii). Dark, like Swann, wanted to see Chisholm’s work historically accepted. She was obviously totally impressed by Chisholm’s work and the fact that she stepped outside the realms of the private sphere. Dark wrote, “not half a dozen books by Mary Wollstonecraft could have been more effective ‘vindication’ than the life of this indomitable woman” (ibid. 57). This view stands in stark contrast to that of Australian feminists of the 1960s and 70s who, as noted below, attacked Chisholm’s actions for contributing to the low self-esteem suffered by Australian women in the later half of the twentieth century.

Eleanor Dark’s work shows the advancing techniques of biographical studies. Dark’s chapter puts Chisholm back into context. It may be rather brief, but Dark gives us an understanding of the contextual background of Chisholm’s life. Dark is very aware that “absorbing as the bare record of her [Chisholm’s] almost superhuman endeavours and achievements must always remain, she has a new importance and a new significance when considered in relation to her times” (ibid. 1988, 55). But at the same time Dark notes the “essentially feminine method and approach” of Chisholm’s work. Dark is at pains to note that “the dusting
of a room for a necessarily (even in Victorian times) limited family was, and still is, often taken to be a
greater, a nobler, a more ‘womanly’ work than the improvement of the world for an eventually unlimited
posterity” (ibid, 58). There is a tension between Chisholm as the effective vindication of women, and the
ideal of the Victorian era and of the period of time in which Dark was writing. Dark saw “the respective
attitudes of the average man and the average woman towards the question of human progress” as “roughly
described as the wide idealist and the narrow practical.” Dark suggested that “there [was] no question of
comparing their merits or their usefulness; each has it own sphere and function.” Dark saw her subject as
one who “saw evils she could redress, she saw suffering she could allay, she saw despair and bitterness
which she could dispel.” The tension shows Dark’s difficulty in creating Chisholm as a role model that
symbolised female freedom from social conventions and the contemporary views of Dark’s social
environment.

Margaret Kiddie’s work *Caroline Chisholm* published in Australia is rightly highly regarded. Kiddie’s
work commenced as a Masters thesis at Melbourne University before World War II. She was unable to
complete her thesis until after the war in 1947. For the duration of the war she worked in public service and
in the teaching profession. From 1946 until her death in 1958 she was initially employed as a tutor, and then
as senior tutor in the History Department of Melbourne University. Kiddie’s other works included
children’s books and the historical work: *Men of Yesterday: A Social History of the Western District of
Victoria*, published after her death in 1961. This latter work investigated the lives of the male squatters and
their wives.

Kiddie’s scholarly work was the first full-length narrative biography of Chisholm’s life that had been
meticulously researched and the findings discussed in academic terms. Kiddie placed Chisholm’s life and
work in the context of political and economic immigration and settlement of Australia. Anne Summers in
her general history of women, *Damned Whores and God’s Police*, argued that such scholarly work placed it
within an academic environment and beyond the limits of a general readership. She goes on to say:

There is a double standard of writing and criticism operating here which has ensured that a
vicious circle exists: biographies about women are seldom taken seriously, certainly not in the
way that a political biography of a male politician or some other prominent man is, and hence
biographers of women have tended to internalise both this and the fact that women are
trivialised and not taken seriously within Australia anyway. The result has been a plethora of
chatty, discursive books about Australian women which have concentrated almost totally on
their subjects’ domestic affairs and which have reinforced the practice of not taking
biographies of women seriously (Summers, 1994, 63).
It was unfortunate that Summers chose to illustrate the “double standard” of writing by the use of Kiddle’s biography of Chisholm. Kiddle’s work is far from chatty - as mentioned above it was a biography submitted for an MA thesis, and Chisholm left no personal diaries, documentation or letters from which Kiddle could extract information. But as Summers suggests, the fact that Kiddle’s biography was such a scholarly work may well account for the lack of knowledge of Chisholm by the average Australian.

Sir Douglas Copland suggested in his foreword to Kiddle’s biography, that Kiddle’s book was:

published at a time when many Australian women feel a sense of frustration, largely because we seem to have lost the pioneering spirit of which Mrs. Chisholm was the living embodiment. For devoted and unselfish service to a great cause her life has no parallel in Australian history. As such, the book should be an inspiration at a time when inspiration is needed” (Kiddie, 1957, ix).

As with Dark, Kiddle was aware of the concerns of the woman’s role and gender relations both in the 1950s and the mid-nineteenth century, the period of Chisholm’s work. Kiddle was concerned as to why Chisholm, faced with all the prejudices that she had to overcome as a woman in the mid-nineteenth century, did not move forward to an understanding of the wider issues behind the restrictions and the lack of opportunities for women of her class. Kiddle appreciated that the massive amount of time Chisholm spent on her work would not have left much time for such questioning, and accepted that Chisholm was no rebel or theorist. In spite of her own career Chisholm did not actively seek equality with men. But, as will be noted later, she did not believe that “Almighty God sent females into the world to be cooks and housemaids all their days” (Northampton Mercury, 5.3.1853) (see chapter ten). Chisholm was not alone in this respect. Fry, for instance, is not seen as a “feminist” in that she rehabilitated the female prisoners to fulfil their allotted place in life. Yet as van Drenth and de Haan suggest, she was “indeed a pioneer of the women’s movement, whereas Butler, who wanted women to be treated equally with men, was a feminist (1999, 47) (See Introduction).

Kiddle supported Sir Keith Hancock’s premise that Chisholm “established the dignity of womanhood and the family in New South Wales” (Kiddle, 1990, xxix). As Grimshaw remarks, however, “Kiddle does not proceed to analyse the meaning of Chisholm’s agenda for poorer single women, namely, their movement into household service and then into matrimony” (ibid. xxxii). By interpreting Chisholm’s work in this manner Kiddle was able to suggest that Chisholm “altered the attitude of the community to female
immigration, and by fostering family life, she raised the social standard of the whole colony” (ibid.).

Kiddle’s work is not the glowing, gushing admiration of Mackenzie and Sidney, but Kiddle obviously found “Chisholm’s work constructive, positive and effective.” Her book is a “careful commentary on Chisholm’s work as a reformer, as an advocate for poor women and for parents of young children” (ibid, xxx, xxxi). But as Grimshaw notes, the language and the judgements Kiddle makes throughout the biography reveal Kiddle’s own world - that of a middle-class woman raised in the 1920s and 1930s. Kiddle’s work is narrative and chronological; only limited space is given to a discussion of the influences on and motivation of Chisholm, the success of her work and the prejudices of historians ignoring her achievements. Of a more trivial nature, the index is extremely inconsistent.

As Kiddle’s biography revealed her own world, so too does the work of the Australian feminists writing in the 1960s and 1970s. Kingston’s reference to Chisholm’s “essential conservatism” refers to the tendentious attempts by Australian feminists to link her work of placing single women in positions of servant, adjacent to where single men were living, to feelings about women generally in Australian society in the 1960s and 1970s. The Australian feminists related the position of women in society at that time with what they regarded as Chisholm’s “conservative” attitude in the 1840s. Such links and relations are tenuous indeed. The twentieth-century feminists created their own anti-feminist Caroline Chisholm to explain attitudes towards women within their own society, ignoring the historical contextualisation of Chisholm and her work.

Mary Hoban, who was born at Kyneton (where the Chisholms once lived), viewed Chisholm’s work far differently. Hoban too was educated at the University of Melbourne where she obtained an Honours Arts degree. She also obtained a Diploma in Education. She studied Australian history and later taught for three years in secondary schools prior to her marriage and life at Kilmore, where she continued her interest in Australian history. She was a member of the Historical Commission and sponsor of the Canonisation Cause for Chisholm.

Hoban’s work, Caroline Chisholm - A Biography - Fifty-one Pieces of Wedding Cake is very different in style to that of Kiddle. Hoban aimed to include “more details of human interest” and to “present Caroline’s thinking expressed in her own language” as a way “towards the recognition she deserves from the Australian
nation and the Christian church” (1984, ix). Hoban consciously decided to cross the fine dividing line between historical biography and historical novel. Hoban also chose to distance herself, as Grimshaw notes “from the secular radical feminism that was shaking accepted views of femininity in Australia in the early 1970s” (Kiddle, 1990, xxxiii). Ultimately, however, as Grimshaw further notes, Hoban’s quest [was] linked to those changing attitudes to gender which were not to leave religious institutions untouched” (ibid.).

This religiosity is clearly stated at the commencement of Hoban’s biography. She remarks that she hopes “that it may take her [Chisholm] one step further on the way towards the recognition she deserves from the Australian nation and the Christian church.” Hoban immediately informs her readers of the stance she is about to take. She does not hide her Catholicism or the fact that she was a sponsor for the cause for canonisation of Caroline Chisholm. It was at the Australian Conference of Catholic Laity, held in Sydney in the April 1976, that delegates asked the Bishops of Australia to consider the cause for Caroline Chisholm. The Bishops’ Conference authorised a prayer that could be said for the furtherance of the cause, and Hoban included the prayer in the Australian Catholic Truth Society publication of her short biography of Chisholm published in July 1977.

Hoban’s sponsorship and support of Chisholm’s cause went hand in hand with her wish for wider recognition of Chisholm’s work. The role of “founding mother”, as Hoban remarks, “was freely acknowledged in her lifetime. Hoban is quick to use the quotations from Henry Parkes’ newspaper The Empire in 1859 which claimed that: “If Captain James Cook discovered Australia ... if John Macarthur planted the first seeds of its extraordinary prosperity ... If Ludwig Leichhardt penetrated and explored its before unknown interior - Caroline Chisholm has done more; she has peopled ... she alone has colonised it in the true sense of the term”. Hoban’s works on Chisholm demonstrate her “goodness”, her “saintliness”. In terms of academic research however, as Grimshaw indicated, Hoban’s biography “had little impact on academic attitudes” (Kiddle, 1990, xxxiii).

The lack of academic recognition may stem from the way Hoban reproduced large numbers of documents within the biography. Indeed Kingston’s comment concerning Hoban’s “exhausting volume” may well refer to the to the reproduction of historical material. Regrettably, however, there are minor, although not insignificant, inaccuracies in the reprinting of the documentation which create difficulties. For instance, in Appendix 2 Hoban reproduces the Phrenological Report that Mackenzie documents in Memoirs with the
date of January 30th 1833 (1852, 143-148). For whatever reason, Hoban saw fit to add the word “Brighton” to the date at the end of the report, and to include wording that emphasised that the report was compiled in Brighton in the main body of the report. Hoban obviously could not substantiate when or where the study was undertaken, and has surmised that, as Mackenzie suggests, Chisholm was in Brighton after her marriage in 1830, then the report must have been written in Brighton. Although the additions may appear insignificant, they are highly misleading and incorrect. New evidence suggests that Chisholm returned to Northampton, possibly only honeymooning in Brighton. It was in Northampton in October 1831 that Chisholm gave birth to her first child, who died there three weeks old. Hoban acknowledges that she has not included the Phrenological report in the body of her work due to “some uncertainty in dates”, but does not acknowledge the source of the work (Hoban, 1984, 421/2). Even allowing for Hoban’s semi-fictionalised historical biography, this additional material incorporated within what appears to be an authenticated historical document is dishonest, to both reader and future biographers. Lucasta Miller makes the point that “we should not see biography as a failed empirical science striving to produce definitive, objective results but doomed to failure.” She continues:

Nor should we take the extreme postmodernist line which completely collapses the distinction between biography and fiction, regarding both as undifferentiated ‘textual constructs’. Instead we should regard it as an amphibious art form, which ideally has both to obey the constraints of evidence and to respond creatively to the challenge of making shape, form and meaning (2001, 169).

While agreeing with Miller that the fine dividing line between biography and fiction should not be withdrawn, and that, ideally, biography should “obey the constraints of evidence and respond creatively to the challenge of making shape, form and meaning”, there must also be a fine dividing line as to the extent of the creativity. The above misrepresentation, and other such misrepresentations within Hoban’s biography, must raise questions of the validity and extent of such creativity. Sadly it detracts from the five years very hard work undertaken by Hoban that produced new evidence of Chisholm’s life and work.

The first biography published in Britain since the beginning of the century is that by Joanna Bogle, published in 1993. Regrettably the book is very disappointing. Joanna Bogle is a journalist, author and broadcaster and her biography Caroline Chisholm - The Emigrant’s Friend is only one-hundred and fifty-seven pages in length, has no index, and is written very much in a “chatty” journalistic style. Like Hoban, she too is a Roman Catholic, and is concerned with Chisholm’s “goodness”. Bogle debates, albeit briefly, some of the values and standards of family life that Chisholm advocated in terms of the values and standards
of family life in Britain today. She reflects that Chisholm's encouragement of people to have "faith in their own courage, resilience, independence of spirit, and desire to succeed" is the sort of "far-sighted acceptance of the potential of the human spirit" that is very much needed today (Bogle, 1993, 154). Bogle's bibliography contains two works - that of Kiddle and Hoban, although she does refer to Mackenzie's work in one of her few footnotes. Some details of new evidence have been traced, but there are also some basic ill-researched errors - "the Reverend B. Winthrop", Bogle wrote, was a Roman Catholic priest, when in fact he was the Anglican Vicar of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at the time of Caroline's marriage in December 1830. On the whole the book adds little to the Chisholm debate. The book has, however, brought Chisholm to the attention of a limited public in Britain and Australia.

To sift through the major biographies of Chisholm reflects the changing attitudes towards her and the changing attitudes to biographical studies. It also highlights how Mackenzie's ambiguities and errors have been used and reused by following biographers creating myths about Chisholm's place of birth, and the time spent in Brighton for instance. What also becomes apparent is that the last two biographies of Chisholm have come full circle in their attitude towards her. Mackenzie and Sidney created the saint-like woman, the woman on the pedestal, the model of the angel in the house who moved into the public arena to care for the poor emigrants as a mother would care for her children. A model strictly to be emulated. Hoban makes no secret of her wish that the Roman Catholic Church "will raise her [Chisholm] to the position from which she can continue her good work" (1984, x). Bogle emphasises that Chisholm's "life has many useful messages for today - the championing of family values, common sense, practicality, the belief in human capacity to overcome problems and to achieve", and, particularly, her "sincere, but never dogmatic religious beliefs" (1993, viii, 155). Hoban and Bogle's biographies contain the overtone of the saintly woman.

Methods and Problems

The sources above, along with the minor biographies, formed the basis from which to begin research for primary documentation. As a main concern was to establish Chisholm's family background in order to ascertain some idea of the motivation and influences behind her work, a genealogical research was undertaken at Northampton Records Office (NRO). This was very time-consuming. Chisholm's father, William Jones, who possessed very common first and second names, had been married four times and had sixteen children! At length, though, the accumulation of data from wills, census returns, legal documents
and briefs, land tax assessments, local directories and papers, militia lists, maps, parish records, poor law books, rate books, records of the local barracks, school records, and discussions with local historians, enabled a picture to emerge of Chisholm's family, the work they undertook and the businesses they ran, which in turn enabled an insight into the social standing of the family.

Hoban's biography gave details of William Jones's will and the precise information of Chisholm's birth, which was the key to finding the names of her siblings, her half-brothers and sisters, and from there building on the information accessed. What soon became apparent, however, was Hoban's misinformation with regard to the signatures of the witnesses on William Jones's will. On the surface it would appear a trivial error, but the fact that the signatures of 'Rob. Abbey, Geo. Abbey and Mr. Penfold' were transcribed as "Mr Penfold and the two abbés" who were together taken into his [William Jones's] room to witness the will, implies a Catholic connotation and as such has an impact on the reading of Hoban's work. Hoban further suggests that "poor William could hold the pen only well enough to make his mark" and that such remarks "hurt her [Chisholm] to think of her father being unable to do anything he wanted to do" (Hoban, 1984, 5).

The implication is that William Jones was too ill to sign his name, and by inference he was an educated man able to read and write. Whereas William Jones came from a labouring family, and neither he nor his four wives signed their respective marriage registers or wills. They all put their mark. Hoban coerces the reader in to drawing conclusions that are not consistent with the actual findings.

The extent to which reliance and credence can be given to previous biographies is also highlighted by Mackenzie's misleading information regarding the newly weds' sojourn in Brighton. Mackenzie merely stated that Caroline and Archibald spent their time in Brighton before their departure to India. This misinformation is perpetuated through all the following biographies. Bogle, Chisholm's last biographer, devotes a whole chapter to Brighton but could not come up with any reliable information as to why the Chisholms spent their time there. As Archibald left England in January 1832 and Caroline did not arrive in Madras until August 1833, it inevitably raises the question as to why Caroline stayed in Brighton when her family was in Northampton. One possibility was that Brighton, with its connections with Catholicism, was chosen to allow Caroline to learn about the Catholic faith. Very detailed research was undertaken at the Sussex Records Office, the Catholic Archives in Sussex and Brighton Central Library to find possible links with the Chisholms and Brighton. No link could be found. As already noted, research at NRO revealed the burial of a child, Caroline Chisholm, three weeks old, on 26th October 1831 at the church where
Caroline and Archibald had married nine months earlier on the 27th December 1830. Such information suggests that Caroline returned to live close to her family in Northampton, and did not live alone in Brighton after Archibald’s departure for Madras in January 1832. This appears more logical. This episode not only highlights how myths are created through telling and retelling, but also shows the importance of checking, where possible, such information against primary sources.

The use of primary sources, however, also raises questions of reliability and interpretation. For instance the wording of William Jones’s will (for full text, see Appendix 1) leaves the reader wondering why Robert and Caroline, the fifth and seventh child from William’s marriage to Sarah (nee Allum), are singled out at the beginning of the will. Robert was to receive “all that my close or inclosed ground with the appurtenances situate and being near Castle Hills”. Caroline was to receive: “all that my messuage or tenement with the appurtenances situate standing and being in Bearward Street ... now or late in the tenure or occupation of my son William Jones”. Later the will refers to “… the said last mentioned premises [in the Mayorhold] unto and equally between my five children by my said wife, namely Charlotte, Thomas, Mary Ann, Sarah and Harriet ...” Harriet was the sixth child from the marriage. Robert and Caroline could have been singled out as they were favourite children. Specific properties may have been left to them as a way of ensuring that should Sarah Jones remarry her new husband, under the Married Woman’s Property Act, would not be entitled to claim those properties left to Caroline and Robert. But why not leave Harriet a property?

Other primary sources also raise questions concerning the interpretation to be placed upon such documents. Caroline’s baptismal record reads “Caroline, daughter of Sarah and William Jones”. Studies show that this is an unusual form of registering the baptism. For all the children of William Jones, including Robert, baptism records state: “son/daughter of William and his respective wife, either Elizabeth, Mary, Mary or Sarah Jones”. The registration of Caroline’s baptism could have been a whim of the officiating officer, but it is a rare form of registration. Studies of baptismal records show that the normal format is to record the father’s Christian name, then the mother’s first name and then surname.

The 1851 census return for Islington lists Caroline Chisholm as head occupant at 3 Charlton Crescent, (at the time of the census Archibald was at sea returning to Australia). The name of Sarah Laws is recorded at 3 Charlton Crescent, and the entry reads, relation to the head “Mother, widow, aged eighty-four, landed
proprietor, born in Nottingham”. The 1851 census return for St. Sepulchre’s parish records Sarah Jones, aged eighty-one, living at the family property of 11 Mayorhold, Northampton. In view of the will and Caroline’s baptismal record, exhaustive researches were undertaken to establish the validity or otherwise of the Islington and Northampton census returns. It was not merely dismissed as a fundamental error by the enumerators.

The primary sources could be interpreted in a number of ways. Was Caroline the illegitimate daughter of Sarah Laws and William Jones? Hence the baptismal record “Caroline, daughter of Sarah and William Jones”. A widow Laws is registered in the Poor Rate Book of St. Sepulchre’s parish church living in the Mayorhold. Is this why Caroline was singled out from the other children from the marriage to Sarah Jones, nee Allum, in her father’s will? The will of Sarah Jones however includes Caroline Chisholm as one of her five daughters. Sarah Jones died in 1859. Caroline was, by this time, a very well known woman. The announcement of the wedding of Archibald Chisholm and Caroline Jones in the Northampton Mercury states “Caroline, youngest daughter of the late William Jones”. It does not give the mother’s name. However the marriage of Caroline’s sister, Harriet, also states that she is the “daughter of the late Mr. Jones, of this place.” Presumably this was common practice and of no significance.

An alternative reading could be the possibility that Caroline was fostered out to Sarah Laws, but was the child of Sarah Jones. It was not an uncommon occurrence during the Victorian period for a child to be given to a widow to help her overcome her bereavement. Rarely were such arrangements legally recorded. Sarah Jones had produced seven children in the space of nearly fifteen-and-a-half years - late December 1792 to late May 1808. She may have welcomed the opportunity for her youngest to be brought up by another woman. Pearson relates information given to her by the Chisholm’s daughter Caroline who remembered her mother telling her that as a small child

when living with an aged lady in Northampton, a burglar got into the house. Both little girl and old lady heard him and got up. When they came out of their room he was at the foot of the staircase, they on the top. The child immediately, with the presence of mind of a grown person, thought of a bunk of picked coal on the landing, and the little creature, assisted by the old woman, showered down on the surprised marauder, with all the force they had, great lumps of coal (Pearson, 1914, 92).

The recollection shows the quick wittedness and bravery of the young Caroline Jones, but it is also significant in that it would seem to indicate that Caroline lived with someone other than her family.
Chisholm's novelette *Little Joe* is concerned with young Joe being brought up by a neighbour following his father's death and his mother's illness necessitating her being taken to the Benevolent Asylum (where she later dies).

Yet another alternative could be that Sarah Laws was paid to educate Caroline and took her into her home to do so. Caroline seems to have been educated above the standards of her brothers and sisters, and half-brothers and sisters, who tended to be trades-people. This is, of course, supposition, and the census returns may well have been coincidental errors on the part of the enumerators. But such questions of interpretation, correct reading and reliability have to be considered. The difficulties are such that Emily Brontë's biographer Virginia Moore, writing in 1936, who claimed she had “paid especial and respectful attention to primary sources” had problems in reading old handwriting and interpreted the title of a poem 'Love's Farewell' as 'Louis Paresell'. She went on to invent a spurious lover of that name (Miller, 2001, 242,3).

Primary sources were sought through the Mitchell Library in Sydney and the National Library in Canberra, both of whom kindly sent lists of their holdings on Chisholm. Where necessary, copies of information were obtained, either collected by friends and relatives visiting Australia, or by postal services, including passenger lists of FCLS ships and emigration agents' reports for example. The disadvantage of not visiting Australia meant that detailed research could not be made of indexes and catalogues to search records that have not been catalogued under Chisholm, as for instance in the case of personages with whom Chisholm worked who may possibly have left letters or references concerning her.

Wherever possible information was tracked down to archives in Britain: the British Library, The Royal Commonwealth Society Library (prior to its move to Cambridge University Library) the Fawcett Library and the British Library Newspaper Library who have holdings of most of the Australian newspapers and of course the Public Records Office at Kew. Surprisingly the NRO and Northampton Central Library did not have information concerning their famous daughter, although the latter did have a copy of Hoban’s biography. The archives of Northampton’s Catholic Cathedral, the Cathedral of Our Lady and St. Thomas, contain limited information on Chisholm. The *Parliamentary Papers*, reprinted by the Irish University Press, have proved an invaluable source of primary information. They contain letters between home and colonial government with reference to Chisholm and her letters to various government officials, as well as Chisholm’s evidence to select committees, both here in England and in Australia. They also contain
Colonial Governors' reports on the colonies, with general and statistical information. A list of all the various organisations, archives, libraries and individuals visited or communicated with are listed in the acknowledgements.

Information that was amassed led to other areas of research. As has been shown above, there were discrepancies in the biographies and it was therefore difficult to rely on their evidence. For instance, information suggested that Nightingale worked for Chisholm, but no concrete evidence was cited. This led to research of Nightingale's manuscript letters at the British Library, at the Wellcome Institute, St. Thomas's Hospital and Claydon House, the home of the Verney family (Nightingale's sister married Sir Harry Verney). Research established that Nightingale knew of Chisholm, there were letters written by Nightingale mentioning her name. However investigations were not able to substantiate the fact that Nightingale worked for Chisholm, although this fact appears in O'Malley's biography of Nightingale (1931, 191). Correspondence with Professor I. B. Smith, author of the more recent and academic research entitled Florence Nightingale - Reputation and Power (1982), established that there was no information or letters or diary entries to substantiate O'Malley's statement. Smith was emphatic that Nightingale was not the sort of person to have worked for anyone!

 Detailed research was also undertaken to try and fill the gaps in the earlier biographies. For instance, there is only limited information about the FCLS and the school in India that Chisholm founded. Where they were available, research was undertaken of archival material of those members listed on the Committee of the FCLS, almost invariably without success. Contact was made with archives in India, whose limited response arrived three years later! Investigations were also undertaken at the British Library India and Oriental Office Collections. Where there were any, the archives of personages that seemed to crop up in the various writings on and of Chisholm were also studied. For instance Chisholm met William Rathbone, the Mayor of Liverpool, when she visited the town to give a talk on emigration in 1853. Chisholm named the school she opened in Australia 'Rathbone House', and when the school moved, she renamed it 'Greenbank', the name of the Rathbone home in Liverpool. In this instance research proved profitable. The diaries of Rathbone's wife, Elizabeth, mention the Chisholm family and gave addresses in London and Cheltenham. Elizabeth's papers also contained the previously unknown-signed Carte-de-Visite of Chisholm taken in Cheltenham in the late 1840s, the home, it transpired, of Archibald's brother. This was an exciting find as portraits of Chisholm have tended to be taken from Hayter's painting or from the rather
In Sir Douglas Copland's forward to Kiddle's biography in 1950, he wrote: "Though averse to any display of force, her [Chisholm's] thinking had been influenced by the Chartists during her stay in England [1846-1854], and in public lecturers on her return to Australia she supported part of their platform" (Kiddle, 1957, ix). Kiddle did not add a great deal further to this surmise, and Hoban and Bogle did not follow up on this information. This seemed an interesting area for research and consequently studies were made of numerous books on Chartism, especially in connection with the Chartist land company, the biographies of a number of Chartists (Gammage and Cooper for example) as well as research in Northampton of early radicalism in the town. This very interesting research showed that Chisholm probably developed an awareness of radicalism during her adolescence in Northampton, which is related in the chapter on Chartism.

Chisholm's thinking was undoubtedly also influenced by her Anglican upbringing and by her conversion to the Catholic faith. In an endeavour to ascertain information as to exactly when she converted to the faith, very detailed research was undertaken to substantiate where and when Chisholm was received into the Roman Catholic Church. In spite of an inordinate amount of research, the date and place remain elusive. Every possible avenue of research has been conducted in Northampton, Scotland, Brighton, India and Australia and of numerous Catholic archives. In order to marry Archibald, a Roman Catholic, Caroline, at that time, needed to convert to his faith. That she did so was a brave decision at a time of anti-Catholic aggression. The chapter on Catholicism looks at the implications of Chisholm's decision as it affected her throughout her life.

Bogle related new information with regard to Archibald Chisholm, who has been relatively ignored by earlier biographers, and which has been expanded upon by current research. Bogle gives very limited information as to the conditions that Archibald and Caroline would have faced living in India. Searches at the British Library India and Oriental Office Collections and communication with the Archives in Madras and Bombay have added to Bogle's information. Studies of diaries and biographies of men and women, who were in India at roughly the same time as the Chisholms, give contextual information of the period. Research has shown that Caroline not only established the school in Madras, but travelled with her husband to the Company's Military Stations. The birth of one of the two sons born in India is given as the military station of Secunderabad, three hundred and ninety-four miles from the Principality of Madras.
Earlier biographers of Chisholm have quoted freely from Chisholm's writings and from her lectures to add content to their narrative/chronological works, but none have evaluated her work or looked at the practical strategies Chisholm utilised. This is a very important area of study of Chisholm's work that has been overlooked. For instance, Kiddle gave little attention, and certainly does not analyse, the four political lectures that Chisholm delivered in Sydney from 1859-1861. Bogle does not mention the lectures at all, and Hoban, although she pays more attention than Kiddle, merely regurgitates reports of the lectures, to a limited extent. This was felt to be an important area of research that had been neglected in studies of Chisholm and that an analysis of the lectures would give further insight into her motivation and beliefs. Chisholm's attitude toward the position of women may be seen from her lectures. She may not have supported female suffrage per se, but by defending a woman's right to speak on public affairs, and by encouraging women to read newspapers, to think about the issues of the day, and to assert their influence, she made it easier for the women who followed to bring about reforms.

Chisholm was also a prolific writer of letters to papers both in Sydney and London. She wrote a series of fifteen articles for Douglas Jerrold's *Weekly Newspaper* and her lectures in Liverpool were reprinted in the *Liverpool Mercury* in April 1853 entitled: "Mrs Chisholm's Advice to Emigrants". Charles Dickens also supported Chisholm's work by publishing a joint article with Chisholm in his first issue of *Household Words*. Further articles on emigration appeared on a regular basis in *Household Words* written amongst others by Samuel Sidney and Douglas Jerrold. Chisholm's development as a writer can be seen from her first rather muddled writing of the first year's report of the Immigration Barracks in *Female Immigration* to the more mature writings of the later publications. However two of the publications are written in such a different style that it raises the question as to whether Caroline received Archibald's help, and this will be discussed in chapter ten.

The serial publication of Chisholm's novelette *Little Joe* in the Australian daily paper *The Empire* (1859/60) cannot be classed as a piece of classic literature. It is an opportunity, however, to obtain an understanding of Chisholm's thinking as, for instance, when she supports raising pigs to help family finances (a hint of home life) and her political viewpoints on Sunday observance. Kiddle, Hoban and Bogle were unaware of this novelette when writing their biographies.
Nineteenth century biographies of women tended to be of women "who might fairly be considered representative of the higher qualities of Womanhood – such qualities as patriotism, religious enthusiasm, fidelity, moral courage, fortitude, devotion and the capacity of governing" (Purvis, 1995, 2). By the time Kingston was writing in 1977 “the growth of feminist women’s history ... was intertwined with the politics of the women’s liberation movement, and especially with socialist feminist historians” (ibid. 7). By the late 1980s feminist women’s history had moved to discussions of poststructuralism which, as Joan Scott suggested, could “transform feminist women’s history through focusing on gender” (ibid. 12). The shift from women’s history to gender history, as Purvis articulates, “decentres the study of women as women” and therefore “the material forces that shaped women’s lives as wives, mothers, sisters, mistresses, lovers, employees, political activists and friends, receives little attention” (ibid. 13). Such viewpoint can also lead to a “situation where women are no longer seen as agents in history, challenging and resisting some of the inequalities they have experienced” (ibid.). As Purvis further suggests, writing a “national [British] women’s history” is further complicated by “Britain’s entry into the European Union and the desire to place ‘British’ women within a broader, European context” (ibid. 15). This more than adequately demonstrates the complexities of writing a history of a female subject. In the mid-nineteenth century Chisholm was an "exemplary" figure, who, by the time Kingston was writing, was no longer “progressive and radical” because “she dared to venture into the world of men” and who no longer attracted attention. Today’s “feminist women’s historians”, Purvis suggests, should “research and explore women’s differences while also acknowledging and recognising the common ground of these female genders against male genders” (ibid 14). By carefully reading Chisholm’s previous biographies and carefully searching the “not-very-rewarding evidence” yet again, as well as analysing Chisholm’s writings and lectures and looking at the strategies she used as a woman in a man’s world, Chisholm’s “extraordinary” achievement will become clearer. By approaching Chisholm’s “extraordinariness” through her “ordinariness” we can recognise her difference from her female contemporaries and appreciate the problems she and her female contemporaries faced in a male-orientated world. To do so, we need to place Chisholm’s life in context, place her in her own world. This is the task of the following chapters.

1 It would be interesting to know why Kingston regarded Hoban’s biography of Chisholm as an “exhausting volume”. Was the volume exhausting to Kingston as a reader, or did she surmise it was exhausting to Hoban in the writing of the volume? Or both? Or was there a slip of the pen from “exhaustive” to “exhausting”?

2 The lavishness of Mackenzie’s denunciatory language would seem to suggest a covert fascination with “miasmatic moral depravity”.

3 The eminent French historian and author Jules Michelet, devoted a chapter on Chisholm in his book La Femme, Paris, 1862, 657 ff, (translation). Michelet wrote that “the fifth part of the world, Australia, has
up to now but one saint, one legend .... The richest and most powerful government in the world ... failed in colonization .... where a simple woman succeeded by her force of character and her vigour of soul”.

Chisholm pre-empts Kennedy’s famous quotation in his inaugural address on the 20th January 1961. “Fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you but what together we can do for the freedom of the man”. Research indicated that the quotation originated from the work of Oliver Wendell Holmes, senior, 1809-1894. He founded the Atlantic Monthly with J. R. Lowell in 1857. It would be pushing the realms of feasibility to suggest that Chisholm’s quotation came to the notice of Holmes. The two moved in widely differing circles, and although Holmes did come to England there is nothing to suggest they would have met. Holmes resided in Boston USA. Kennedy’s paternal great grandfather, Patrick Kennedy, emigrated to Boston from the small Irish village of Dunganstown in 1848. Again there is no reason to suppose that Patrick Kennedy (who, as an emigrant, could well have been aware of Chisholm’s work) would have moved in the same circles as Holmes. An interesting thought nonetheless.

Formerly vice-chancellor of the Australian National University, Canberra.

Sir Keith Hancock was an eminent Australian historian whose history of Australia appeared in print in Sydney in 1945 (Kiddle, 1957, 236-247).

Robert sold the land c1821 following his marriage and twenty-first birthday and just prior to his emigration to America. Regrettably I have been unable to find out if Caroline actually did receive the inheritance.

The name ‘Laws’ is written quite clearly, and it is not a corrupted writing of ‘Jones’.

Note that the notice for Harriet’s wedding, reads “late Mr. Jones, of this place” i.e. Northampton, not Wootton.

Hoban relates this incident, without acknowledgement, to Pearson. Hoban’s interpretation suggests that Caroline was alone in the house with an elderly woman who helped her mother. The inference being that they were actually in the Jones family home (1984, 9).

Hayter’s portrait was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1852, where it attracted much attention (Hoban, 1984, 282). The Daguerreotype by Beard appeared in the ILN on the 17th April 1852 (see discussion of painting in chapter six).
CHAPTER THREE

ENGLAND 1808-1833

The purpose of this chapter, and the following chapters on Empire and Emigration, is to outline the main pattern of development in Chisholm's life, setting this in its general social and political context as appropriate. Areas of new research will be highlighted, and Chisholm's pamphlets, lectures, newspaper letters and articles and evidence to Parliamentary and Legislature Council will be discussed as opposed to mere reportage of such items as in previous biographies. The chapters will act as a link from the Introduction and Sources, Methods and Problems by giving biographical information that will enable a fuller discussion in the following chapters of the political and religious influences upon Chisholm, putting her philanthropy in context and examining, again by analytical study of Chisholm's lectures and pamphlets, her attitude toward the position of women in the mid-nineteenth century.

As already noted, previous biographers have presumed that Mackenzie's Memoir was correct in stating that Caroline Chisholm, née Jones, was born in Wootton, about two miles south of Northampton. The biographies contain very little information with regard to Chisholm's family background. As a consequence we have been unable to understand the influences upon the young Chisholm or gain any insight into the possible motivation of her philanthropy. Very lengthy and detailed research was therefore required. This was undertaken in order to build a profile of Chisholm's family, and to "peer behind the veil of domestic life", in the hope that such information would help toward an understanding of her motivation and the social environment and influences that shaped her.

The results of the genealogical research conducted have conclusively established that Chisholm was born in the Mayorhold in Northampton on the 30th May 1808. The misinformation as to Chisholm's place of birth in earlier biographies no doubt arises from the fact that her father, William Jones, was born in Wootton, and baptised there on the 30th March 1744. William was the son of John, a farm labourer, and his wife Mary, probably née Plowman, who had four other sons and one daughter. William, and his younger brother Plowman, both showed considerable initiative and worked extremely hard to raise their living standard from that of their father. Plowman took advantage of the growing sheep farming industry within the parish and started his working life as a shepherd, but by the time he died in 1821 he was working as a lace manufacturer. A lace manufacturer usually indicated a middleman, a local dealer of lace who collected lace from the makers at the village inn, and would then travel to the London markets to sell the lace. Plowman,
however, quite likely travelled to the nearer market at Newport Pagnell where vast quantities of lace were sold (Pinchbeck, 1969, 205). Dealing in lace was quite profitable. Plowman’s personal estate on his death in Wootton in 1821 was declared as being under £300. He bequeathed “a yard, Garden Ground and appurtenances thereabouts” to his son, William, and other real estate cottages and closed land to his wife which on her death was to be sold and divided between the other children. Unlike his elder brother William, Plowman was able to sign his will. He worked his way up from being a shepherd to a lace manufacturer and bequeathed an estate that shows just how far his determination and hard work had carried him from his father’s humble beginnings. This characteristic is clearly seen in Chisholm’s father and Chisholm herself.

William Jones was only eighteen when he first married in Wootton, nearly six months following the birth of his first child. To have a child outside wedlock however was not thought to be unusual at that time. A premarital pregnancy proved fertility, especially at a time when the family remained an important unit of production (Rendall, 1990, 38, 40). Possibly William moved with his young family to Duston to obtain work as a shoemaker. Wootton was a typical Midland agricultural locale, with people living in the village and moving out daily to tend their land (Rice, 1991, 20). William was married four times, and had sixteen children, of whom Caroline was the youngest. His two first wives died in childbirth. His third wife quite possibly died from a disease caught from nursing a stepchild who died not long before her.

It was following the marriage to his third wife that the family moved into the Mayorhold in Northampton, no doubt to be near his wife’s family who lived in the adjoining parish. Northampton was a compact, thriving, lively, market town, in a successful agricultural county. It was “pleasantly situated” sixty-six miles from London on the “thoroughfare road between London, Liverpool, and Manchester”. The opening of a branch canal in May 1815 between the River Nen [Nene] and the Grand Junction enhanced the town’s accessibility (Pigot’s, 1824). The land-owning aristocracy, with their town houses and cultural pursuits, ensured that the town catered for their tastes, with a theatre, regular balls, concerts, lectures and literary gatherings. The middle and professional classes and the ambitious retail tradesmen were concerned with the social, religious, scientific and literacy interests of the town. Regular markets were held including cattle markets and live stock and horse fairs. That there were live stock fairs may have been a consideration for William moving into the town as he abandoned the shoemaking trade to turn his hand firstly as a victualler, which no doubt involved him in brewing his own beer, and secondly as a pig dealer.
After the death of his third wife William, aged forty-seven, married Caroline’s mother, the twenty year old Sarah Allum, at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (St. Sepulchre’s) on the 24th October 1791. They had seven children. By this time William was established as a pig dealer. He was probably the middleman who bought in pigs to fatten up and sell them on. He did not own vast areas of land — “a close, or inclosed ground … situate and being near Castle Hills”, and “gardens and outbuilding … situate in the Mayorhold”.° It was in Chisholm’s novelette Little Joe that was serialised in Australia when Chisholm was in her early fifties, that she invoked memories of her father’s business that her half-brother William continued. She remarked on the “poor man’s friend – the pig”. She went on to comment that the pig gave “comfort and hope to thousands”, and questioned “How many rents does the pig pay? How many debts wait to be paid until the pig be killed? How many new dresses are bought with her bacon? How many children are educated by the profits of the pig?” (Moran, 1991, 74). Rhetorical questions that suggest Chisholm well knew the answer. Perhaps she had indeed waited for the pig to be killed before she had a new gown, and was well aware that it was the profits from her father’s pig business that had educated his children and possibly some of the grandchildren.5

In spite of William Jones’s four marriages and the large number of offspring, the families seem to have been close. Evidence indicates that a number of the children from previous marriages, together with their own families, lived in close proximity to the Mayorhold, a working class area, in the parish of St. Sepulchre’s.6 That the Jones family was a close knit unit may well have been a formative influence on Chisholm. New information has been found that demonstrates close family ties. The diary of Elizabeth Rathbone, for instance, indicates that Caroline and Archibald often visited Scotland (presumably to visit Archibald’s relations) and Cheltenham where Archibald’s brother John resided. A letter written by Caroline Chisholm thanks the recipient for “making enquiries for apartments for my brother’s family”.7 A previously unknown letter from a “grateful and affectionate” Caroline Chisholm to “Dear Mrs. Rathbone” gives an indication of Chisholm’s feelings for her own children. She wrote that she felt she “need not I am sure say how much how deeply I feel your motherly kindness to my children”.8

Indeed throughout her life Chisholm was to advocate the importance of family life, which was a subject mentioned in her four political lectures in Australia between 1859 and 1861 and in her novelette published at this time in The Empire. In Emigration and Transportation Chisholm wrote that she looked “upon the separation of families as one of the greatest evils connected with our present system of emigration” and Chisholm’s belief in the importance of family ties and attachments was no doubt a consideration in the
founding of the Family Colonisation Loan Society (1847, 10). The "Society was based on the principle of friendly parties or groups of approved individuals, who are acquainted with each other's character, becoming jointly and severally responsible for loans advanced to them". One of Chisholm's strategies was that working families should work together to raise the cost of their share of the fare in "mutual co-operation" as detailed in item 15 of the Rules of the Society. Rule 25 also stated that "the reunion of families now separated ... be specially encouraged by this Society".

There are two vignettes that supposedly highlight the philanthropic proclivities of William Jones and are reported as "really the remote cause of instilling the ideas that ruled her [Chisholm's] life in after years" (Pearson, 1914, 71). One is the tale of the maimed soldier and the other a story of a priest who was befriended by William Jones. Mackenzie only wrote of the former incident:

One day this high minded man [William Jones] introduced to his house a poor maimed soldier whom he attended with respect and affection, and calling his children pointed out what obligations they were under to this veteran; he having fought the enemies of England amid the perils of sea and land, and sacrificed his limbs, that they might live in ease, comfort and security at home. This old soldier excited the curiosity of the children by descriptions of other countries, the beauty of the scenery, the excellence of climate, the abundance of food, the advantages that would accrue by the possession of those paradises as colonies, and the fortunes emigrants might reap (1852, 2).

It was in 1914 in Pearson's essay that the following tale of an old refugee French priest was first mentioned together with the story of the maimed soldier:

Caroline's father one day at the mid-day meal heard a great commotion in the village, and went to see the cause. He found an old priest being followed by a great crowd of people, who were pelting him with stones and mud. He rebuked and dispersed the people, and brought the priest into his home and family. The old man was an honoured guest for many weeks, tended and supplied with food and clothes. During the time of his stay the priest and little Caroline became great companions. He had travelled much, and Caroline drank in all his lovely stories of foreign parts. On the day he left her father's home they had a celebration at the mid-day meal, when (as was the custom at that time) toasts were given and speeches made. We can hear the dear old priest, in his broken English, expressing his deep gratitude for all that had been done for him: he prayed to God to "bless this home and especially this child" (little Caroline who was seated next to him), and Mrs. Chisholm's daughter tells us that "he laid his hand in blessing on his little friend's head". Ever after the departure of the old priest his prayers and influence were over her (Pearson 1914, 73).

The similarities are problematical. Pearson reputedly spoke to Chisholm's daughter Caroline. With the passage of time, however, the daughter, and even Chisholm who must have told her daughter of these incidents, may have been confused. Chisholm was very young when these episodes supposedly occurred; she was not quite six when her father died. Kiddle believed that the "legendary" story that "a refugee French priest, whom her father had befriended, first turned her [Chisholm's] thoughts towards Catholicism"
had "no basis in fact" (1957, 3). There may, however, be some truth in the former occurrence, as related by Mackenzie, suggesting that William Jones was a kind and generous man. Chisholm wrote to friends in Sydney that as a child she invented an immigration game. The maimed soldier might well have "excited the curiosity" of the young Chisholm and inspired her imagination to create such a game (see chapter ten). The soldier's tales might also have persuaded Chisholm's brother Robert, eight years older than her, to think about emigrating to America. But without being able to substantiate these accounts, other than Chisholm's letter detailing her immigration game, it becomes difficult to give total credence to them.

William Jones died at the age of seventy at his property in the Mayorhold on the 4th April 1814 and was buried at the Anglican Church of St. Sepulchre's. William's will gives a clear indication as to how far he had come from his humble start in life. William left Sarah five hundred pounds and well provided for, and several properties to his surviving twelve children. Without a diary or letters it can only be conjecture as to Chisholm's feelings on the death of her father. However in Little Joe Chisholm, commenting on the death of Joe's mother (a widow), wrote that it was "astonishing how at times early sorrow and adversity change and form the character of youth — the lively and playful stripling becomes all at once, under this character, the thoughtful man; and this was the case with Joe" (Moran, 1991, 19). Was perhaps Chisholm looking back to the death of her own father? The siblings nearest in age to Chisholm would have been fourteen and ten when their father died; an age when they could well have been working. Was Chisholm like Joe who with "much earnest industry evinced to help his mother?" (ibid.). We can only speculate.

Research has been unable to uncover new information regarding Chisholm's mother. In 1854 the Illustrated Magazine of Art declared that Chisholm had "to deplore her father's loss" at an early age, and "thenceforth she was indebted to the example and energy of her maternal parent for many of those characteristics which have so singularly marked her career, and place her in the first rank among the practical reformers of this enlightened age" (John Cassell, Vol II, 177). The Magazine was simply reiterating Mackenzie's remarks. Mackenzie went on to add, "the life of a young country girl [Chisholm] presents but few points of interest. The sphere is prescribed within a narrow compass, still an isolated active mind will in some manner develop its vital powers, and we find that the practical benevolence of visiting the poor and the sick, of advising and soothing the distressed, shed a lustre around the girlish days of this noble woman" (1852, 5). It is from such information that Hoban, displaying her fictional biographical skills, felt able to write "it became Caroline's task to carry round the dinner basket with the meals provided by her mother" (1984, 6). This is of course pure invention. However there may be some truth in what Mackenzie has written. Again in Little Joe,
Chisholm wrote that “he who gives from an overflowing purse comparatively gives but little, to him who
gives his mite from a scanty one”. In later life in her lectures and writing Chisholm would often refer to the
“overflowing tenderness of the poor” (Moran, 1991, 7, 3). It is also in Little Joe that Chisholm wrote quite
passionately of Mr. Jeyes, a man of wealth, who had neglected his duty to the poor. She wrote, “we are told
‘that we should remember the poor’, and oh! In how many, many ways, and variety of forms can the rich
fulfil this injunction. This is a heavenly privilege which the rich have at their disposal when they carry out
the designs of Providence” (ibid., 58). 11

In spite of Chisholm’s conversion to Catholicism, her words hark back to evangelicalism, and may very well
recall Chisholm’s upbringing and attitudes instilled in her as a child and young woman. Hannah More, a
committed evangelicalist, wrote in a similar vein. “Privilege” she wrote, “carried great responsibilities”.
There was a special duty the rich owed to the poor (Collingwood, 1990, 107). All this leads to the
conjecture that Chisholm’s mother may have encouraged such “characteristics which have so singularly
marked her career”, and the further conjecture that Chisholm was writing about her mother when she wrote
of Mrs. Brown who adopted Joe in the novelette:

There was a peaceful calm, a domestic serenity in her acts, that made Mrs. Brown’s
countenance pleasing to look at. There is something very beautiful to contemplate in the face
when the aspirations of a well-disposed mind in a manner illuminates the features, and leaves
its own impression and the most striking beauty in the widow’s face was the stamp of
humanity; her face was an index of her pure and peaceful mind; her charity of thought and
soundness of judgement were daily exercised; her children often heard her praise, but never
censure; she was one of those made to love and to be loved (ibid. 8).

Interestingly the rules and regulations of the Female School of Industry in Madras note that the rod was to be
spared and only used as a last resort (see chapter four). Perhaps when drawing up the conditions Chisholm
remembered her mother’s praise and lack of censure.

No new evidence has been found to substantiate the information by earlier biographers that Chisholm’s
mother educated her. As Sarah Jones put her mark on both her marriage registration and her will this would
seem highly unlikely. Chisholm’s work and her writing show a well-educated, methodical and meticulous
woman. Even by the age of nine as a witness at her sister Charlotte’s wedding, Chisholm was able to sign
her name clearly and distinctly. Regrettably detailed research has been unable to discover exactly where
Chisholm was educated. She was born forty-six years after the birth of William’s first child, and there
were grandchildren who were older than William’s own children. The ‘pig’ could perhaps have helped
finance a governess for a number of the Jones’s offspring as Hoban suggested. However, as speculated in
the earlier chapters, if Chisholm was educated above the standard of her siblings, this may not have been the case. There were a number of ‘academies’ in the town, three of which were ‘ladies’ academies (Pigot’s 1824). In the main, schools in Northampton were associated with the various places of worship within the town, including the Dissenter’s College. From 1786 there were eleven Sunday Schools (Bain, 1875, Appendix i). The General Sunday School, which was not affiliated to any church, became redundant in 1823. The Lancasterian boy’s school was founded in 1811 and the girl’s school in 1815. Few records of the earlier schools exist, and no record can be found of Chisholm’s education. What is not in doubt is that she attained a high standard of instruction.

Chisholm grew up in a period of transition and rapid industrialisation. At the time of her birth Britain had been at war with France for fifteen years. It wasn’t until she was six years old that the fighting ended. The various battles were reported in the Northampton Mercury, but the war, unless families had male relatives involved in the fighting, was of less consequence to the populace than the increased prices of bread and other foods that resulted from Napoleon’s attempts to defeat Britain by attacking British trade. The blockade of the British ports meant a reduction in food imports. With high unemployment and low wages the increased food prices were a disaster for the workers, and there were food riots in 1810. During Chisholm’s early childhood the effects of the war and industrial developments displaced many manual workers. In the Midlands area, and in parts of Yorkshire, the misery and poverty saw framework knitters and hand loom weavers uniting together to destroy the newly introduced textile machines which they regarded as the cause of their trouble.

By the time Caroline and Archibald married at the end of December 1830, they and their contemporaries must have been aware that they were living in a period of radical change. There were outbreaks of revolution abroad. The Catholic Emancipation Act that was passed in 1829 would have had a significant impact on Archibald and his Catholic relatives and upon Caroline when she converted to the faith (see chapter nine). And, more significantly, as Caroline awaited the birth of her first child in mid-September 1831, she very probably read in the Northampton Mercury (23.9.1831) of the petitions and counter petitions regarding the Second Reform Bill passing to the House of Lords. It was in February 1830 that the Bill was proposed to abolish all rotten boroughs with their transfer to the counties and large towns. It was also proposed that the maximum parliamentary life should be five years, MPs should be paid, with a household franchise in the boroughs and an extension of the county franchise to include copyholders, who held land by custom without formally owning it (Evans, 1983, 26). As Hopkins suggests, “there were many thoughtful working men who
believed it to be unjust that they should not have a vote. It seemed obvious to them that they should be given a greater say in government, not only as a simple matter of political justice but also so that they could draw attention to their economic grievances" (Hopkins, 1979, 33). The Bill was rejected in the early hours of the 8th October by a majority of forty-one.

As Caroline's baby daughter, Caroline, was born in that first week of October perhaps she did not get time to read the papers, and only learnt second hand of the riots that broke out in Derby and Nottingham the following day. The extensive rioting that took place during the rest of the month was also well reported. The sad death of their child at three weeks old was probably more important to Caroline and Archibald than the riots in the large towns, particularly Bristol, and in the smaller west of England woollen towns, such as Blandford and Tiverton (ibid. 33). But Caroline was nonetheless aware of the disturbances. Quite possibly the remembrance of the trauma of her daughter’s death and her burial on the 26th October was intermingled with remembrances of the riots following the rejection of the Bill. In 1842 in the first year’s Report of the Sydney Immigrants' Home Caroline recalled the breaking of the windows at the Mansion House in Bristol as a “Bristol tune” (1842, 77). 12

Caroline was still in England when King William IV gave his royal assent to the first Reform Act on the 7th June 1832. Archibald had been back in India for nearly six months. Perhaps Caroline wrote and told Archibald how the passing of the Act was a backward move for Northampton voters. Between 1768 and 1796 all male householders not in receipt of poor relief were entitled to vote, a wide franchise which the town retained until 1832. As a consequence of the Act, which imposed a uniform franchise on borough electorates, householders were rated at £10 or over. This gradually reduced the number of persons in Northampton who were entitled to vote. Nearly two and a half thousand votes were polled at the election of 1831, but in 1852 there were only one thousand, eight hundred and fifteen names on the electoral roll, although the town had almost doubled in size during the intervening period (Hatley, 1965/66, 243/249). However, Archibald would have been delighted to learn that following the passing of the Act there was a real prospect of elections in Scotland, although only one male in eight had the vote. Only five per cent of Irishmen were entitled to vote following the passing of the Act. Earl Grey, who was dedicated against annual parliaments, universal suffrage, and the ballot, was convinced that moderate reform was the only secure route to political stability and a way of averting revolution in England (Evans, 1983, 36/37).
For Chisholm growing up during this period of transition it would have felt like facing two distinct worlds. She witnessed the development of steam and the construction of the railway system that transformed the countryside, and altered the social and economic life of the British people. But the new world was not an ideal world. It was in 1843 that Thomas Hood wrote the heart-rending *The Song of the Shirt* attacking the use of sweated labour. This so affected Sidney Herbert that he was moved to inaugurate an emigration scheme to send young needlewomen to Australia. It was in 1847 that Chisholm, totally aware of what was happening in the world around her, wrote of the “unparalleled misery and distress – at a time when England groans with the burden of her redundant population” (1847, 3). As Houghton notes, the “definition of an age of transition in which change is revolutionary has a dual aspect: destruction and reconstruction” (1973, 3). Transition had its disadvantages as well as advantages. There was much poverty, as for instance Henry Mayhew’s *London Labour and the London Poor* amply testifies.

1. NRO, Northampton Wills, Plowman Jones, 1821.

2. The 1777 Duston Militia list notes that William Jones, Shoemaker, was exempt from serving as he had young children.

3. This too was not an unusual occurrence. In the mid-nineteenth century more than one in two hundred women died in childbirth (the main causes of death being toxaemia, haemorrhage and puerperal fever) in comparison with one in sixty thousand in England today (Perkin, 1993, 65).


5. Although none of William Jones’s children emulated their father with sixteen offspring, most had six to nine children.


7. Liverpool University Archives and Special Collections – Pocket books/diaries of Elizabeth Rathbone. Letter 18 – March 11\(^{th}\), Caroline Chisholm to Mrs. Chesnel, MS. No. NLA Ms 1212 National Library of Canberra. “The apartments for my brother’s family” probably refers to Archibald’s half-brother, Alexander (born 1808) who emigrated to Australia in 1854.


9. See Rule 1, FCLS A System of Emigration, in a letter dedicated by permission to Lord Ashley by Mrs. Chisholm, August 1849.

10. Ibid.

11. One wonders whether Chisholm was thinking of Philadelphus Jeyes (1814-1893). His father died when he was still a schoolboy and his mother when he was fourteen. He apprenticed himself at the chemists in Drapery in Northampton. He worked extremely hard eventually taking over the chemists on the death of the owner. He later became the founder of P. Jeyes and Company Limited (of Jeyes Fluid fame). There appears to be a family connection with the Jeyes of Wootton, and Chisholm may well of known of both families.

12. The Bristol riots, 29\(^{th}\)-31\(^{st}\) October 1831. During the whole of Saturday, Bristol was in a state of considerable ferment from the arrival of Sir C. Wetherall, the Recorder. In the evening the multitude
assembled before the Mansion House in Queen Square and smashed the windows in the front of the building with a volley of stones. A Bristol tune – the noise of the stones breaking the windows.
ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM.

Pictured here as a young officer of the 30th Madras Native Infantry.

By courtesy of Mr H. J. Chisholm, Sydney.

ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM.

Photographed in later life.

By courtesy of Mr H. J. Chisholm, Sydney.
View of Northampton. Highlighted areas denote the places where the Jones family lived and worshipped.
Chapter Four

Empire 1832-1838

For Archibald Chisholm, who was ten years older than Caroline and raised in a remote rural community in Scotland, the changing world would have seemed even more dramatic. Archibald was born on 15th February 1798 at Knockfin in the parish of Kilmorack, Inverness-shire. He was the son of a farmer, John Chisholm and his first wife, Jean (nee Fraser of Culbokie). John, as one of the principle cadets, or heirs, of the Chisholm Clan, would have leased the land from the Laird, Colin of Knockfin. Archibald’s father married twice — there were four sons from the first marriage, of whom Archibald was the youngest, and two sons from the second marriage to Hannah Fraser of Achnaloich. The family had a long tradition of links with Roman Catholicism and Archibald’s half-brother Thomas (1807-1872) was a priest in Strathglass and close cousins included Bishop John Chisholm (1752-1814) and Bishop Eneas Chisholm (1759-1818).  

Like many of his clansmen, Archibald knew Gaelic as well as English. He was educated at Fortrose Academy (founded in 1791) but sadly their records do not go back far enough to tell us of Archibald’s attainments. We do know from his application form for his entry into the East India Company’s Army in 1818 that he had a “classical” education. As there was no provision for boarders at the time of Archibald’s attendance at the Academy, and as the family home was about thirty-five miles from Fortrose, Archibald would probably have lived with relatives on his mother’s side on the Black Isle. There was an element of fee paying to provide for teachers’ salaries, but free tuition was available to some students whose parents could not afford to pay. This is in line with Scottish education of the period, which was far more advanced than education in England. Among the Academy’s objectives today, and probably not far removed from the early 1800s, is the full development of pupils’ talents to encourage the highest possible level of academic attainment, and to foster an atmosphere of diligence, tolerance, co-operation and mutual respect at all times. It would appear that Archibald learnt his lessons well, for his support of his future wife undoubtedly shows his diligence, tolerance, co-operation and mutual respect.

Archibald followed in his brothers’ footsteps and joined the East India Company Army. Both parents had died by the time his Uncle, William Fraser, certified Archibald’s parentage on the 12th May 1818 in connection with Archibald’s nomination as a cadet for the Madras Establishment by Charles Grant, a Director of the East India Company Army. It was on the 28th May that Grant, having enquired into Archibald’s character, connections, and qualifications, certified that he had found Archibald to be a fit
person to petition the Company. He was duly appointed an Ensign in June 1818 and arrived in Madras on the 29th September of that year. He was posted to the 15th Native Infantry Regiment and was based at Fort St. George in Madras. Only a month later, on the 31st October 1818, Archibald was made a Lieutenant of the 15th regiment.

Fort St. George in Madras was built in 1640, and many of the officers lived within the walls of the Fort. The fort was also known as “White Town” (from the colour of the buildings) and covered a mile-square. It contained dwellings, shops and taverns, as well as the Barracks (Hoban, 1984, 12/13). The city itself had some fine buildings. However in 1837 a young ensign, Cumming wrote “Madras has quite disappointed my expectations. There are only one or two good houses in the place, the rest are small shabby houses inhabited by poor people” (Stanford, 1962, 65). Cumming would also have been unimpressed by the verminous soldiers’ barracks, and would have fully understood why the men preferred sleeping in the street, except in the monsoon season (ibid.).

The officers wore high-necked, gold-buttoned red tunics, with epaulettes, as their uniform. There was a sword shoulder strap with buckle, on which was engraved M.N.I. XV (Madras Native Infantry, 15th Regiment). The men wore scarlet tunics and white pantaloons and a black head-dress. In such clothes in the heat of India it is not surprising that the lives of serving officers and civilians were hampered by ill health, as indeed Archibald’s health suffered. Even off-duty, attending official balls and dances, such apparel would have been obligatory.

Archibald Chisholm was appointed Lieutenant of the 15th Native Infantry, which later became the 30th Regiment, in 1824. In June he took on the duties of Quarter Master and Paymaster to his Corps. As Quarter Master Archibald would have been responsible for collecting and examining the regimental abstracts, and also attending at the Pay Office in connection with all matters drawing and issuing the pay of the men in the Regiment.

Although Archibald had taken leave in India, and had portions of this leave cancelled in June 1824, (to fight in the Opium Wars), he was eventually granted a furlough on the 22nd January 1828 and sailed for England on the 24th February. After ten years service he was entitled to two years leave. New information has found that returning with Archibald, on the Marquis of Wellington bound for London, were a large number
of passengers. Among just over thirty passengers were Captain and Mrs. and Miss Kerr but none of the passengers belonged to Archibald’s regiment.

It is noteworthy that Archibald extended his furlough on the 23rd February 1831, and then again on the 8th June 1831 for a further period of six months. It was during his furlough in England that Archibald met and married Caroline Jones at St. Sepulchre’s Church, Northampton on the 27th December 1830. Although Archibald was a Roman Catholic it was a legal requirement that the wedding take place in an Anglican Church. The Catholic clergy were not legally empowered to hold and register wedding services. It is believed that Caroline converted to Catholicism at this time. Before she accepted Archibald’s proposal, however, Caroline told him of “her strong faith in having a divine mission to perform”. That led her to give “her intended husband one month to consider whether he would accept a wife who would make all sacrifices to carry into effect her public duties” (Mackenzie, 1853). (Caroline’s significant request to her future husband is discussed more fully in chapter ten.)

The further extensions to Archibald’s leave enabled the young couple to adjust to marriage life, and to parenthood. They spent some time in Brighton but returned to Leicester Terrace in Northampton where, as already noted, their first child, Caroline was born, and died three weeks later, in October 1831. What is not clear is why Archibald chose to visit Northampton. It may just have been that there was good hunting in Northamptonshire. It could be, as has been suggested in note six above, that Archibald became friendly with Captain Kerr and his family on the return journey, or had known them previously; and possibly they had connections with the several Kerr families in Northampton. Research has firmly established however, that the reason Archibald returned to Northampton was not, as has been suggested by all previous biographies, because he was stationed at either the British Army barracks in Northampton or the barracks at Weedon. As a recruit of the East India Company Army he was just that, a member of the Company Army and not a member of the British Army. Hence outside the Company Army’s territorial areas he was not entitled to use either his designated title or British Army bases.

After their marriage and a period spent in England, Archibald returned to India on the Elphinstone sailing from Gravesend on 6th January 1832. At that time the fare to India would have been in the region of £100/£120 for the run out to Bombay or Calcutta. For that price the passenger would only have a small empty cubicle or cabin which would have to be furnished, including bedding and linen. It would have been hazardous to walk the decks, which would have been strewn with pig-pens, chicken, geese and duck coops,
and cow and sheep stalls (Young, 1934, v.i, 392). Travellers could use the alternative overland route between England and India. It is debatable however, which would have been the more hazardous. The overland route may have been slightly shorter in time duration, but probably far more exhausting.

Archibald was given the commission of Captain on the 8th April 1833. As a Captain, Chisholm’s pay would have been £120.00 per annum, paid per month of thirty days, with £36.00 gratuity and £75.00 tent allowance. He would have received £50.00 for horse rent, but only if in receipt of half batta 7 and not provided with quarters. Half Batta was £90.00, giving a total of £371 per annum. When in the field the pay was £120.00, with £36.00 gratuity, £75.00 tent allowance, but no horse allowance, but £189 full batta, giving a total of £411 per annum.8

Caroline arrived in Madras on 4th August 1833. She too sailed on the Elphinstone that left Gravesend on the 30th March 1833. There were eight passengers and two natives.9 Peter Cherry felt there were just as many perils to be faced on board ship as there were on the high seas. He wrote to his daughters before they left England for India giving strict guidelines for their safety, conduct and protection on board ship, which he saw fraught with difficulties, “more especially of consequence when it is considered that you will meet persons whose character, morals and behaviour you are unacquainted with” (Stanford, 1962,36). He was also concerned to ensure that the girls were properly dressed at all times, and, for decorum’s sake, on no account were they to hang washing out to dry outside the cabin (ibid.). Thirteen years later, when Chisholm was sailing to India, such difficulties would still have beset a woman travelling on her own. Even when within sight of Madras, which would have been a very welcome sight after three months on the high seas, there were still the difficulties of getting ashore. Cumming, who arrived at the end of May 1837, wrote, “we are now snugly anchored off Madras roads though there is a fearful surf on the beach” which prevented his landing for three days. “Indeed on Sunday two gentlemen lost their lives and one lady was much injured” (Stanford, 1962, 64 10).

Why did Caroline not travel out to India with Archibald as a couple as did Captain and Mrs. Mathias? There are four possibilities. Firstly, the lack of finance to pay for two fares. Secondly, passages were limited and places only allocated on a lottery system. Thirdly, Caroline would have been three/four months pregnant when Archibald requested a further six months furlough in June 1831. Perhaps they both felt it would be unwise to travel to India with such a young baby. Lastly, perhaps after the death of baby Caroline, Chisholm became pregnant again. Edith Pearson in her essay on Chisholm relates that Caroline had told her
eldest daughter that she had had nine children (current research has only found evidence of eight children). For whatever reason, the decision for Caroline to travel to India on her own would not have been taken lightly. The above, however, shows possible reasoning behind such a decision.

However much Archibald would have told Caroline of India, it would undoubtedly have been something of a culture shock for the young twenty-five year old woman arriving in Madras. The biggest shock no doubt being the heat, scorpions and snakes. A far cry from her hometown of Northampton. The climate in India was very taxing, "it was the heat, added to the lack of any great necessity for action, that was the downfall of so many English ladies in India" (Sattin, 1986, xix). It is not clear from Archibald's service record whether he was at Madras to meet his wife. If he had not been given leave to greet her, perhaps he arranged for Caroline to join him at the military base where he was serving in Vellore thirty-five miles west of Madras. It was not unusual for women to travel with the army. Georgina Cherry and her sister travelled to Masulipatam from Madras in 1821 (Stanford, 1962, 77).

Clearly the transition from a young woman in Northampton to the wife of a Captain in the Company's Army would not have been easy for Chisholm. The normal routine for a memsahib was to rise between four and five and attend to household matters, followed perhaps by a short ride around the station before breakfast at eight. There would be visits amongst the ladies of their own social level during the late morning and early afternoon. Lunch would follow, and then a sleep through the heat in the whitewashed room of a screen-darkened bungalow. There would be an early evening drive, no doubt following the same route as the morning ride, and meeting the same people. Back home for dinner, and an early night, if you were not dining out or partying with other officers and their ladies. The children would have ayahs to care for them, and there would have been a stream of servants. Chisholm was not used to dealing with servants and it would not have been easy for her to fit into the "glitter and enchantment of military life" (Mackenzie, 1853, 6). A great advantage for Chisholm, however, was that it must have been at this time that she learnt to ride. Such an accomplishment was to be of great benefit to her in her work in Australia. But as the wife of a Company Captain she would be expected to follow domestic conventions, and there would have been a very strict code of conduct - the wives of other ranks were referred to as "women" and only mixed with very occasionally.

Fortunately for Chisholm their first son, Archibald, was born in Madras on 4th May 1836. In the provinces there was very little chance of a doctor attending the birth, but at least there was a possibility of a doctor
attending in Madras, provided the army did not require his services. Surgeons were appointed for the army and the army came first. The baby was not two months old before the family set off to the Company Military Station at Secunderabad, three hundred and ninety-four miles to the north of Madras, just north west of Hyderabad, towards the end of June. Chisholm was not so fortunate with the birth of her second child. William, presumably named after his maternal grandfather, was born at Bowenpilly on the 6th September 1837. Bowenpilly is within the Secunderabad province, but not one of the out-posts of the Company Army. Possibly the baby arrived early whilst Caroline was returning to Madras, or the Chisholm’s had accommodation at Bowenpilly. 11

It is difficult to see just how Caroline managed to establish the Female School of Industry for the Daughters of European Soldiers whilst accompanying Archibald around India and giving birth to two sons. Mackenzie suggests that Chisholm founded the school shortly after her arrival in India. This would seem improbable. Caroline would have had to acclimatise herself to the weather and to the social environment and the social niceties of living within the British community in India. Certainly within the cultural climate of colonial India, it would not have been an easy achievement for a twenty-five year old woman, newly arrived in Madras, and newly married, to begin to assert her independence and show her methodical and practical abilities in organising such a school. It would probably have been easier for her to obtain both physical and financial help if she established the school a few years after her arrival in India, once people had got to know her and she had become acquainted with colonial life. Whether Chisholm founded the school earlier or later during her stay in India, the reason for doing so stemmed from her observation of the children running wild within the barracks, and the lack of provision for the ordinary European soldier’s wives and children. The boys would probably have been drafted into the Army with their fathers. The girls however were left to their own devices. Mackenzie graphically writes of the “familiarity with licentious and profane expressions, and indecorous conduct [that] must obliterate all delicacy of mind and action” of the female youth (1852, 6). Chisholm saw the degradation and set about organising a girl’s school for the children and orphans of the European soldiers to give them a basic education in reading, writing, arithmetic, needlework and domestic management. Religious instruction and moral conduct was made an object of particular attention. Interestingly research undertaken of the records of the Beckett and Sargeant Charity School in Northampton show a marked similarity with the school organised by Chisholm in Madras. The school taught not only the ‘three r’s’ but the domestic accomplishments of cookery, needlework, knitting, and the arts of laundry. There is no record of Chisholm being a pupil or teacher at the school in Northampton, but she may well have been aware of the methods taught at the school. Chisholm may also have been aware of
other Schools of Industry in England who “catered for girls of lower socio-economic background ... where girls ... spent most of their time learning domestic skills in preparation for service and marriage and motherhood” (Gomersall, 1997, 106).

To organise and run such a school, Chisholm needed to collect subscriptions for the support of the school. The Governor of Madras, Lieutenant General Sir Frederick Adams, subscribed £20.00, and reputedly within a few days Chisholm was able to raise 2,000 rupees. The school was allocated a room within Fort St. George Barracks, but then moved to Black Town to escape the influences within the Barracks. Mackenzie suggests that the move isolated the Chisholms as it was considered unhealthy and unfashionable by the officers and their wives (Memoirs & Emigrant’s Guide). A matron was appointed and considered to be worthier due to her lack of ability in reading and writing. The girls were appointed to a Committee and had to arrange their own duties. They learnt their lessons through practical achievements, i.e. they had to keep strict records of expenditure, and items purchased, they cared for their own sick friends, and had to account for any wastage.

What the rules of the school show is Chisholm’s practical nature, and an understanding of the difficulties of the “not-so-well off” parents. The religious instruction of the pupils is clearly laid down - but there was no specific instruction as to any particular religion, foreshadowing Chisholm’s determination “to serve all creeds” when she opened the Immigrant’s Barracks in Australia. The young girls could acquire tickets for good behaviour, which they accumulated, and the child who had acquired the most was awarded a prize. The hard won tickets, however, could easily be lost. Telling an untruth lead to the forfeiture of five tickets and isolation from the other children. A child caught stealing, however trifling an offence, would also be deducted five tickets and separated from her classmates. For a second offence, black bracelets would be worn in addition, making the child’s offence highly visible. Punishments of pupils relied heavily on the young child being made to feel different from the other pupils. All offences were entered in a black book, which was shown to visitors, with emphasis on the distress that such entry would cause parents. The rod was to be spared and only used as a last resort. Self-achievement would give the girls self-respect, and pupils were encouraged to be industrious, to take pride in themselves, and to consider how proud their parents would be of their achievements. Through the example of the Matron and Mistress the girls would learn the practicalities of helping to run the school, cooking meals, looking after the sick etc.
The school was a success, so much so that young mothers begged to join the classes. Young non-commissioned officers sought wives and servants from the young girls who had completed their education at the school. Chisholm continued to oversee the school, looking after her own two sons and travelling with Archibald, which is presumably why she made a written “Address to be read by the Mistress” and a written “Address to the Matron and the Mistress” as detailed by Mackenzie (1852).

Chisholm would have learnt a great deal from her experience of India and of organising the school. She would have learnt how to raise funds, to deal with men in power, to cope with the practicalities of arranging and organising accommodation, of setting out the rules and regulations of the establishment. The lack of diaries and or letters makes it difficult to ascertain exactly where Chisholm obtained the motivation, strength and ability to attempt such an undertaking. It inevitably raises the question as to whether she helped run a school in Northampton. It would seem doubtful that Caroline would have gained such a wide experience from merely assisting her mother in visiting the poor at home in Northampton. Certainly her plea to Archibald that she be left free to do philanthropic works after their marriage indicates a strong desire to do good. Unfortunately there is no further information to be gleaned from documentation in Northampton on this aspect of Chisholm’s life, and we are left to speculate on what may have been.

Mackenzie’s biographies suggest that the Female School of Industry in Madras at the time of his writing had become an “extensive orphanage”. However research of The Madras Almanac and Compendium of Intelligence for 1842 shows that the Ladies Institution for the Education of the Daughters of Europeans and their Descendants in the Presidency of Madras was still a going concern at that date. A Ladies’ Committee ran the school and it was reported that “the School in connection with this Institution has been removed to the large and commodious house formerly occupied by the late Dr. Bannister, at Vepery”. A day school had also been opened in Popham’s Broadway, Black Town, and placed under the care of a Miss Austen.

Archibald returned to the Presidency of Madras on the 15th January 1838, when he petitioned for permission to proceed to Australia. He applied in writing enclosing his medical certificate for permission to proceed to New South Wales and Van Diemens Land on the 9th February 1838. The records do not give the reason for Archibald’s medical certification. The Surgeons, John Wylie and R. Cole merely note that Captain Chisholm was “in a bad state of health and think it necessary that he should be permitted to proceed to New South Wales for the recovery of his health, with leave of absence for two years”. Archibald had served a total of seventeen years in India, and, as was a common occurrence, his health had suffered. Leave was
duly recommended by the Commander in Chief, and signed by B. R. Hitchins Adjutant General of the Army and the Order given on the 12th February 1838. 13

1 Detail from Mr. Macleod, Genealogist, Highland Council, Inverness.


3 John Chisholm, Archibald’s elder brother, born 16th August 1793 became a cadet in 1808. He was invalided out of the army in 1839, the year of his wife’s death. Archibald’s brother William joined the Company Army, the Madras Artillery. He was killed in action in 1818 at Corrygeum, Deccan, fighting against the Pelswah’s army. Brother Colin however, practised as a solicitor in Inverness. Information acquired via the British Library India and Oriental Collections and with the kind help of Mr. James MacRae of Inverness and his Chisholm family tree.

4 British Library India and Oriental Collection, 1/MILL/11/41, 375

5 It was not until October 1836 that regimental Quarter Masters were relieved from these duties, and the Officers of troops and companies made responsible for issuing the pay to the men (History of the Madras Army, v.4, 1888, Chapter XVII, 461).

6 Although Kerr is a Scots name, Kerr is also a Northampton name in that there were (and still are) a number of Kerrs living in Northampton. Dr. William Kerr of Abington Street, was a Northampton physician and on the Board of the Infirmary. It cannot, of course, be said with any certainty, but there is a possibility that Archibald may have known Captain Kerr, and that Captain Kerr may have had connections with Northampton. A tenuous supposition, but it is a possible reasoning for Archibald returning to Northampton.

7 “Batta” was a hard-living allowance for discomfort and extra expense. Presumably when in the Presidency of Madras officers were able to obtain British supplies, i.e. beer, liquors, hams, cheese etc., at a cheaper rate than they would have done in the provinces.

8 East India Office Library, East India Register and Directory, 1839, vi and vii.

9 Previous biographies suggested that Chisholm acted as a chaperone to several young ladies on the trip to India. But there was only one single young woman on board. Chisholm may well, of course, have befriended her.

10 Stanford uses the quotation from A Six Years Diary by James Slator Cumming, 9th Foot, Martin and Hood, 1847.

11 The East Indian Register and Directory, Births, Deaths and Marriages, 1838.

12 Governor of Madras from 1832-1837.

13 Military Consultation, vol. no. 1258, received from the Tamil Nadu Archives, Egmore, Madras.
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Enlargement of the 1841 Map of India
detailing Military Stations of the East India Company.
Archibald served at Vellore, Madras and Secunderabad.
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THE SPINE
CHAPTER FIVE

EMIGRATION 1838-1846

Chisholm would undoubtedly have felt uneasy arriving in India, as a young woman, newly married, and only recently having left the provincial town of Northampton. She had to come to terms with the oppressive heat, the strict social attitudes of a hierarchical system within the Company Army's military base at Madras and the empirical attitudes to Indians and the Indian soldier. Like Queen Victoria, the Victorians viewed Empire as possession, if sometimes a distressingly barbaric possession, from both a maternal and a romantic eye. It was more than the mighty network of great highways along which British free trade and enterprise might reach the uttermost ends of the earth (Trollope, 1994, 13). Royalty, however, was not immune to the dishonourable attitudes of political officers. On his tour of India in 1875, the Prince of Wales wrote home to his mother expressing his conviction that Indians of all classes would "be more attached to us if treated with kindness and with firmness ... but not with brutality or contempt" (ibid. 18). As Trollope indicates:

the English were, as all other nations were swift to point out, impossibly superior and self-righteous, but they were, too, bursting with excellent intention. Private enterprise, free enterprise, was to be encouraged at all costs, and in the process of expanding free trade across the globe, the English would raise up all those with whom they came in contact and take them along the path of progress that had made England great. Enterprise was everything, empire only the auxiliary that allowed it to flourish (ibid. 20).

In India the native population were to be ruled, but in Australia there was a sense that the aboriginal races were different and should not be too much interfered with in matters of habits and conditions (ibid. 21). The Chisholms could not have been unaware of the cultural contrast between India and Australia. Australia, a white settlement that, as Said emphasises, was established as a "penal colony in the late eighteenth century mainly so that England could transport an irredeemable, unwanted excess population of felons to a place ... that would ... function as a colony replacing those lost in America" (Said, 1993, xvi). By the time the Chisholms arrived the colony accepted free settlers and was beginning to be seen "as a country where (with land, labour and capital correctly balanced), the [white] proletariat [the emigrant] would prosper, enabling it to produce raw materials for British manufacture. In turn, according to this view ... prosperous workers in the Antipodes would provide an enthusiastic market for British manufactured goods, while spreading the gospel abroad. ... British wealth would circulate within the Empire" (Haines, 1997, 2). There was a distinct difference between the two cultures, emigration being at the root of that difference.
This section of the thesis will, therefore, discuss Chisholm’s emigration work in Australia during her first seven years residence there before her return to England. In order that we may better understand Chisholm’s work and the context from which she was working, it is important to have a knowledge of the economic and social conditions prevalent in Australia, as well as an appreciation of the emigration systems in operation at that time.

Between 1809 and 1820 Governor Macquarie established the physical structure of Sydney, and helped change the martial settlement to a civic community. But immorality was still rife under his Governorship, and there were often quarrels between him and his officials, which, together with his extravagance, resulted in his recall by home government. Although there had been a depression from 1822 to 1825 the town continued to prosper, with the establishment of the Bank of New South Wales and a new legal system with trial by jury, and new improvements to education and a water supply. A Legislative Council was set up and the agitation for responsible government began. Sydney also boasted a number of newspapers, and freedom of the press. Between 1826 and 1829, however, there was a newspaper war, which resulted in Governor Darling being impeached and recalled to England. Chisholm used the newspapers extensively to publicise her work, to raise subscriptions and obtain assistance in transporting the immigrants into the bush, and on another occasion to raise funds for a hearse from which to bury the poor of the city of Sydney.

Samuel Sidney writing of Sydney before the great crash of 1843 found Australia the most hospitable country in the world. But he believed the “topping citizens of Sydney very much resemble the same gentlemen in Manchester; they are so busy making money, that unless you have a large letter of credit they have no time to be hospitable to you, in fact, they can’t afford it”. He went on to say “the streets of Sydney were particularly brilliant” with “landaus, gigs, all kinds of quiet carriages, and ladies and gentlemen on horseback.” Sidney particularly noted that among the Government clerks and the sons of wealthy emancipists “there were great numbers of both sexes who delighted to adorn themselves after the exact pattern of the book of fashions” (Brissenden & Higham, 1962, 19).

The 1830s ended on a high note of prosperity but even when the Chisholms arrived in September 1838 things were beginning to change for the worse. The colony was beginning to face a pecuniary crisis “utterly unprecedented in the history” of the colony. Prior to the crisis the colony had enjoyed several years of “unexampled but unreal prosperity – prosperity based on the illusive anticipation of extraordinary returns from the investment of funds borrowed, chiefly from English capitalists, at an exorbitant rate of interest, and
expended in what has ultimately proved ruinous speculations in land and stock”. Extraordinary “inflation” and a “state of collapse” followed the “deep and general depression”. The “whole framework of society” had been affected by the horrendous downward turn in the economy and it was estimated that there were nearly “sixteen hundred and forty bankruptcies both in town and country, and even the bank of Australia failed” (Barnard, 1956, 26). As a consequence there was a glut of sheep, selling for as little as sixpence a head, and land sales ceased. The labour market was overstocked which was made worse by the influx of penniless immigrants who were being brought out to Australia under the bounty system (see below). That system of immigration had been conceived during the earlier period of prosperity, but was being operated in the climate of depression (ibid.). Colonial Government did little to help the immigrants, except erect an Immigration Barracks in Phillip Street. This was a weatherboard structure round an open courtyard, and was the Barracks that Chisholm used part of later as the Sydney Immigrants’ Home.

Henry Parkes was a bounty immigrant who arrived on the Strathfieldsaye in 1839, ten months after the Chisholms. He and his wife, Clarinda, and their newly born baby were not unusual in arriving in Sydney with only two or three shillings on which to live. Some immigrants arrived with even less. Parkes was very disappointed in his expectations of Australia. In a letter home written in May 1840 he said he found it difficult to write of the wickedness he found in his new homeland. Parkes “sold some of their little stock to help support the family” and at “length being completely starved out” he engaged as a “common labourer about thirty-six miles up the country ... at £25 per annum with a ration and a half of food”. For the first four months Parkes and his wife and baby lived in very poorly appointed hut. Parkes did not even have the opportunity to provide home grown vegetables for the family for “the slave-masters of NSW require their servants to work for them from sunrise till sunset, and will not allow them to have gardens, lest they should steal a half-hour’s time to work in them”. Not surprisingly Parkes finished his letter by saying that not one of his companions that travelled out with him on the Strathfieldsaye but most heartily wished to be back home (Teale, 1978, 49).

Parkes and his family fended for themselves. It is doubtful, however, that the poor who had travelled on the Strathfieldsaye really would have wished to go home to live under the system of the English Poor Law. The fundamental principles of the new Poor Law of 1834 was the refusal of poor relief to the able bodied, and relief only given at a rate below that of the poorest independent worker. This was an endeavour to stop fraud and to encourage a return to normal work at the first opportunity (Bruce, 1978, 89). There was considerable resentment of the English Poor Law in Australia. The Australians did not “want a Poor Law Tax nor their
poor to be treated like outcasts in State Institutions” (Peyser, 1939, 109). Attempts were made to create a relief system more congenial to Australian mentality.

A Female Orphan School was opened in Sydney in 1802. It became an Orphan School for boys in 1819, the girls having been removed to a new building in Paramatta. These were public institutions in that they were a mixed system of management, committees of private individuals were running the schools doing the work in an honorary capacity, and some money was collected by private subscription. But the Government appointed the committees, subsidised the work nearly completely, and controlled the management and the budget of the establishments (Peyser, 1939, 92). The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and Benevolence, which was the father of the Benevolent Society of NSW, was founded in June 1813. From the start the Benevolent Society of NSW used two chief methods of social work, outdoor and indoor relief. The Benevolent Asylum was opened in 1822. It was a refuge for all and everybody, for the old, the infirm, the blind, the deaf, the cripple, the homeless vagabond, the penniless, deserted wife and her children. Outdoor relief was to help families and individuals who had a home, the old, the invalid, the ailing mother, the unemployed, and the poor family with many children. Whoever applied for help and was “deserving” was assisted. The care of maternity cases was taken over by a Female Committee of Visitors in 1820. It was in 1826 that the Female Committee founded the Female Friendly Society. Benefits were given to members during their lying-in, but the main idea was to provide for the old age of the members. This was the first attempt at collective self-help in Australia and was organised by a small group of women. However it was short lived (see Peyser, 1939).

Large numbers of free immigrants had begun to arrive in the colony c1832 under the system of assisted immigration. They often sought help of the Asylum in cases of sickness, homelessness, or other, mostly temporary, needs. It was probably due to the fact that there were so many immigrants arriving in the colony that a Strangers’ Friend Society was formed in 1835. This was a Roman Catholic Relief Society that worked on similar lines to the outdoor relief branch of the Benevolent Society. The first single females sent to Australia arrived in 1832, and were welcomed and cared for by a Ladies’ Committee. Six years later however, the sheer numbers of single females arriving in Sydney was considerable. They were unable to find work, were destitute and complete strangers. The very nature of the high numbers of women arriving in Sydney made it impossible for the Ladies’ Committee to welcome and care for the women as they had done previously. Nearly a year later in July 1839, with high unemployment and the subsequent high food prices, the Sydney Association for the Temporary Relief of the Poor was founded. It raised subscriptions to buy
meat, oatmeal, sugar, rice, sago, etc. as well as fuel. It then sold the items at reduced prices to the poor (ibid.).

In 1826 the Governor's wife, Mrs. Darling, organised a Female School of Industry, maintained by private subscriptions, to train girls for the work of servants. Twenty girls were admitted when the school first opened, and the numbers rarely exceeded forty, and was often under thirty. However the school remained opened until 1926 (ibid.). Mrs. Darling was also involved in attempts to establish a Ladies' Committee for the Female Factory at Paramatta, which, in 1839, housed nearly one thousand convicts. The committee did not operate for any length of time. It appears that the ladies of Sydney and Paramatta found the charitable work in an institution which was at once a prison, a work-house, a house of correction and a hospital, and which had a fairly bad reputation in the colony, unpalatable (ibid.).

It was against this background that Chisholm began what many have called her social work. When Chisholm made "enquires if any ladies felt an interest in these young creatures [single female immigrants], or afforded them protection?" she was told that "there was a committee, but the ladies never visited the institute [immigration barracks] or interfered" (Chisholm, 1842, 2). Chisholm made contact with the "ladies who formed the committee" seeking assistance, and was pleased that "no one refused her". There was, however, "a giving way - even some of my first promised supporters withdrew their pledges". Chisholm saw this withdrawal as the results of the Protestant fear of a "Popish Plot". At the same time leading Catholics were withdrawing their support. Lady Gipps gave kind and generous support, and "strewed a few flowers" in Chisholm's path by obtaining access to the Governor (ibid. 5, 6, 10). Australians, as noted above, did not "want a Poor Law Tax nor their poor to be treated like outcasts in State Institutions" and probably the former led Governor Gipps to insist that Chisholm's work be undertaken at no expense to either the colonial or home government. Chisholm filled the gap - she treated immigrants with kindness and respect, found them jobs and homes, at no expense to the Government.

We can only speculate as to why Chisholm choose not to return to India to continue her work there when Archibald was recalled for service in 1840. We can only guess at the "circumstances" which Chisholm felt it unnecessary to detail, which led her soon after her "arrival in the colony, to feel a peculiar interest in the young women who are sent ... without friends or advisers" (ibid. 1).
The Chisholms may well have considered it was “more prudent for the health of the family that they should remain for some time longer in the more favourable climate of Sydney” (Mackenzie, 1853, 23). Possibly Archibald was aware that his health had not greatly improved. He arrived back in India in March 1840 and only eight months later on 24th November requested that he should be “disqualified for active duties of his profession ... at his own request, transferred to the Invalid Establishment”. Archibald was posted to the 2nd Native Veteran Battalion and continued to serve in India until his retirement from the Service on the 5th June 1845. Perhaps his failing health had meant that the Chisholms had considered that Archibald might retire at an early date and would need a home to return to.

Certainly Mackenzie believed that it was for the health of the family that Archibald returned to India on his own. Mackenzie stated in his inimitable style that it

While the devoted and noble minded husband urged his beloved and courageous wife to carry out those views over which they had pondered for the reformation of evils detrimental to morality, the success of the colony, the honour of their native country, and the mission of man on earth (1853, 23).

Samuel Sidney, in a more down to earth description, relates that it was Captain Chisholm who first pointed out to his wife that the “neglected state of the bounty emigrants ... [were] fit objects for her charitable zeal and energy” (1853, 134). Archibald and Caroline could not have been unaware of the deplorable economic downturn of the colony or of the considerable difficulties the bounty emigrants faced when landing in Sydney. The couple had come across some “Highland emigrants, who spoke no English, had large families, and found difficulty in obtaining employment. A little money lent them by Captain Chisholm to purchase tools, and a little useful advice, set them up as wood-cutters, and they prospered” (ibid.). Sidney went on to suggest that it was the “unprotected position of female and often friendless emigrants that awakened Chisholm’s warmest sympathies” (ibid.). Undoubtedly the plight of the Highlanders was a significant turning point for Chisholm.

But it was the plight of Flora, a beautiful Highland girl who had been seduced by a married gentleman and was contemplating suicide, that convinced Chisholm that “the evil which struck me so forcibly would soon be made apparent to the good people of Sydney” and spurred her on to “serve these poor girls” (Chisholm 1842, 2). Chisholm particularly “abhor[ed] and loath[ed]” the way single women were shipped out to Australia under the bounty system without “decent protection".
Emigration – Background Details

To understand Chisholm’s abhorrence of the bounty system, details are given below of the methods of emigration that were in operation whilst she was working in Australia.

Significantly MacDonagh wrote in 1973 “emigration history has tended up to now to be inward-looking and self-contained, possibly because it is a relatively new and unworked branch of history”. Certainly it is only within the last decade or so that the question of emigration from Britain has been given fuller coverage by historians with works from Charlotte Erickson, David Fitzpatrick, Maldwyn Jones, Richard Reid and Eric Richards, to name but a few, in the forefront of historical migration studies. Previous works include those of Carrothers, Madgwick and Plant. The most recent work by Robin Haines is an excellent example of the research that is now being undertaken. His study contains numerous statistical appendices. What is apparent from these new works is the changing attitude towards nineteenth century emigration. Madgwick’s work for instance, published in 1937 and reprinted in 1960, gave a very pessimistic view of the nature of emigrants. But, as Haines remarks, Madgwick was concerned with “imperial or dominion policy [on emigration] at the time of writing.” Haines notes that “the pioneering work of R. J. Shultz and F. K. Crowley, among others, who, having analysed the socio-demographic characteristics of the emigrants in their periods, reached the opposite point of view” (Haines, 1997, 12, 13). Such comments again reinforce the debate in the Introduction regarding historical works. Madgwick and Shultz and Crowley lived in very different periods, and their works very much reflect the period in which they were writing.

The limitations of this thesis do not allow for an in-depth debate on nineteenth century emigration, and with such eminent works as Haines to call upon, the necessity for a detailed account of emigration here is superfluous. What is required, however, is a contextual background to give an understanding of the rules and regulations that were prevalent when Chisholm was setting up the Immigrants’ Home and the problems and difficulties that Chisholm was faced with when setting up her own FCLS. Chisholm arrived in Australia in 1838 and founded the Sydney Immigrants’ Home in 1841. She founded the FCLS back in Britain in 1849. To understand the emigration issues at that time, it is necessary to look backward before coming forward to 1838.

It was towards the end of the eighteenth century that the growing increase in numbers in Britain led Thomas Malthus, a clergyman and mathematician, to ponder the problem of the dramatic rise in population without
the equivalent rise in food production. The solution, Malthus suggested, was to discourage marriage or other relationship that would produce children, and to encourage emigration. (Malthus was himself happily married!) However he realised that the poor could not emigrate unless they received financial assistance. A proposal put forward early in the nineteenth century for Parliament to fund emigration from the poor rate was not met with much enthusiasm. It was also suggested that landlords in Scotland and Ireland be asked to contribute. The emigrant was to be given free land and also be given a period of four years in which to settle, after which time they would be required to repay the loan. Malthus stated that nobody should be compelled to go overseas, but that if they did refuse to go they would be denied poor relief (hardly what one would expect from a clergyman!) Canada, as the nearest and therefore the cheapest colony to travel to, was suggested as the preferred place for those emigrating. There has, however, as Haines rightly suggests, been a tendency to place too much emphasis on the Malthusian explanation when analysing the reasoning behind emigration (ibid. 9). Emigrants left Britain for varying reasons; the push and pull factors were only part of the decision to go overseas. The decision to go was as much about friends and/or relatives asking/begging/paying for prospective emigrants to join them in their new-found homeland. Haines quotes Baines who suspected that emigration “may have ‘tended to run in families’” (ibid.). Haines study also shows that although poor, sometimes from the very margins of the economy, government emigrants bound for Australia were, typically, literate, enterprising, self-selecting individuals who sought opportunities to exchange lives of under-employment at home in an unstable socio-economic environment, for the chance of full employment in the colonies where their labour was in demand (ibid. 17).

It was in 1828 that Wilmot Horton introduced a Bill in the House that in essence would allow parishes to mortgage their poor rates to provide for their able-bodied paupers by colonisation to the British colonies. Horton’s Bill suggested that the paupers should be supplied with capital goods to enable them to settle and to make something of their lives rather than be a burden on the colony of their choice. The Bill was defeated, and again in 1830 when it was resubmitted. However Horton was involved with experimental emigration to Canada to assist Irish unemployed labourers. The scheme was successful, but not repeated because of the excessive costs involved (ibid. 85). In 1832 the Government made it clear that they did not intend to give monetary assistance to those who wished to emigrate (five years later, however, government schemes were in operation – see below).

There are similarities between the Hortonian and Wakefieldian views of emigration. They both foresaw that the poor would be reformed into a self-confident labour force, although the means by which they reached
that end did certainly differ. It was the fear that the "propertyless masses" might revolt that drew support for
Wakefield’s systematic colonisation as a means of "diffusing discontent while creating 'new fields of
opportunity' for paupers abroad" (ibid.79-80). Edward Gibbon Wakefield was an unusual, poorly educated,
character. It was while he was in prison (for abducting an under-aged heiress) that he read everything he
could concerning colonisation. His predicament did not stop him from publishing his views on emigration
in a paper *A Letter from Sydney* that was published in 1829. He did, however, use the pen name of Roger
Gouger, pretending he was a struggling emigrant in NSW while languishing in prison in England. Four
years later, under his own name, he published *The Art of Colonisation*, which went into far greater detail
than his earlier work.

Basically Wakefield’s systematic colonisation was founded on the premise that emigration should work on
the principle of supply and demand, and that land should not be given free of charge. Land should be sold
at a fixed price per acre. This would, he felt, improve the character of those going to the colonies. It would
encourage those who were prepared to work to establish themselves overseas, and discourage the
impoverished, the idle and the infirm. In a *Letter from Sydney* Wakefield noted the lack of paid labourers to
develop the rich resources of the colony. Land had been too easy to obtain, and those who had risked the
long journey to an unknown land were not the types who wanted to work for anybody other than themselves.
Wakefield believed his system of emigration would redress the balance.

Appendix 4 of Haines’ research takes over nine pages to detail the emigration agencies, regulations and the
glossary of terms in operation between 1831 and 1900. That Haines had to compile such a lengthy
Appendix highlights the complexity of the emigration systems.

The following are the six agencies that were recruiting emigrants between 1831 and 1840:

1831-2  Emigration Commission under auspices of the Colonial Office
1831-6  London Emigration Committee, chaired by Edward Forster for
         selection of single women
1832-6  Colonial Office supervision under the superintendence of T. F. Elliot
1834-6  NSW Agent-General J. D. Pinnock liaised between parishes, the
         Colonial Office and the NSW government
1835-40 South Australian Colonisation Commission
1837-40 T. F. Elliot, Agent-General for Emigration, including monitoring of
         bounty mobilisation
Between 1840 to 1872 the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission selected and supervised emigration, including monitoring of the bounty system until 1843, and control thereafter, until its cessation in the mid-1840s (Haines, 1997, Appendix 4, 272).

Both the bounty and government schemes were in operation during the period 1837 to 1843, but it was the former system that was the more favoured of the two at this time. Both schemes were open to abuse particularly the bounty system whereby representatives of approved ship-owners selected emigrants. As Haines states, following the successful inspection of each emigrant by the Immigration Officer on arrival in the colony, the bounty (a set rate between £18-£19 for carrying each passenger) was claimed by the shipping company or their representative authorised to introduce emigrants. If the emigrant was rejected, because of ill health, deemed to be of poor character, considered the wrong age, or to have an occupation not suitable to the colony, payment of the bounty was refused. No payment was given if the emigrant died en route. The ship-owner was liable for the cost of transporting the emigrant if the bounty was not paid (ibid. 273).

Government schemes were those of assisted, free or selected emigration. Initially assisted passages were for those who did not qualify for a free passage in that their occupation or age was incompatible with the needs of the colony. Assistance was calculated on a scale determined by occupation, gender, marital status and age. Assisted passages could be given, for instance, to aged relatives, travelling with those who qualified for a free passage. From 1849 the assisted and free method of emigration was dispensed with and a new complex sliding scale of support introduced. Selected emigrants were those who applied to the CLEC, or its authorised representatives. The prospective emigrant would have to meet particular requirements of age, character, health, gender and occupation (ibid. 274).

A further scheme in operation during Chisholm’s time in NSW was the nominated system. This was the system whereby those who purchased land could nominate one to three labourers for each £100 of land purchased (ibid. 275).

Chisholm perhaps did not feel confident enough in 1842 when writing Female Immigration to comment on the relative merits of the bounty and government systems of emigration. Her knowledge of the government system was only through hearsay, but she had been able to observe the “evils” of the workings of the bounty system. Chisholm was incensed by the lack of protection given to young women that she “solemnly avowed” was highly necessary. It was the lack of protection, she believed, that caused the ruin of many young women (1842, 19). Particularly worrying was that the bounty system did not allow for the protection
of the young women once they had arrived in Sydney, and Chisholm voiced her concern that some disreputable men and women were allowed on board ship shortly after its arrival to speak and engage the women. In some instances Chisholm felt the Bounty Agents were harshly treated when they were blamed for the poor character of the women they shipped to Australia when it was the lack of protection and assistance on disembarkation that led to their ruination. Chisholm was also concerned that the importers were allowed the liberty of selecting their own surgeon whom she felt was often inadequately trained. She also felt that the examination of the emigrants on arrival in Sydney to assess the eligibility of payment of the bounty was not always carried out evenly, justly or correctly (1842, 23-30).

Chisholm considered the question of emigration in her paper *Emigration and Transportation* (1847). Writing in her open letter to The Right Honourable Earl Grey, Secretary of State for the Colonies, she raised the question of the renewal of free emigration and couched her argument in economic debate. For her it was a question of

common sense to solve the financial question, as to whether it is better to endeavour to support the overburdened labour market of the United Kingdom by the instrumentality of Government works which are not required, and by an augmentation of the poor rates; or whether it would not be more in accordance with the sound spirit of political economy to give a free passage to her Majesty's Colonies, to such eligible families as should voluntarily come forward and solicit this boon (1847, 3).

Chisholm felt it far better that prospective emigrants “instead of being as they are now, an encumbrance to the State, or having to be supported by poor rates, the produce of the industry of others, would shortly in themselves become an industrious population, and would contribute to the commercial revenue of Great Britain annually” (ibid.).

It was also in *Emigration and Transportation* that Chisholm raised the issue of the land question. She could see the absurdity that there was a constant cry of “no funds” to give free passage to the Australian Colonies when “if land be not put up for sale, land cannot be sold; consequently there are no funds”. She noted that when

land was required by the large capitalists, or men merely land jobbers, land was put up for sale, and funds were raised; aye, even when it was known that gambling was being carried on to a frightful extent, land was put up and sold, when men bought on chance with accommodation paper (1847, 3).

Chisholm’s practical solution to emigration being resumed was to:
temper the supply to the demand. Labour, it may be seen, will create capital; that capital will bring out emigrants, and find employment for them; thus a self-creating and a co-operating system would, in a shorter time than is calculated upon, provide for hundreds of thousands. The late consumer in Europe now becomes a producer in Australia; he finds a remunerative return for his labour; he transforms it into capital, and that capital enables him in his turn to employ labour (1847, 9).

This was not the first time Chisholm had raised the land question. Nor was it the last. She touched on the subject during all four of her political lectures in Sydney during the late 1850s early 1860s. The report of Chisholm’s lecture in Sydney on the 10th December 1860 noted that

for some years the subject of a free selection of the land by the people, and for themselves, had been one which had occupied her [Chisholm’s] mind, and fully was she persuaded of the fact of its being a subject of the deepest importance, and one which nearly affected the interest of every man, woman, and child of the community. She had made the land question in this colony a matter of deep study (SMH, 11.12.1860).

By the 1850s squatters had acquired most of the land suitable for agricultural and pastoral purposes. It had been in September 1826 that Governor Darling established an area known as the “Limits of Location”. Settlers were permitted to take up land within this area, but not beyond its boundaries. Land outside the limits was not sold or let. In 1829 Darling issued a second order extending the original boundaries to establish what became known as the “Nineteen Counties” surrounding Sydney. Settlement within these new areas was permitted, but again no land could be acquired or occupied beyond the Nineteen Counties. During the 1830s many ex-convicts as well as some emigrants illegally occupied land outside the boundaries. In some instances they also stole the stock to put onto the land on which they were squatting. They squatted on Crown land and the colonial government did not have the power or the resources to remove them. In 1833 Governor Bourke took action to ensure the squatters could not claim legal title, and in 1836 imposed an annual licence fee of £10. This gave the squatters grazing rights, but also ensured that the Crown kept the title to the land. The squatters, wool manufacturers and importers to Britain, wielded considerable power, socially, economically and politically, both in Britain and Australia. It was in the early 1840s that home government fixed a minimum price of one-pound per acre for land within the Nineteen Counties. Land outside the area, particularly unsurveyed land, was not available for sale. This made it impossible to obtain fertile land until the authorities put it up for sale. Even when they did put land on the open market, there was often insider trading adding to the problems of the poor acquiring small plots of land. The squatters gained security of tenure and pre-emptive rights in 1847. This had the effect of locking up the land and making it impossible for the emigrant, or emancipist, to purchase land for fourteen years. There was much land grabbing and under-occupation by the squatters, some of whom lived in Britain.
These then, are some of the problems regarding the working of the emigration systems in operation during the period in which Chisholm was working. She voiced her opinion on a number of occasions, not least of which were her strong comments on the Despatch from the Duke of Newcastle to Sir Charles Fitzroy dated 29th November 1853 on the subject of the extent of the rights of occupiers of pastoral lands. It was during her lecture on ‘Free Selection before Survey’ that Chisholm read extracts of her comments and objections to the Order in Council that established “regulations relative to the occupation of waste lands in NSW”. Chisholm firmly stated her belief in the injustice of Pre-emptive rights.  

That Chisholm was able to understand and to appreciate the problems that the regulations raised can be noted from the remarks made by Mr. Hanson, who proposed a vote of thanks to Mrs. Chisholm following her lecture on ‘Free Selection before Survey’ in Sydney on the 10th December 1860. He said “no one had worked so hard as Mrs. Chisholm in the cause of the people, and had received so little for it. She knew more than many of their statesmen about the land question” (Empire, 11.12.1860).

It is debatable though whether the Chisholms knew much about Australia, and even less about emigration, when they embarked on the Emerald Isle in Madras on the 23rd March 1838. They travelled with three native servants who returned to India after the completion of the journey. The journey was beset with problems, and the ship had to put in for repairs at Mauritius for a month and was laid up for a further month at Adelaide, and three weeks at Hobart Town, Van Dieman’s Land, before sailing on to Sydney. The journey in fact took some seven months. The ship’s five hundred and fifty-one tonnage was grossly overloaded. The sight of Sydney and the end of the journey must have truly gladdened the hearts of the passengers, especially for Caroline and Archibald with a toddler of nearly two and a half years and a baby just over a year old. They would have sailed in with the many other vessels entering the harbours of Sydney Cove and Darling Harbour, and would have seen other ships unfurling their sails for departure.

After their arrival in Sydney in October 1838 the young Chisholm family settled in a cottage in Windsor, some thirty miles inland to the north west of Sydney on the Hawkesbury River, a “wearisome drive of five or six hours” (Walker, 1890, 6). As noted earlier “the Scots were generally acutely aware of the value of education”. They regarded a school as an essential element in a community and this concept was one Archibald would have “carried with him wherever he went” (Donaldson, 1966, 20). This may well account for the choice of Windsor as a home. There had been a Roman Catholic school in Windsor conducted by James and Esther Cassidy from 1835-1844. There were one hundred and four scholars on the roll in 1838,
and the school was somewhere in George Street, perhaps next to the cemetery (Steele, 1916, 122). In 1837 there was only one religious building, that of the Church of England. The Roman Catholics met in a room or shed called a chapel in Macquarie Street belonging to Mrs. Christopher Davis. The resident priest then was the Reverend Father Brady (Walker, 1890, 10). The Catholics eventually acquired their own church that was opened by Archbishop Polding on 21st October 1840 with the assistance of Reverend W. Ullathorne. There were about forty public houses in Windsor, “quite out of proportion to the extent and requirements of the place” including one called “Help me through the World” (ibid. 11). A very small settlement of aborigines resided just outside Windsor. The town boasted a Police magistrate, a Court House and Benevolent Asylum, and had its own solicitor and a branch of the Commercial Bank as well as a good few houses.

During expeditions from Windsor to Sydney, both Caroline and Archibald, as noted above, first became aware of the unacceptable conditions that faced newly arrived emigrants to the colony. Many emigrants, like Parkes and his family, arrived without money and without the prospect of employment. As already indicated, the first recipients of the Chisholm’s benevolence were Scottish Highlanders but Caroline particularly noticed the young girls who “were ... sent here without friends or advisers: I soon observed that many of them did not conduct themselves with propriety” (Chisholm, 1842, 1). She was aware that the young girls were prey to the dubious attentions of some of the men. She visited the immigrants’ barracks in Sydney and was surprised to learn that there was a ladies committee but that the ladies never visited the building. It was after this visit that Chisholm devoted all her “leisure time in endeavouring to serve these poor girls, and felt determined, with God’s blessing never to rest until decent protection was afforded them”. Chisholm initially sheltered the young girls in her home - up to as many as nine at one time (Chisholm, 1842, 2).

A further son, Henry John, was born to the Chisholms on the 30th July 1839. He was baptised at St. Mary’s Church in Sydney on the 7th August 1839. Later that year Archibald was recalled to active service, and in January 1840 he sailed for India.

After much deliberation in January 1841 Chisholm wrote to Lady Gipps to seek her help with founding the Sydney Immigrants’ Home. From that day forward she never ceased in her exertions (Chisholm, 1842, 3). Organising, funding and arranging accommodation for the girls in Sydney was not easy. The difficulties placed in her path, and the deep humiliation she was made to feel on many occasions, made Chisholm
“suffer much; but on the Easter Sunday, I was enabled, at the altar of our Lord to make an offering of my talents to the God who gave them”. Chisholm “promised to know neither country or creed, but to try and serve all justly and impartially” (ibid. 4).

Even with the help of Lady Gipps, it still took Chisholm some time to obtain help from the Governor, who believed Chisholm had “over-rated the powers of her mind”. He eventually allowed her the use of the rat-infested immigrants’ barracks - “such a trifle ... so long withheld” (ibid.10). Sir George insisted that Chisholm could have the use of the barracks only on the understanding that the Colonial Government would not be put to any expense. The home was run entirely on public subscription. Only later did Sir George begrudgingly allow Chisholm the privileges of free postage, and even then he questioned the validity of the recipients. He felt she should have been addressing the mail to the Magistrates and Police of the different districts, whereas Chisholm addressed her letters to the people she considered best knew where jobs were available. The letter asked very specific questions as to whether girls who had merely been accustomed to milk cows, wash, and the common household work about a farm, would readily get places in the interior. She wanted to know what wages these girls would get, and how many of them would be required over the next two years. She questioned whether good servants, such as housemaids and cooks, were likely to be required, and what would be the wages for them if they were, and how many would be wanted. Further questions followed in the same vein with regard to married couples with small families; and could young single boys and girls from seven to fourteen be protected and found work? Would young women be able to save from their wages – were clothes as expensive as she had heard? And what would be the cheapest way of conveying people into the country? Other such questions followed (Sidney, 1853, 136). That Chisholm went to such lengths indicates her seriousness about her venture and shows her very practical and methodical nature. It also illustrates Chisholm’s concern for the young single women. Chisholm found them work as domestic servants but it was not a totally negative move. The women could “learn valuable social and domestic skills which might lead to a better marriage than she might otherwise expect”. It also gave the women an opportunity to earn their own livelihood and obtain a sense of “freedom” (Perkin, 1993, 236).

The Immigrants’ Home was expanded to include accommodation for families and young men, and housed the only free employment registry. Chisholm was well ahead of her time in insisting that contracts of employment should be drawn up in triplicate - one for herself, one for the employee, and one for the employer. The contracts were hardly ever contested. It was obvious from the beginning that there was a fear of travelling into the interior of the colony. The young women were particularly frightened of doing so.
To allay such fears Chisholm lead large parties of immigrants herself, drawing courage no doubt from her experience of travelling in India. She organised resting stages and employment agencies at a dozen rural centres. To keep costs to a minimum, Chisholm advertised in the local papers requesting farmers that she and her immigrants be allowed the use of empty bullock drays returning to farmsteads after bringing produce into Sydney. The farmers willingly helped her, and helped feed her and her immigrants, free of charge, on their journeys into the bush. Neither Chisholm nor her immigrants were ever attacked by bushrangers. The bushrangers admired her for the work she was undertaking.

It was at Sydney's Supreme Court in April 1842 that Judge William Burton sentenced Captain Robert Robertson of the bounty ship Carthaginian, and Richard William Nelson, the ship's surgeon, to six months' gaol for the cruelty at sea of their passenger, Margaret Anne Bolton. They were also fined £50.00 each. This was the culmination of Chisholm's prosecution of the men. Margaret Bolton and a number of other distressed women from the Carthaginian had told Chisholm of the horrors of their journey to Australia and the particularly brutal attack on Bolton. She had been "hauled from her bed in the middle of the night, doused with buckets of water, pinioned with her hands behind her back and left shivering on the poop for hours in her night-gown. The captain, the doctor and the captain's uncle, the third mate, had clamped such terror on bounty passengers in steerage that not one man who witnessed the savagery dare raise a hand to stop it" (Joy, 1972, 72). Bolton had not mixed well with the other women on board ship, and was particularly outspoken against the half-dozen or so "ladies of the town" who "sang, danced and drank with the captain and surgeon each night" (ibid. 73). There were other instances of ill treatment of the passengers throughout the journey. On hearing of the gross misconduct of the Captain and Surgeon, Chisholm demanded of the Magistrates Innes and Brown, both members of the Emigration Board, that a warrant be issued against the two men. The Magistrates declined. Undaunted Chisholm petitioned Governor Gipps, courageously informing him she was ready to prosecute and willing to go to prison herself if necessary (ibid. 72). Possibly Chisholm felt she was in a "win, win" situation. If she had lost the case and gone to prison, probably the resulting outrage would publicise the plight of passengers, particularly female passengers. The success of the prosecution would bring reforms, as indeed it did, and ensured Captains and Surgeons on emigrant ships were more cautious in their treatment of their passengers.

It was on the 14th November 1843 Chisholm gave evidence before a Select Committee on Distressed Mechanics and Labourers. During her evidence she outlined a scheme for settling families on the land with long leases. The land-owning members of the committee opposed her scheme. However she was not
daunted, and with the financial help of Captain Robert Towns and the proprietors of the Wollongong steamers Chisholm put her own scheme into operation (Kiddle, 1957, 52). Only twenty-three and not the fifty families she hoped for, settled on the land at Shell Harbour, near Wollongong. Later that year Chisholm reported that the scheme had some failures, but also added, “the plan had succeeded remarkably well considering the many difficulties thrown in the way.”

Chisholm gave further evidence before another Committee on Distressed Labourers in 1844. At the Committee’s request she advertised for the unemployed to register with her in order that a true record of unemployment in Sydney could be calculated. Chisholm again questioned the validity of the Government’s land purchase regulations, but again the Committee did not heed her remarks. Chisholm did not attempt to settle other families on the land as she had at Shell Harbour. She had proved her point, but wanted to concentrate her efforts upon making further journeys into the bush seeking employment for the newly arrived immigrants.

As mentioned above, Archibald retired from the East India Company Army and set sail from Madras on the 5th January 1845. The ship, the Coringa arrived in Sydney via Trincomalee and Hobart Town, on the 11th March (Hoban, 1984, 152). No doubt Archibald received a very warm welcome from his wife and family, and quite likely Caroline and Archibald discussed what the future held for them. Chisholm was by this time a very well known woman in Australia, and obviously felt she still had much to do. Archibald supported his wife by helping her gather evidence from immigrants who had settled in Australia. Chisholm felt that the best help she could give those intending to emigrate was detailed information from the settlers themselves. At their own expense Caroline and Archibald toured NSW and collected over six-hundred statements from immigrants about their lives in the colony. It was Chisholm’s hope that the Government would publish these statements, but they declined to do so.

It was on the 4th September 1845 that Chisholm was called in and examined by the Committee set up by Legislative Council of NSW to inquire into and report upon the best measure of promoting immigration. Chisholm made it clear to the Committee that she felt that the poorer classes considerably improved their circumstances by coming to the colony. She read a number of statements that she and Archibald had collected “from immigrants in various parts of the colony, relative to the improvement of their circumstances, caused by the emigrating to NSW.” It was during her evidence to the Committee that Chisholm raised the question of ticket of leave men being allowed to have their “wives and families sent to
the colony passage free” as she considered that “the separation from their families” was a source of “great evil”. She also put forward the suggestion that “female immigrants should be sent out under the guardianships of respectable ladies” and made clear her disapproval of females coming out under what was called the protection of families. She put forward the idea of ships with married families, preferring that no single men be sent out in the same ship with single women. She also stated categorically that she thought the system of bounty emigration was a “very bad one, thoroughly bad”. Chisholm could not propose a better system at that time, but stated that once she had ascertained the actual demand for labour, by visiting the districts, and discussing with employers the question of country dispersion, she hoped to be able to submit a proposal to the Honourable Commissioners for Emigration. Chisholm confined herself to her collection of facts, collected with Archibald’s help, and stated her belief that it was the “poor peasantry” that was wanted in the colony, settled upon small farms.

As Chisholm prepared to depart for England in April 1846, the Scottish Presbyterian Minister, John Dunmore Lang, who was involved in the work of emigration, was also preparing to sail for England. Before departure he published a letter in the local paper openly accusing Chisholm as a “zealous and devoted Roman Catholic” who was trying to romanise the colony (SMH, 14.5.1846). This was just one of a number of attacks John Dunmore Lang was to make upon Chisholm’s work. Though hurt by his attacks, she was more than able to defend her work and faith (see chapter on Catholicism).

During the seven years she was in Australia from the time of her arrival from India to her departure for Britain, Chisholm achieved a great deal. In that short time she had become so well respected that the Legislative Council had requested her to give evidence before them on three separate occasions. This was no small achievement for a woman, a Roman Catholic woman, working and living in the mid-nineteenth century. It must have been a disappointment to her, however, that the Council did not accept her ideas, or that arrangements had not been made for the better reception of immigrants on arrival in Sydney as she had advocated and was practising to the best of her ability. (Reforms were made a few years after Chisholm’s return to England). She established a Home for the newly arriving immigrants, and had placed nearly 11,000 immigrants in employment, and was, as Chisholm believed, “the first lady in Australia who had ventured in the character of an author, to appear before the public” (Chisholm, 1842, viii). And all this for the majority of the time, without the help and support of her husband who was serving overseas in India. Chisholm showed remarkable patience and determination in pursuing her aims of establishing the home when faced with the opposition of not only the Governor of NSW, but also both the Protestant and Catholic
clergy. She showed that she was not afraid to lead large parties of immigrants into the bush. She sacrificed
the pleasure and enjoyment of bringing up her own children (who stayed at Windsor under the protection of
a Nanny, Miss Gavin). All this was achieved without a penny being paid out by the Colonial Government.
In fact Chisholm would not accept financial assistance, believing that to do so would jeopardise her
independence to "serve all creeds" to the best of her ability.

1 Report, Select Committee of the Legislative Council, appointed 8th November 1843 "To take into
consideration a Petition from upwards of 4,000 of the Inhabitants of Sydney, soliciting the attention of the
Council to the distressed Condition of the numerous unemployed Artisans and Labourers in the City of
Sydney, having accordingly taken the same into Consideration, and examined various Witnesses, both as to
the actual Condition of the Unemployed in Sydney, and the demand for Labour of various kinds in the
Interior". IUP, BPP, Colonies, Australia 7, 1842-44, 522.
2 Ibid.
3 A letter from the Colonial Secretary's Office, Sydney, 28th October 1835, set out the Notice
Introducing the Bounty System. (Copies of Correspondence Respecting Emigration, 64. BPP, 1837, XLIII,
358). The regulations were changed in 1837 and 1840. The new regulations were published in the New
South Wales Government Gazette on the 25th September 1837 and 18th March 1840.
4 Parkes overcame his dislike of wicked Australia. He went on to be the Premier of NSW on five
occasions between 1872 and 1891. He was knighted in 1877.
5 It was due to Elizabeth Fry's influence that a barrack for the female convicts was built at Paramatta,
and a Ladies Committee established. According to reports that came in the 1830s, however, the situation in
Paramatta had deteriorated considerably (van Drenth & de Haan, 1991, 59).
6 See particularly Helen Heney, Caroline Chisholm - Pioneer Social Worker, paper read before the
RAHS, September 29th 1942 and published in their Journal, V. 29, 1943, pages 21-34.
7 Kiddle writes that "Captain Chisholm was recalled to active service in the Chinese 'Opium War',
but there is nothing within his service record to suggest that this was the case (1957, 5).
9 Twenty-three years service in India, with three years furlough, would have enabled Archibald to
retire on a Captain's pay of £191.12s. 6d. per annum, but by prudently remaining in India a further four years
he was entitled to retire on a Major's pay at £292 per annum. As the Chisholms were not financially secure
the difference in pay would have been a significant consideration (The Calendar for the year 1846, 193,
supplied by Tamil Nadu Archives, India).
10 This is another episode that has been changed a number of times in the telling. In his Journal in
1849 Sidney suggests that it was Chisholm who helped the Highland emigrants. In 1853 he was writing that
it was Archibald who had initiated the help (had Chisholm read the former and corrected it?) Mackenzie
(1852) suggested that it was Chisholm who helped the Highland emigrants. Dark does not relate the tale,
whereas Swann states that Captain Chisholm lent the Highlanders money to purchase tools (1925, 9).
Kiddle merely notes that the "Chisholms met some Highlanders" (1957, 5). Hoban greatly extends the
incident to several paragraphs, suggesting Archibald originally became involved with the Highlanders and
was about to give them some money, when Chisholm suggested that part of the money should be expended
on ropes and equipment to enable them to become woodcutters (Hoban 1973, 26, 27). Bogle follows
Hoban's description of the incident as if it were true fact and does not take into account Hoban's declared
biographical fictionalisation (1993, 46).
11 There is also the recent work by Margaret Humphreys Empty Cradles, which deals with child
migration from Britain in the 1940s-60s.
“Push” being synonymous with the conditions at home that made people feel that they had no alternative but to emigrate, and the “pull” factors, such as the allure of the gold fields and the belief that life could be better overseas.

The ‘Nineteen Counties’ of white settlement were: Argyle, Bathurst, Bligh, Brisbane, Camden, Cook, Cumberland, Durham, Georgiana, Gloucester, Hunter, King, Murray, Northumberland, Phillip, Roxburgh, St. Vincent, Wellington and Westmoreland.

The Empire, 11th December 1860. Chisholm had commented on the 1847 Order in Council prior to its publication in December 1846. She had hoped to alter the contents for she was aware that it favoured the squatters and threatened the expansion of land ownership amongst other European Australians (Moran 1994, 66).


The branches were established at Paramatta, Port Macquaire, Moreton Bay, Wollongong, Maitland, Scone, Liverpool, Campbell Town, Goulburn, Yass and Bong Bong (Chisholm, 1842, 86/87).

Chisholm was referring to Rule No. 3 of the then current regulations whereby young women were required to be assigned to the charge of a family. Chisholm suggested that many of the women travelling in this manner did not meet with the family who were to act as her protectors until the ship was about to leave port.

Statistics compiled from Haines (261) show that just over 26,000 emigrants arrived in NSW between 1841 and 1846 (from the foundation of Chisholm’s Home and her departure for Britain). Not all of those immigrants would have required help, some would have had friends and/or relatives or jobs to go to. That Chisholm placed nearly 11,000 immigrants (almost half of those who arrived in the colony) in employment is no little achievement.

Hoban notes (1984, 95) that a book by “a Lady long resident in New South Wales” entitled A Mother’s offering to her Children, was published in 1841. The book was dedicated to the son of Sir George and Lady Gipps, and was, its author claimed, “the first work written in the Colony expressly for Children”. Either Chisholm was not aware of the publication of this work, or had discounted it because it was a children’s book which recounted accounts of shipwrecks drawn from printed sources.
As the ship Dublin bringing the Chisholms back home to England neared its destination, Caroline gave birth to her fourth son Sidney on the 6th August 1846. In spite of the difficult birth at sea, and settling herself and Archibald and the three young boys, aged ten, nine and seven, into life in London, Chisholm carried out her promise to bring to the attention of home Government the plight of emancipists’ wives and families, and the children who had been unable to accompany their parents to Australia.

Chisholm fought for the right of emigrants’ children, those left behind in England because of government regulations (because the children were either too young or too ill to travel, or due to the parent’s lack of funds) to be sent out to join their families in Australia. It was through Chisholm’s determined efforts in locating, documenting and detailing the whereabouts of the children, that the ship, Sir Edward Parry, was chartered to take the children out to their families in Australia. In their report for 1847, the CLEC were considerably concerned that “211 applications” had been received “on behalf of children, of whom 161 are under 14 years of age, and of whom 205 are living in Ireland, and are scattered over 20 counties”. The Commissions admitted that “frankly ... we should not ourselves have ventured to suggest a large juvenile emigration, but, being anxious to meet the wishes expressed by the Colonial Government [instigated by Chisholm] ... no effort shall be wanting on our part to fulfil successfully the benevolent designs in which it originated. Due to no small effort of Archibald and Caroline in locating and organising the children, the ship arrived safely in Sydney, on the 17th February 1848.

While tracing the children who were to be sent out to join their parents in Australia, Chisholm also discussed with home government the plight of emancipists’ wives and families whom she believed should be sent out to join their partners in the colony free of charge. When the system of transportation was at its height, the home government rewarded convicts for good behaviour by the grant of a free passage to Australia for wives and children. However due to economic pressures the practice was discontinued in 1842, causing hardship to many of the emancipists in Australia and their families in Britain. It was in April 1847, through Chisholm’s efforts, that a number of wives and families sailed for Australia, free of charge, to join their partners. In both instances Chisholm had accumulated all the information and data concerning the children and wives and families. As Harris suggests: “it is one of the characteristics of Caroline Chisholm, that she
never makes a claim or a charge - whether it be against a government department or a commercial system - which she is not prepared to establish with the strongest judicial proof" (1862, 4).

As Hoban notes, it was no doubt due to Chisholm’s understanding and knowledge of the rules of “convict discipline” and her experience of working in NSW, that led her to be called as a witness before the Select Committee of the House of Lords enquiring into the Execution of the Criminal Law on the 20th April 1847 (Hoban, 1984, 202). During the course of her evidence Chisholm stated that she had placed about one thousand “ticket of leave” men in employment in NSW and that she had placed a number of emancipists’ in jobs in the interior because the men themselves had felt that “Sydney was a place of danger, where they would be exposed to great Temptation”.

Chisholm was also requested to give evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland. It was on the 12th July 1847 that Chisholm was cross-examined on her work in Sydney, transporting the single females and groups of families into the bush to seek employment. The Select Committee questioned Chisholm on her views on the fixed price of land at one pound per acre. Chisholm was not shy in stating her views that if “the upset Price were much lower Numbers would buy Land in large Blocks, and that the People that want to get it would not, because they prefer selling Land in large in preference to small Quantities”. Chisholm also read some of the statements that she and Archibald collected in NSW prior to their departure. The statements were later published as Comfort for the Poor! Meat Three Times a Day!! etc.

It was during 1847 that Chisholm published Emigration and Transportation Relatively Considered in a letter dedicated, by permission, to Earl Grey. The purpose of her booklet-cum-open letter was to persuade the Government to follow a systematic plan of emigration. Chisholm commences her letter with an apology that “if the subject which I am desirous of advocating be not of sufficient importance to plead my apology for thus addressing you, there is nothing which I could say that would make the act excusable” (1847, 3). Having made her apology however, Chisholm spells out her plans “with the sound spirit of political economy” (ibid.). Appended to the booklet are eighteen statements of “voluntary information of the people of NSW, collected by Mrs. Chisholm”. (That Chisholm did apologise for her work is discussed more fully in chapter ten.)
The language and style of *Emigration and Transportation* suggest the possibility that Chisholm may well have sought Archibald's help in drawing up the document. There is a distinct difference to her other papers. *Emigration and Transportation* was published in 1847. In a letter to Benjamin Hawes at the Colonial Office dated the 28th February 1847, Chisholm mentions that “indisposition” had prevented her making an early reply to his letter of the 12th instant. The birth of Sidney on 6th August 1846 had been fraught with difficulties. Although the document is dated June 17 1847, no doubt it was drafted somewhat earlier. While Chisholm may have felt it necessary to raise her tone when addressing Earl Grey, the language is such that Archibald may well have helped her. Such phrases as “in the spirit of captiousness” and “I intensely feel the solemnity and the responsibility of the question” as well as “I hesitate not to say, iniquitously tried to depreciate and thwart the decrees of Providence in the propagation of the human race” is far removed from Chisholm’s simple and natural style of writing.

The response to Chisholm’s open letter and her repeated visits to the Colonial Office were not what she had hoped for. Chisholm was unable to interest the government in her land ticket system and family emigration. She was not to be defeated, and in 1849 she founded the Family Colonisation Loan Society. The Society encouraged and helped families to accumulate the cost of half their fare, the remainder being loaned by the Society and to be repaid within two years in Australia. The Chisholm home in Islington, London, became the Australian information centre, and letters addressed Caroline Chisholm, London, actually reached her in Islington. Recent research located a letter addressed to Caroline Chisholm, Colonial Secretary's Office, Downing Street, London, which was redirected to her home at 3 Charlton Crescent (now Charlton Place) Islington where one room of their home was furnished as steerage accommodation on board ship. It was here that Chisholm held regular evening meetings for the emigrants, which were often attended by Sir Sidney Herbert, and/or Lord Shaftesbury who served on the Committee of the FCLS. At these meetings Chisholm advised and helped families suggesting ways in which they might combine to pool their resources to save the cost of half the fare. She also ensured that single females would meet and join family groups, the purpose of which was to afford the young girls protection on board ship and on arrival in Australia. Archibald left England in 1851 to act gratuitously as Australian agent for the FCLS.

Chisholm published a series of letters to “the gentlemen forming the Committee of the Family Colonization Loan Society” entitled *The A.B.C. of Colonisation* detailing the rules and explaining more fully for the benefit of the public the “principle of the Society” and how it may “be worked in detail in the Australian Colonies” (1850, 2).
As with *Emigration and Transportation* the language and style of *A.B.C.* would seem to suggest that Archibald helped his wife in its composition. The document is dated London, August 1849. Caroline Monica was born on the 13th May 1848. A further child, Sarah, had been born in February 1850 (she died in the August from a throat infection). This would have meant that Caroline was about two months pregnant prior to the date of the document. The Chisholms also had two very young children, Sidney about two and Caroline about thirteen months old. Even with the help of one maid, it would have been a difficult time. That Caroline may have sought Archibald’s help in the drafting of the document is more than understandable.

In *A.B.C.* Chisholm voiced her deep concern that “orphan after orphan had been victimized on board emigrant ships” (ibid. 10). It is therefore no surprise that new evidence seems to suggest that Chisholm may have been one of the founders of the British Ladies Female Emigrant Society (also known as The British Female Emigration Society: The British Matron Society) founded in March 1849. The organisation was not involved in promoting emigration but was specifically established to find “matrons” to escort single female emigrants to the colonies. Chisholm was a strong believer in time on board ship being put to the best possible use. It was one of the aims of the Society that Matrons were employed not only to protect the young single females from the adverse attentions of the sailors and single men but to also ensure that the young women occupied their time usefully. The Matrons encouraged the young women to make garments to be sold on arrival in Sydney and to learn to read and write if they could not already do so (Layton, 1864, 616-18).

It was through Chisholm’s endeavours that improvements were made in the Passenger Acts. She was very particular with regard to the ships that were used under the auspices of the FCLS. Mackenzie describes how Chisholm used to visit Blackwall docks and would give directions to carpenters and ship-fitters, inspect the provisions, interview brokers and make arrangements with Government officers (1852, 27-28). Chisholm wanted the ships of the FCLS to set an example to ship-owners. She was determined that men and women would not have to dress and undress before each other and that married couples should not sleep on open shelves or bunks in sight of one another. Chisholm insisted that there should be an improvement in the ventilation methods and that there should be sufficient number of closets that were well situated and well secured to avoid destruction from rough seas. She was also determined that there should be adequate light, and that there should be pumps that the emigrants could use to give an ample supply of water. Chisholm
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considered it of prime importance that there should be facilities for washing clothes, and that there should be a better supply of food of higher quality than was currently the case (Harris, 1862, 8). Chisholm was the target of "vehement and virulent opposition" by the ship-owners who were put to considerable cost to install the improvements she put forward (ibid.).

Chisholm was not requested to give evidence to the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the working of the Passengers’ Act, but current research has found that she gave evidence to the Select Committee on Emigrant Ships on 6th April 1854. Chisholm again showed no reticence in stating her views very specifically. She left the Committee in no doubt that she believed the "present space of 18 inches ... is not sufficient." Chisholm made "inquiry of a tailor" who gave her "a good idea of the measurement" and he told her "that the average width of the back of a man’s coat is 21 inches". Chisholm clearly stated that she thought "12 per cent. more space than is given by the last Act is necessary." This is again indicative of Chisholm’s attention to detail, and the acquisition of facts. Later in her evidence she was asked about shipwrecks. Anticipating such questioning she had acquired the Admiralty Wreck Chart for 1853 which detailed where ships had been lost. She compared the findings with Lloyd’s Register to establish that only a small number of “good ships” had been lost. It is noteworthy that Chisholm was the only woman among the twelve witnesses to give evidence to this all-male Committee. A further fifteen witnesses gave evidence to the Committee in May 1854. None were female (ibid.). Interestingly Florence Nightingale on her return from the Crimean War chose not to give oral evidence to the Royal Commission on the Health of the Army for political reasons (Woodham-Smith, 1992, 295).

In spite of giving attention to all of the above, Chisholm continued her work with the FCLS. That the Society was relatively successful is emphasised by recent research which has uncovered a letter that Sir Sidney Herbert received in January 1852 from 14 Old Jewry Chambers, City [London]. The letter requested that Herbert attend a meeting with gentlemen connected with the Australia trade at the London Tavern on the 16th January at midday. The discovery of gold and the fear of insufficient labourers in the colony had stirred those connected with the Australian trade to act swiftly (see below). The letter stated the “Scheme of Emigration known as the Family Colonisation Loan Society appeared to them to present the readiest means of attaining the object they have in view, and it was determined that efforts should be made to raise a Fund in the City of London with the view of extending the operations of this Society”.
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The result of the meeting was that a City Committee was set up with offices at 29 Bucklesbury that seems to have worked in conjunction with Chisholm who still continued to hold meetings at her home in Islington. A report in *The Times* of 16th January 1852 noted that Mrs. Chisholm’s Society, though enjoying remarkable success, had no provision for a proper rate of interest (Hoban, 1984, 271). It was also in 1852 that the Legislative Council of NSW voted a sum of £10,000 to be entrusted to the London Committee of the FLCS.

The newly found Report of the Executive Committee of the FCLS, to consider the best mode of employing the sum placed at their disposal, and signed by P. M. Strzelecki, T. S. Atkins, George Hay Donaldson and F. R. Gore, agreed, amongst other things, that “preference shall be given to young married couples with few or no children, or to single persons of both sexes between the ages of 18 and 30; and that males and females shall be sent out as nearly as possible in equal numbers.” The sum of £10,000 was to be applied in “furtherance of the object of the Family Colonisation Loan Society in such manner as might be arranged between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the London Committee of the Society.” The Duke of Newcastle authorised the payment of the money to the Society “without any restrictions as to the mode in which it should be applied”. This was a mark of confidence in the Society and the London Committee.

While still continuing her work with the FCLS Chisholm undertook lecture tours throughout England, Ireland, France, Germany and Italy where Pius IX gave her a bust of herself and a papal medal. It was while in Rome Chisholm fetched her son William from the Propaganda College where he had been studying to become a Priest. He was unable to continue his studies at the college due to his ill health. Chisholm returned to Australia on the Ballarat which sailed from London on the 14th April 1854, accompanied by her sons, William, Henry and Sidney and her two daughters, born in London: Caroline Monica and (Harriet) Monica, (born 24th July 1851). Chisholm had hoped to sail home on the maiden voyage of the auxiliary screw steam ship the Caroline Chisholm commissioned by the Society and built in Newcastle upon Tyne by W. S. Lindsay. The ship was built to Chisholm’s high specification for ventilation and space, but was requisitioned for the Army to transport soldiers to the Crimea.

Chisholm had achieved much during her time in London at a cost to herself and family. Previous biographers refer to the subscription as a testimonial to Chisholm that was begun in the August 1853. Kiddle writes that “It was proposed that ‘a fund be raised and presented to her as a public testimonial of the appreciation of her valuable services’” (1957, 186). New evidence, however, suggests that Chisholm’s friends started the testimonial in order to alleviate her poverty. A letter written by Nightingale to her mother Fanny on the 2nd June 1853 states how badly Chisholm needed funds. She wrote “Mrs Herbert has
just written me word that Mrs Chisholm is living on nine-pence a day having parted with her one maid of all work and not having tasted any meat for weeks.” Nightingale, writing from Paris, asked her mother to subscribe £5.00 on her behalf because “there is no time to be lost - as the woman is starving”. The testimonial was, in fact, “the only way they [Caroline’s friends] could think of helping her”. Chisholm was a proud woman, and had insisted all along that she would not accept money from individuals or religious organisations. She wished to remain, and to be seen to remain, an independent agent working in the field of emigration. Such knowledge no doubt prompted Nightingale to write in a further letter “you cannot give her [Chisholm] private charity”. The subscription raised between £800 and £900 and was presented to Chisholm at the meeting held on the 9th August 1853 at the London Tavern to mark “the respect and gratitude of the friends of Mrs Chisholm for her long, arduous, and successful efforts in improving the condition of emigrants to the British Colonies, and especially in promoting the reunion of families, and to present her with a testimonial previous to her departure for Australia” (The Times, 10.8.1853). Hoban notes that other sums were added later (Hoban, 1984, 322).

It is a further indication of Chisholm's work that a portrait of her was hung at the Royal Academy in 1852. Kiddle writes that the painting, which gave a very good likeness of Chisholm, was painted “by an obscure painter, Angelo Collen Hayter” (1957, 163). Hoban, however, attributes the painting to the “Queen's portrait painter, Sir George Hayter” who had “previously made a drawing of her [Chisholm] the reproduction of which he was not very pleased, although Caroline had written to thank him for the compliment to herself and the 'cause of Colonization.'” Hoban quotes Chisholm’s letter that informs Sir George of the esteem in which he is held by one of the London Editors who believed him to be “just the fine fellow I thought him” (Hoban, 1984, 281). However, one has to question the validity of Hoban’s reading of the letter. The Royal Academy of Arts Dictionary quite clearly shows that Angelo Collen Hayter exhibited the portrait (Graves, 1906, vol. 4, 45). This is clearly misinformation presumably used by Hoban to raise Chisholm’s stature in the eye of her readers. It also again raises the issue of how much reliance can be given to previous biographers. That Hoban authoritatively devotes nearly a whole page and gives so much emphasis to the fact that Sir George painted the portrait would lead readers to assume that the lengthy data was undoubtedly correct and Kiddle, who only uses two sentences to impart the details of the artist, was incorrect. Fortunately Bogle merely writes that Chisholm had “her portrait painted” and therefore the misinformation, in this instance, has not been perpetuated (1993, 136). The potential for such misinformation being perpetuated aptly illustrates how ‘historical’ data can so easily become corrupted.
Interestingly this letter was from a James Charles Kiernam (sic) writing from Battery Point, Hobart Town, on the 25th February 1850. He wrote requesting Chisholm's help and influence in obtaining a pardon from "an unmerited and cruel sentence of Transportation". This was not the first occasion he had written to Chisholm (Wiltshire Record Office, WRO 2057/F8/VIII 260).

Present research has established that Chisholm spoke at thirty-two lectures/talks/emigration meetings between April 1850 and April 1854. Undoubtedly there were others. As noted, it was during this time that Chisholm gave birth to two daughters: Sarah, born January 1850, but died in the August, and Harriet Monica, born July 1851. The younger children were Caroline born May 1848 and Sidney born August 1846.

Caroline Chisholm to Sir George Hayter, 11th April 1850, LaTrobe Library, State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, MS6318.
Throughout 1852 and 1853 the *ILN* carried numerous articles concerning the gold digging areas of Australia and California. But the presence of gold in Australia was known nearly twenty years previously in 1823. The Polish geologist Strezelecki found "auriferous rock in 1839". That there was gold, however, was played down by the Colonial government who feared "the discovery, for the excitement of a gold rush might make the large convict and ex-convict element in NSW uncontrollable" (Morrell, 1968, 200). The government was proved correct in playing down the discovery of gold for when the new find became known in May 1851 Bathurst was drained of its labourers and the squatters deserted by their shepherds, although the smiths were busy making pickaxes (ibid. 202). Sydney too soon began to feel the effects of the discovery with an exodus from the town. Likewise Melbourne's population was depleted as diggers left for Bathurst at a time when the State of Victoria had only just won its independence from NSW. To counter the outflow of population, Melbourne citizens offered a reward "for the discovery of a profitable gold-field within 200 miles of the city" (ibid. 209). It was in August 1851 that gold was found "on the banks of a stream at Ballarat, some fifty miles north-westward of Geelong" (ibid.). By October Melbourne and Geelong were almost emptied of many classes of the male population (ibid. 210).

The mercantile interests, as noted above, adopted Mrs. Chisholm's scheme of emigration to encourage the much-needed labourers to emigrate. But the pull of the lure of finding gold itself stimulated emigration and eclipsed Chisholm's work. There was no longer a need to encourage emigration. As Kiddie remarks: "the gold discoveries had brought such a flood of new people into the colony, and ... hastened the pace of what had been a leisurely pastoral society. ... The colonies were filled with a lusty, thrusting development, quickened by the results of the gold discoveries" (1957, 246-247). The rapidly growing colonisation in Australia meant that Chisholm's work in the field of emigration was no longer needed and because she was no longer needed she began to slip from view.

Chisholm returned to Australia on the aptly named ship Ballarat that arrived in Melbourne on the 12th July 1854. But the ship was late in docking, and many people from amongst the large crowd that had assembled to meet Chisholm and her family had dispersed. A welcome meeting was therefore arranged for Chisholm to be held at the Mechanics Institute on the 31st August. The meeting was a great success. A second meeting,
organised by the committee of the FCLS, was held towards the end of September. The purpose of the meeting was to welcome Chisholm back to Australia and to also thank Captain Chisholm for all his efforts in Victoria.

It was agreed that a testimonial should be raised in recognition of Chisholm's philanthropic works. The Legislative Council, after some wrangling, agreed to allocate the sum of £5,000, provided that the sum of £2,500 was raised by public subscription. Because of difficulties within the province, Chisholm only received the cheque from the Legislative Council during 1855. In the meantime the Chisholms were in such financial difficulties that the testimonial committee had "to advance the family 'a small sum of money' to put them in a position of earning their livelihood". The money was allocated to the purchase of a large store for the family (Kiddle, 1957, 202-206).

Prior to Chisholm's arrival in Melbourne, however, Archibald had obviously tried to find ways of enhancing the family finances. Hoban notes that Messrs Chisholm & Son had a small warehouse off Flinders Lane East but it did not make a fortune (1984, 330-331). Archibald reached retirement age on the 28th November 1854 and, as noted earlier, having served the required number of years in India, upon retirement he received a major's pension and was allowed the courtesy title of Major. The retirement pension and the testimonial allowed the family to move within Melbourne to Elizabeth Street where they acquired a retail store. The store was well sited and it was hoped that it would capture its fair share of the goldfields trade (ibid. 354). The beginning of 1855 was not an ideal time to be opening a store. At the end of the previous year there had been many insolvencies and prices and wages were falling. The Chisholms suffered as others suffered and towards the end of the year the family bought the well-established store of Roger and Harper's in Kyneton, but again the shop was not a successful enterprise (ibid. 356, 369). Major Chisholm sat on the Magistrate's Bench at Kyneton.

Chisholm's memories of running a shop must have been useful in writing Little Joe. In the novelette Mr. and Mrs. Crampton, walking "arm and arm up George Street", reach Mr. Croft's shop (Moran 1991, 52). Chisholm reflected on the "ugly willow" pattern that the Crampton's were compelled to buy, and obviously saw the disadvantage of selling crockery in sets. She wrote: "it would be a great advantage for a young wife to be able to purchase her one dish and six plates of an elegant pattern, that she could add to as her circumstances improved or her family increased (ibid. 53). In the novelette Chisholm commented upon pickle jars and "the difficulty of getting the pickles out of the bottle" that spoilt a good dinner. "The bottles
ought to be large enough to admit into them a good-sized spoon” (ibid. 77). Yet again Chisholm’s ever-practical nature shines through, and demonstrates her attitude to running a store, both for the benefit of the customer and herself as shopkeeper.

That Caroline and Archibald choose to open a store signifies their attitude to work. Chisholm’s father and her Uncle Plowman obviously had aspirations to achieve more than their farm-labouring father, and worked hard to achieve it. Chisholm’s choice of occupation reflects her need to be seen to have moved on from her father’s position, and like her father before her, she was prepared to work hard, as she had done all her life. As a well-known and popular woman it would have been important to find employment that befitted her status. As Roberts notes “for many working-class families working in a shop carried more social status than working either in a factory or in domestic service” (Roberts, 1990, 37). The positioning of the store would also have been important. It was in an ideal position for Chisholm to keep an eye on the progress of the Shelter Sheds en route to the gold-digging areas (see below).

Chisholm had not been welcomed back to Melbourne by everybody. In fact William Howitt was extremely critical of Chisholm in a letter he wrote from Bendigo on the 23rd April 1854. Howitt firmly believed that the statements Chisholm had made at meetings in the manufacturing districts of England to encourage people to emigrate to Victoria were “totally untrue” (Howitt, 1972, 336). While in Britain Chisholm had indeed been unaware of the squatters’ monopoly in Victoria. Howitt had himself experienced the appalling conditions the prospectors faced when travelling to the diggings, and the appalling living conditions that confronted them when they arrived. His censure of Chisholm arose because he believed she had no knowledge or experience of life in Victoria, or of the gold digging routes and living conditions in the gold prospecting areas. Writing a post-script to his letter on March 1st 1855, Howitt was not disappointed to learn that Mrs Chisholm had “candidly at a public meeting in Melbourne declared her discoveries of the painful reality that awaited her” (Howitt, 1972, 340). Chisholm travelled to the gold-digging areas herself to see and experience the terrible problems of getting through the thick mud of the Black Forest, and the horrific sights of the long ranges of public houses at the diggings. Chisholm saw with clarity that the “great grievance of the diggings is that [the men] cannot get the land” (ibid. 341). As previously noted, Chisholm had often spoken of the unfairness of the squatters’ monopoly of the land. The conditions she saw in Victoria resulted in her campaigning even more strongly for the “unlocking of the land” and she promoted the cause for the small farmer. She wrote a number of letters to The Argus. One letter in particular, written on the 9th December 1854, shortly after the “Eureka Stockade”, 2 deplored the incident which had
“stained the hands of the people with blood” and she hit out at the monopoly of the lands and the Wakefield system (Kiddle, 1957, 220-225). Chisholm continued her campaign until her health broke down towards the end of 1857 (she was beginning to suffer from the kidney disease that blighted the rest of her life).

Chisholm’s new project was to help organise shelter sheds (later to become known as “Chisholm Shakedowns”) along the gold digging routes. The Supplement to the Victoria Government Gazette of Friday, July 27th 1855, requested tenders by noon on Friday August 10th for the erection of Shelter Sheds or Protection Posts to be built at Essendon, Keilor, Robertson’s, The Gap, Gisborne, The Black Forest, Woodend, Carlsruhe, Malmesbury and Elphinstone. The sheds were to be an easy day’s walk apart, and they were to provide accommodation for single men, single women, and families in separate living quarters. The high costs of accommodation and food at the numerous inns along the track often made them out of reach for many travellers. For those travellers who provided their own beds the charges for the Shelter Sheds were 6d and 3d for adults and children respectively. Furnished beds were 1s for adults, 6d for children. Beds in small room were 1s.6d. For cooking with wood and water the charges were 6d per adult and 3d. per child. Such charges enabled families to travel together to the gold digging areas. Chisholm helped manage the shelter sheds, travelling the length of the route on a great number of occasions. The sheds were a great success. Others had been planned, but either due to financial difficulties, or because of Chisholm’s ill health, no further shelters were built.

Concern, as noted previously, regarding misinformation within Hoban’s biography raises questions concerning the Secretary of the Shelter Shed Committee whom Hoban notes was Eneas Mackenzie. Hoban points out that Eneas Mackenzie later obtained a position in the Government service, but still remained Secretary of the Committee (Hoban, 1984, 361, 371). Hoban emphasises that as Caroline made her farewells to friends and relatives before her departure from England in 1856, Mackenzie “like other literary people, was thinking of emigrating himself” (Hoban, 1984, 327). This information is not substantiated, and factual detail has not been found. Hoban however believed that it was Chisholm’s biographer who was Secretary of the Committee. The brief biographical details of Mackenzie in Hunt’s The Book Trade in Northumberland and Durham suggest that he emigrated to Australia c1834, but had returned to England by 1845 (1975, 63/64). Perhaps he visited the colony on a second occasion. A Mr Mackenzie was present at a “friendly little soiree” to mark the Chisholm family’s move from Melbourne to Kyneton at the end of 1857 (Hoban, 1984, 382). New evidence indicates that an Alastair Mackenzie appears as Colonial Treasurer on the FCLS Committee for Port Phillip, Melbourne, in an advertisement that gave details of the FCL Scheme.
and written by Archibald Chisholm (The Belfast Gazette, 1851). Hoban found other similar advertisements
that appeared in The Argus on various dates in April 1852, again giving Alastair Mackenzie as Treasurer
(Hoban, 1984, 276). Mr. G. W. Rusden, Acting Immigration Agent signed the notice requiring tenders for
Shelter Sheds or Protection Posts to be built in the Victoria Government Gazette as noted above. An
original poster used in the 1850s details the charges for the Shelter Sheds stated on behalf of the Committee,
Alfred J. Agg and Caroline Chisholm (ibid.). Hoban emphasised that "Eneas Mackenzie remained secretary
for the Shelter Shed Committee but having obtained a position in the Government service, was not able to
travel up and down the line" (1984, 371). Hoban does not substantiate her evidence and although evidence
has not been found to refute her observations, it is possible that A. and E. Mackenzie have become confused.
Hoban's information is not found in Kiddle's biography.

The problems with Chisholm's health persisted. In 1859 on the advice of her doctors the family moved from
Kyneton to Sydney for the better climate as the "only chance of her recovery" (Harris, 1862, 14). During
improvements in her health Chisholm conducted political lectures on various subjects, including the secret
ballot, free selection before survey, early closing of shops and the poor conditions of city housing. From
December 26th 1859 until May 15th 1860 eleven chapters of Caroline's novelette Little Joe appeared in The
Empire. Caroline continued to be beset by ill health and financial problems. Her dire financial problems
prompted her to write to Farther Therry for the loan of £15 or £20 (Hoban, 1984, 390). The Papal Medal
was pawned to help subsidise the family (Archibald junior some considerable while later found and
purchased the medal). To help alleviate financial difficulties and educate their young daughters, Caroline
and Monica, Chisholm opened a school at Rathbone House, Stanmore and later moved to Greenbank,
Tempe. As with the opening of the store, opening a school carried with it an acceptable social status and
enabled Chisholm to earn a livelihood as well as educate her daughters.

The Chisholms had much to celebrate during this period of their lives. They also had much to regret.
William, their second son, married Susanna McSwiney at St. Francis Church, Melbourne, on 20th April
1857. Chisholm's first grandchild, and William and Susanna's first daughter, Josephine, was born on the
18th March 1858. William, however, died quite suddenly in Melbourne in the December of that year.
Only a month later Josephine died. Susanna Chisholm later joined the Sisters of Charity where she was
noted for her charitable nature, and held the position of Reverend Mother at the convent at Woollahra, NSW
(Hoban, 1984, 391). Chisholm's mother, Sarah Jones, died on the 28th March 1859. The news would
have taken some while to reach Chisholm and her family in Sydney. Sarah's will states that all her houses,
lands, tenements, appurtenances etc. should be sold and divided equally between her five daughters, Charlotte Wright (Widow), Mary Ann Auld (widow), Harriet Goode (widow), Sarah Gage (wife of Samuel Gage) and Caroline. There were a number of properties to be sold, and the legacy would have been substantial, albeit that the sum raised was to be divided between the five daughters. In view of the financial problems and difficulties of the Chisholm family, it raises the question as to whether or not Chisholm received the legacy. Possibly the legacy helped to pay for the school that Chisholm founded, or paid for the return fares to England and the further education of the two daughters.

An article written by Edmund Dwyer Gray, Chisholm’s grandson, in the Sydney Morning Herald, of the 16th February 1924, suggested that Caroline left Australia in June 1866, inferring that she travelled with the family. New research has established from the records of Elizabeth Rathbone of Liverpool that other members of the Chisholm family came back to England before her. Rathbone’s diary entries for 1865 show that the “Major and Miss Chisholm came” on 7th June 1865 to visit her at her home, Greenbank, in Liverpool. Entries for July and August indicate that Major C., Sidney and Monica and Miss Chisholm visited either for lunch or as dinner guests. An entry on the 25th October 1865 mentioned that Elizabeth wrote to Mrs. Chisholm.

It would appear to be a reasonable assumption that Archibald (senior), Sidney, Caroline and Monica returned to England without Caroline to enable the girls to complete their education. Kiddie obtained information from Miss M. E. Chisholm, a daughter of Chisholm’s son Henry, who suggested that Henry returned with the family to complete his education in Ireland (Kiddle, 1957, 232). However, as Henry would have been twenty-six at the time, and had married Kate Hefferman in Sydney on the 13th October 1864, this is highly unlikely. Hoban wrote that she had evidence that indicated that it was Sidney who completed his education in Ireland. He would have been nineteen at the time. Kiddie on the other hand wrote that Caroline (junior, aged seventeen) was boarding at a convent in London and Monica (aged fourteen) was in a Belgian convent (ibid. 232). This is consistent with Rathbone’s diaries, which give the address of Convent Elm Villa, Highgate, and an entry on the 20th March 1866 that says “Miss Chisholm to school.” Regrettably research has not been able to uncover further information, other than that the convent was run by the Marist Sisters, in “a pretty little house with a garden on Holloway Road at the foot of Highgate Hill and quite a distance from St. Joseph’s Church on the crown of the hill”. The convent was pulled down some years ago and replaced by Highgate Bus Garage. Research has been unable to trace the convent in Belgium.
That Chisholm remained in Sydney is made clear from a letter she wrote on the 22nd September 1865 addressed to “My Dear Mrs. Rathbone” and continues, “I am sure you will be pleased to hear that I am getting better, every day this last week I have been able to go out for a walk twice a day and find great benefit from doing so; I go out in the morning ¼ to 9 and return at five minutes past – in the cool of the evg I take a slow walk for twenty minutes”. 7

It would therefore seem highly likely that it was important for the girls to return to England to further their education, but that Chisholm was too ill to have made the journey with them. The letter notes that Chisholm was staying in a comfortable lodging at 6 O’Connell Street, Sydney, that her son had taken for her, and proudly wrote that her married son dines with them “which made her very happy and comfortable” (ibid.). 8 As son William had died in Melbourne in 1858, it is therefore surmised that it was Archibald (junior) who had taken the lodgings, and that Henry visited for dinner. Hoban had been able to read a letter that was in possession of Mr. H. Chisholm of Sydney that a cousin had written to Major Chisholm. (1984, 413). The letter indicated that Archy (junior) was returning to the Colony of NSW. Hoban had surmised that the family had travelled to Scotland to visit relatives. They may well have done so. On the 11th July 1867 for instance, Rathbone wrote: “Sam (or could be ‘Saw’) Miss C & Cuthbert to Scotland”. However, an address in Rathbone’s diaries indicates that Major Chisholm could be contacted at an address in Cheltenham. My research found that the address was that of the Major’s brother, John. 9 The carte de visite of Chisholm found in amongst the papers of Rathbone was taken in Cheltenham as already noted. The photograph was probably taken during the Chisholm’s visit to England from 1846 to 1854. 10 This would seem to indicate that there was fairly close contact with brother John and his family there, and Archibald (senior) could have travelled to both or either Cheltenham or Scotland to visit relatives. From this information it would appear highly probable that Archibald (junior) accompanied his mother on her return to England in 1866. Regrettably there is no evidence of shipping details or any announcement of Chisholm’s departure or arrival in England. As it had been some while since she had appeared in public, it would seem that her travel arrangements went unnoticed.

Chisholm however still had hopes of being of use to those wishing to emigrate in England. Her letter to Rathbone reads:
Only yesterday Mr. Cowper the Colonial Secretary appraised me that my Pension for £200 per annum for life should be on the Estimates; the House meets in October and before the Xmas holidays the Estimates must pass the House. The Appropriation Bill will follow so that I have every reason to expect I may leave here in January, I should not think of doing so until I had received my first months pension – after seeing Mr. Cowper I called on the Minister of Land and Emigration to thank him for his promise of support, and he took that opportunity of assuring me that when I was certain of going home he would like to know that he would see that funds were available to enable me to render service to the colony without injury to myself (ibid.).

Even in her twilight years, Chisholm was as practical as ever. She asked Rathbone if she could find out how much the rent of a house would be near the Docks "to enable me to visit ships and for parties about emigrating to call upon me for information". Chisholm wanted to be fully prepared with all necessary information. Regrettably however it would appear that Chisholm did not receive the pension. She may have been an innocent victim of the difficulties of the time. Search of the Parliamentary Papers indicates that the Appropriation Bill was never passed. Obviously Chisholm had high hopes of being able to be of service to the colony, for a rough draft of a notice of the "Liverpool Committee of Advice In the Protection of Emigrants" was found amongst Rathbone’s papers. It reads:

The Committee have no pecuniary interest in emigration, but are willing to afford information and to advise country persons sailing from Liverpool in the choice of ships – lodgings and etc. on their arrival at Liverpool... (the words underlined were deleted).

Also on the recommendation of the Sydney Melbourne & Adelaide Committee to receive instructions regarding Remittances made by Emigrants there to assist their relations (sic relatives) in this country and to see that the sum be properly appropriated. Committee, -- Acting Hon. Secy., (Liverpool University Library, RPVI.I.478).

Research in Liverpool has been unable to locate any further references to the Liverpool Committee and presumably it did not materialise. Chisholm would have been fifty-eight in 1866, and it seems remarkable that she was still hoping to continue her work back in England. This may very well have been a necessity to help pay for the education of the girls and the way of justifying a pension. Perhaps it is also an indication that Chisholm was finding it difficult to retire and possibly a way of not giving in to her illness.

Shortly after Chisholm’s return to England, and whilst they were still living in Liverpool, Caroline’s name was used for fraudulent purposes. A young man by the name of Henry Phillip Dashwood Arthy was charged at the Bow Street Police Court with having obtained the sum of £100 from the Royal Bounty Fund and with forging the receipt of Mrs Caroline Chisholm (Hoban, 1984, 410-412). Arthy had written in July 1866 to the Prime Minister, Lord Derby (the former Lord Stanley) requesting financial assistance in the name of Caroline Chisholm praying for a grant from the Royal Bounty Fund and pleading poverty and ill-health.
The court case necessitated Chisholm attending the hearing and giving evidence. This would seem to indicate that Chisholm had not been entirely forgotten.

It may have been coincidental or prompted by the above court case, but Chisholm was awarded an annual pension of £100 from the British Government in June 1867. The Rathbones may also have been instrumental in obtaining the pension for Chisholm, for an item in Elizabeth’s diary for 14th May 1867 reads “called Mrs. Chisholm told her of Pension”. The pension must have helped the family considerably, and was probably badly needed as Chisholm’s health continued to be a problem.

October 19th 1868 is the last entry in the Rathbone diaries to note that she had visited or been called upon by Mrs. Chisholm. It would appear that the Chisholms stayed at 15 Brookland Road, Old Swan, Liverpool, and at 255 East India Road, in Toxteth. I can find no further information concerning their stay in Liverpool than as above. What is undoubtedly clear however, is the close friendship of the two women. A convention of the time no doubt, but it is noticeable that both Caroline and Archibald appear in the diaries as Major and Mrs. Chisholm.

By 1869 Caroline and Archibald were living at Highgate Hill, London. New evidence shows that they resided at 3 Great Winchester Buildings, Winchester Street, and then 6 Whittington Grove, Highgate. Daughter Caroline remained at home with the family until her marriage to Edmund Gray, the son of Sir John Gray MP, on the 13th July 1869. Edmund became the Mayor of Dublin and sole proprietor of *Freeman’s Journal* and a member for Tipperary. Edmund’s father died in 1875 and left Edmund considerable property. The 1871 Census returns for Highgate and Islington show that only Archibald and Caroline were at home on the night of the census. A Matilda Copner from Warwickshire, Birmingham, and a Margaret U. Kearsy from Wicklow, Ireland were visiting. But were they visitors? Quite possibly due to their continued financial difficulties the Chisholms may well have taken in lodgers. The Chisholms at that time had a servant, Ann Smith, born in Bethnal Green, Middlesex.

As she lay in her sick bed, Caroline must have been fretting for the medal that she had received from Pius IX. In consideration of his wife’s feelings Archibald wrote to their son Henry in Australia authorising him to “receive on my account from any party who possess them, one Gold Medal, and one gold crop” (Hoban, 1984, 416). This note was written on the 21st September 1875 from Highgate Hill London. Archibald wrote another note the same day to Henry detailing his pension from the Madras Military Fund. Archibald,
ten years older than his wife, must have worried considerably for her welfare should he die before her, as he suspected he would. Archibald had been subscribing to the Madras Military Fund since he entered the Service. After Archibald’s death, Caroline would have been entitled to £147.16.0d per year for Monica, while single, and she herself would have received £40.00 per year. Caroline’s own pension, as noted above, was £100 per annum. Archibald’s letter to Henry also indicated that if both he and Caroline were dead, then Monica would be allowed £60 a year. If she remained single, then Archibald felt sure that “friends would make interest with Government, on death of us both, to grant her the yearly pension her mother had, or at least half of it” (Hoban, 1984, 416). Research shows that this does indeed seem to have been the case. Florence Nightingale wrote to her brother-in-law, the MP, Sir Harry Verney, on Easter Day (April 1st 1877):

You know that Mrs. Chisholm, the Emigrants’ friend (and alas Mrs. Nassau Senior both) died last week. They are to try to get Mrs. Chisholm’s pension of £100 continued to her unmarried daughter. Who has nothing (Major Chisholm who still lives having only his pension). Sidney Herbert, had he lived, would have done this. It is greatly to the credit of the Chisholm family that they have literally no fortune – everything was spent in the work. (She died last Sunday in London after a long illness). If you and Lord Houghton thought well to write to Disraeli about the pension, I should think it would be done (Wellcome Institute, Letter, Easter Day/77 – 1.4.77).

It was with the assistance of Edmund and Caroline Gray that Archibald and Caroline with their youngest daughter Monica, removed to 43a Barclay Road, Fulham. They had been five years at Highgate Hill. The property in Fulham was slightly larger but importantly it enabled Caroline to have a bed in the bay window. She had by this time been bedridden for some considerable time. It was in Fulham on the 25th March 1877 that Caroline died. The death certificate indicates that the cause of death was “senile softening at brain 6 yrs - bronchitis 14 days, certified by R. Pitman LRCP.”

A sad end for such a remarkable woman. Archibald died a few months later in Rugby on 17th August 1877. The funerals of both Caroline and Archibald were held at the Catholic Cathedral in Northampton. The tombstone above their joint grave in the Billings Road Cemetery in Northampton asks “Of your charity pray for the repose of the souls of Caroline Chisholm, The Emigrants Friend who died 25th March 1877 aged 67 years and of Archibald Chisholm, Major, 30th Madras Native Infantry, who died 17th August 1877, aged 81 years. R.I.P.” Neither Caroline nor Archibald left a will.

Of the eight/nine children from the marriage of Caroline and Archibald Chisholm, four survived their parents. As indicated above, baby Caroline died at three weeks old in 1831, and Sarah had died shortly after her birth in 1850. William, the second son, died in Australia in December 1858. Archibald junior died
in Sydney in 1875. Archibald had married Anne Loder and they had two daughters, Caroline and Jean. His wife Anne also died in 1875. Of the surviving children, Henry John who married Kate Heffernan on the 13th October 1864, had six children, William John born 17.8.1865, Mary Ellen born 10.4.1867, Archibald Frank born 13.3.1869, Henry Sydney born 17.9.1871, Edmund Arthur born 17.9.1873 and Caroline born 7.6.1875. Henry became an Army Officer and Magistrate. Sidney married Anne Loder's sister, Isabella. They did not have any children. Daughter Caroline, as above, married Edmund Dwer Gray and had four children, Edmund, Mary, Monica and Archibald. Mary entered a convent in Ireland. Edmund settled in Tasmania after his father had died and his mother had married a second time to Maurice O'Connor. She died on the 15th April 1927 in Ireland. Harriet Monica (known as Monica) married Maurice Gruggen on the 30th April 1883. They lived in Moosomin, Saskatchewan, Canada. As far as known, they had no children.

1 Interestingly Hoban comments (without notation) that "in the store they [the Chisholms] found that old blue willow-pattern china would not sell; that pickles, wines and spirits sold according to the bottles, and shirts and gloves to the boxing (1984, 368).

2 The "Eureka Rebellion" was an armed conflict in 1854 between diggers and government authorities on the gold fields at Ballarat, Victoria. The Diggers' grievances included the licence system and its administration, for which the diggers were forced to pay thirty shillings a month. The miners had to carry their licences at all times, and had to face licence hunts, which were deeply resented. There was corruption among officials, and the diggers had no political representation and only limited access to land. A Royal Commission was appointed in 1854 to inquire into the state of the gold fields. Its recommendations, most of which were adopted, included the abolition of the licence fee, the introduction of an export duty on gold, and the introduction of a miner's right, which conferred legal and political rights, to cost £1 a year.

3 Details from a facsimile poster, the original of which was published in the 1850s, and preserved in an album of cuttings and souvenirs kept by the Chisholm family, and purchased by Hoban, in Tasmania in 1976. The poster was reprinted by kind permission of The Age for "The Caroline Chisholm Society", a voluntary family welfare organisation which tries to emulate in the modern world the spirit of Caroline Chisholm.

4 Rathbone House was obviously named for the Rathbone's of Liverpool, with whom Chisholm had become friendly when lecturing in Liverpool in 1853. Greenbank was the name of the Rathbone home in Liverpool.

5 The records of the Rathbone family are held at the Sidney Jones Library, University of Liverpool.

6 The information was kindly supplied by Sister Jessica Leonard S.M. of the Marist Sisters. She has made an historical study of Marist Sisters' archives in relation to their foundations in England, including Highgate, 1863-1870.

7 Liverpool University, Sydney Jones Library, RPVI.1477.

8 Chisholm notes elsewhere in the letter that the rent for Board and Lodging was 25/- per week without washing and etc.

9 Colonel John Chisholm, 31 Clarence Square, Cheltenham.

10 There is no indication as to the date of the photograph, but from the appearance of Chisholm's dress, and an assumption of her age, it would be most likely that the photograph was taken some time in the 1840s/50s. Certainly the dress is consistent with the fashions of the late 1840s.
OF YOUR GRACE PRAY FOR
THE SOULS OF THE BODIES
OF
CAROLINE CHISHOLM
THE EMIGRANT'S FRIEND,
WHO DIED 29TH MARCH 1877,
AGED 67 YEARS.
AND OF
ARCHIBALD CHISHOLM
WHO DIED 17TH AUGUST 1877,
AGED 61 YEARS.
R.I.P.

CAROLINE CHISHOLM'S GRAVE.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CHARTISM

In his forward to Margaret Kiddle's biography Sir Douglas Copland stated: "Though averse to any display of force, her [Chisholm's] thinking had been influenced by the Chartists during her stay in England [1846-54], and in public lectures on her return to Australia she supported part of their platform." This description of Chisholm's political influences is too narrow, and could distort the account unless it is placed within a broader canvas. Copland is right, the Chartist movement was not founded until after Chisholm's departure for India in 1833, but her political education did not commence in the mid-1840s when she was thirty-two plus. The weight of surviving evidence shows that radicalism in Northampton in the early 1830s, along with the wider reform/radical movement, had a strong effect on Chisholm, one equal in scope and impact to that later of Chartism. Copland's view that Chisholm was only influenced politically by Chartism at a fairly advanced stage in her life has an unfortunate implication. It suggests that, up to this time, she was devoid of any general knowledge of affairs of state, questions of social reform, and conflicts between contending interests and values. It suggests that, in her youth, she was politically unaware.

At best, this would be a patronising conclusion. Even as a young girl of eleven years of age Chisholm could not have been unaware of the furore following the Peterloo riots in 1815. These were widely reported in the press and discussed throughout the country. Neither could she have been unaware, for instance, of the mood of the country towards the end of 1830, the time of her marriage at the age of twenty-two. The death of King George IV at the end of June 1830, the news of a revolution in Paris, the serious worries concerning a depressed economy, together with the advance in agricultural industrialisation and the effects of the poor law, led to a widespread cry for reform. There were a number of Swing agricultural riots (rick burning and destruction of threshing machines) which again were widely reported. As already noted, with the rejection of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords in October 1831, there were further riots at Bath, Derby, Nottingham and Bristol. To suggest that Chisholm was uninfluenced in her thinking by such occurrences is naive in the extreme. Chisholm's own writings make clear (as detailed below) that she was totally aware of what was happening around her and of the Chartist cause from its conception.

This chapter will therefore look at early radicalism in Northampton and the Jones' family links with radicalism in the town. It will also look at early Chartism in England and note Chisholm's awareness of the
movement. The role of women within the organisation is discussed as well as the influence on Chisholm of Thomas Cooper, Charles Dickens, Douglas Jerrold and Lord Shaftesbury.

**Historical Background**

The term Chartism refers to a number of protest movements of the 1830s and 1840s that together hoped to transform social and economic injustices and the appalling conditions suffered by the majority of the population, through political reform. Although, as Woodbridge notes, the roots of parliamentary reform can be traced back to the beginning of the seventeenth century, there were a number of factors that culminated in the agitation for representation in Parliament that resulted in the 1832 Reform Act. Parliamentary representation had developed from the late thirteenth century, and local social and political élites had dominated politics. By the early nineteenth century many of the newer industrial towns such as Birmingham did not have a representative in Parliament. Demographic growth, coupled with the shift in population from country to town as the industrial revolution began to take hold, highlighted the disproportionate representation of one constituency over another, and showed that the “elective franchise” was “so partially and unequally distributed”. The long periods of war from 1793 to 1815 led to deprivations and difficulties for the poor and peace did not bring economic and social improvement. When the grain prices were high and trade poor, the people of Northampton would have felt the pinch as much as they would have done elsewhere in Britain. Such pressures led to social tensions that decreased as grain prices fell and trade rose. The “periods of economic distress gave rise to real or potential violence, not a new phenomenon, but dangerous in a country with an inadequate police force” (Woodbridge, 1970, Chap 2).

Abuses of the electoral system were becoming more widely reported in the growing newspaper industry and added fuel to the agitators’ campaign for parliamentary reform (Brock, 1973, 28). For instance Chisholm would presumably have been aware, both from the local paper and possibly local gossip, of the scandal of the electoral misdeeds of the corporation candidate at Northampton being paid £1,000 out of corporate funds for electoral purposes during the 1826 elections and the subsequent aftermath in February the following year (ibid. 26).

For many workers the rapid increase in industrialisation was seen as a threat to their livelihood. Membership of the protest movements that formed the basis of Chartism was drawn from a wide area of Britain, but support for the movement was not generally forthcoming from rural villages and market towns.
or the newer smaller industrial towns. That the Chartists sought political reform for the social ills they saw around them was a highly significant development. It was hoped that by winning universal suffrage the working man would be able to cast his vote for a more socially minded candidate. The movement was fuelled by the severe disappointment felt by the working men of Britain at their lack of success in achieving the right to vote under the Reform Bill of 1832. The Factory Act of 1833 only reduced the hours worked in textile factories by children, and ignored the efforts of Richard Oastler and his followers who aimed at achieving a ten hour work-day. The 1834 Poor Law that introduced workhouses into the manufacturing areas was greeted with much resentment. Chartism’s popularity rose and fell with the rise and fall of the economic climate and the consequent rise and fall of employment. Its popularity also rose due to the effect of the revolutions in Europe. The movement’s ultimate decline was due to the diversity of interests of its leaders and its followers and the problems of uniting local and regional groups.

Within the space of seventy-five years, five of the six points of the “People’s Charter” of 1838 was achieved, namely: universal suffrage, vote by ballot, equal representation, payment of Members of Parliament and no property qualification. It was in 1911 that an Act of Parliament shortened the life of future Parliaments to five years. A further significant achievement of the movement was that it highlighted the injustices of social policy that resulted in grants to education, a ten-hour day, a Public Health Act, and a new, and more generous, Poor Law. More particularly, it also brought the working-class man into contact with politics and enabled him to participate in public life.

Early Radicalism and Chartism in Northampton

The general movement of population from country to town was not reflected in Northamptonshire where the movement from land to town did not begin until as late as the 1870s. Greenall notes that in the “late enclosure era social tensions were reflected by such events as the Swing riots in 1830, and by outbreaks of crimes (particularly arson) against the property of farmers in times of privation”. In Northamptonshire privation “was never quite so acute nor social tensions so sharp, as in some of the southern counties, the principal reason being that shoemaking spread slowly into many of the villages in the early nineteenth century” (Greenall, 2000, 101). Although for some industries peace in 1815 brought a decline in trade with the fall in demand for goods for the army, Northampton’s shoe industry did not suffer the same fate. Following labour troubles in London in 1812, the wholesalers put work out to Northampton, and Northampton traders were able to capture London’s export trade in cheap footwear. As Greenall further
emphasises “what attracted the London wholesalers to Northamptonshire was the cheapness of labour. In order to keep it cheap female and child workers were introduced on a large scale. ... In Northampton, children, often as young as six and seven, were taught stabbing and stitching, men doing the knife-work and tooling” (ibid. 115).

Social ills, such as the employment of young children, led to the formation of numerous societies and organisations, some of them nearly national in scope, that were “formed to support the many and various reform demands” (Woodbridge, 1970, Chap 2). It was these societies and organisations that were the basis of the Chartist movement. Among them was the Working Men’s Association founded in Northampton in 1838. Like its brother Association founded in London in 1836, it called for universal male suffrage, annual parliaments, and secret ballots. Interestingly one of the members was a G. Jones. 3 As Maehl notates, “Henry Vincent gave a series of four lectures in the town in August 1838 advocating the establishment of the WMA and adoption of the National Petition. The first meeting was held on a date to coincide with the full emancipation of British Slaves (August 1st).” Local reports suggest that crowds “never exceeded 1000” but “the meetings appear to have drawn considerable numbers, chiefly working men, some of whom came from the surrounding towns and villages” (Maehl, 1983, 40). Four hundred members were enrolled in the Northampton Chartist Association following Vincent’s meetings and the numbers rapidly grew from within the town and from the outlying villages (ibid. 41).

At a meeting of the Northampton Female Radical Association reported in the Northern Star of June 22nd 1839 a Mrs. Jones seconded a motion, which was passed unanimously. The members viewed “with horror the wretched and degraded condition of the working classes” which they were “convinced arise from an unjust system of legislation; and, the People’s Charter being, in our opinion, the only remedy for such grievances, we hereby pledge ourselves to assist our sister and brother Radicals in every possible way to cause the same to become the law of the land”. Robert Gammage notes “the spirit with which numbers of women joined with men to forward the great movement of the day” and recalled a number of women at the meeting in Northampton in May 1839 (Maehl, 1983, 42).

Although such societies and organisations were founded after Chisholm had left for India, that they were founded in Northampton establishes the radicalism of the town. Frustratingly records of these associations cannot be traced and therefore it is speculation that the Jones’s quoted were relations of Chisholm. However Chisholm’s father, William had six sons all of whom had relatively large families. It is not beyond the
realms of fantasy, therefore, to suggest that there could have been a family connection. Interestingly Joseph Jones, the Secretary to the Operative Cordwainers (detailed below) was the son of George Jones, and grandson of William Jones.

Further evidence of the radicalism of the town is reflected in Janet Howarth’s comments that when Labouchere first stood as the Liberal candidate for Northampton in 1880 he remarked that “the mildest Liberal in Northampton would be termed a Radical elsewhere”, and that the town’s working class were all “more or less” politicians” (1970/71, 269). Howarth also goes on to say that “the county gentry had little influence in borough politics after 1874 .... and by 1880 Northampton stood for an extreme Radicalism which outraged county society” (ibid.). Although the article is concerned with late Victorian Northampton, research indicates that such comments are as relevant to the 1830s and 1840s as they were to the 1880s. That Dr. Peter McDouall, the chartist candidate only received one hundred and seventy six votes in the General Election held on the 24th June 1841 when Robert Vernon Smith was returned to parliament with a vote of nine-hundred and ninety votes, reflects the fact that a large number of Northampton men did not have the right to vote (Jenkins, 1999, 206).

The Northern Star on the 9th July 1842 gave details of trade membership of the National Chartist Association. The shoemakers of Northampton are amongst those listed. It should be noted that it is generally accepted that “small workshops were a notorious breeding ground for radicalism; men in tailoring or shoemaking could discuss ideas at work, to keep their minds occupied, in a way not open to operatives in a noisy factory” (Royle, 1996, 67). Machines were not developed for the shoe industry until the 1840s, and it was only then that factories began to appear, gradually displacing the journeyman shoemakers who worked at home or in small workshops. In 1831 one-third of the men living in the town were shoemakers, and by 1871 the figure had risen to two-fifths (Lines, 1990, 50).

Robert George Gammage, who was born in Northampton in 1821, thirteen years after the birth of Chisholm, is better known to those interested in the Chartist movement as the author of the History of the Chartist Movement 1837-1854 rather than as a member of that movement. Gammage, however, played his part in the political events of the day (Maehl, 1983). Gammage was born of working-class parents. The early political influences of his life stemmed from his parent’s Toryism and the Toryism that he found in his work at the Rose and Crown where he helped brew the beer that was consumed on the premises. The male members of his family belonged to the Conservative Club that met at the Rose and Crown. When Gammage
was twelve, his father died and he went to work for a local coach builder, Thomas Mooney in Market Square. The Market Square was within close proximity to the Jones’s properties in the Mayorhold and Bearward Street. It was at the coach builders that Gammage mixed with men from different political and religious backgrounds, all of whom were radicals “disenchanted by the Reform Act” (Maehl, 1983, 8). Gammage was influenced by his fellow workers and by the “Unstamped Press” that was easily available in Northampton. In Reminiscences Gammage refers to his old friend “William Jones” who was a “Radical bookseller of Northampton” (ibid. 38). By the age of seventeen Gammage was a committed radical. He joined the Working Men’s Association that led to his talking to the local communities on Chartism. Gammage left Northampton in the summer of 1839, not returning to the town until late in 1844 when he “organised and served as Secretary of an active Chartist Association with eighty paying members” (ibid. 8). Because of clashes between O’Connor and Gammage concerning the organisation of the movement and the “Land Plan”, Gammage was forced out of the branch and he moved to Stony Stratford. The ebbing tide of Chartism meant that Gammage kept a low profile, not emerging again until the revival of the movement in 1848, when once again he became fully involved with the organisation. He was appointed to the Chartist Executive in 1852, and he undertook a lecture tour with Ernest Jones between 1852 and 1854. Their travels took them to the West Country, Wales, the Midlands, the North of England and Scotland and finally London. Coincidentally Chisholm was also touring the country at this time talking to audiences about emigration.

Gammage’s involvement with the Chartist movement seems to have been curtailed following an argument with Ernest Jones in 1854, after which time he wrote the History of the Movement. He returned to Northampton in 1887 because of ill health. He died in the town on 11th January 1888 after being injured in a fall from a tram (ibid. 9).

Gammage’s Reminiscences quite clearly show Northampton was a radical town as early as 1832. This is further endorsed by the fact that in November 1832 Cleve and Hetherington, during their tour of the Midlands, established the Northampton Political Union, and in the December of that year the Union published an open letter urging their fellow townsmen to vote for the liberal candidate. In March 1833, the month Chisholm sailed for Madras, the Union protested against the Irish Coercion Bill, and in the June protested against the outrage of Cold Bath Fields on which they combined “in sentiment and action with our brethren of the National Union of Working Classes in London”. They also praised the “truly valuable” unstamped papers. In October 1833 they pledged to circulate the True Sun. (Hollis, 1970, 271, 277).
Dorothy Thompson notes that the population of Northampton was 21,000 as recorded in the *Parliamentary Gazetteer* for 1841. The figure of 38,000 is listed on the first Chartist petition (from the *Northern Star*). (Thompson suggests the discrepancy probably arose in that the population figure given by the Chartist petition is for Northamptonshire). Thompson further details membership of the Northampton Female Radical Association in 1839, The Teetotal Chartist Association and the Working Men's Association. In 1842 six hundred members took out membership cards for the National Chartists Association. Chartist activities were recorded in Northampton in 1842 and 1848. There were Land Branch Members and Company Members (Thompson, 1984, appendix: *Location and Timing of Chartist Activity*).

It would have been very difficult for Chisholm not to know of the radicalism in Northampton during her life there. She is noted for having told her audiences at lectures to read newspapers - something that she undoubtedly did herself. In her lecture in Sydney entitled “Our Home Life” reported in *The Empire*, Friday 14th June 1861, Chisholm tells the men “above all things, read the *Herald* and read the *Empire*, and [to] use their own judgement”. Chisholm had a strong belief in the value of newspapers; she certainly used them for her own use in publicising and reporting her work and for obtaining the public’s attention and help. If Chisholm had not read the “unstamped” press she would no doubt have read the local paper, the *Northampton Mercury*, which carried reports of the progress of the reform bill, and notices of meetings both for and against, and of the riots in Derby and Nottingham.

Apart from these broader sources of political influence, radicalism seems to have been prevalent within Chisholm’s own family background. A study of her family indicates that Caroline’s half-brother George had a son Joseph, baptised at St. Sepulchre’s on the 11th April 1815. George Jones and his family lived in Bearward Street. Joseph would have been fifteen when Caroline married Archibald in December 1830. Joseph Jones of Bearward Street, Northampton, signed as Secretary, on behalf of the Committee, an eight-page pamphlet that was delivered to each of the Northampton shoe manufacturers in August 1838. The pamphlet was entitled ‘*An Appeal from the Northampton Society of Operative Cordwainers, to the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers of Northampton, on Behalf of the workmen.*’ It had the sub-title of “Live, and let live”. The document set out six recommendations for a more equalised rate of wages; equal distribution of that part of the work performed by women and their children; an immediate abolition of the Factory System; an abolition of the present competitive system; a protest against the payment of “truck” and a request for a general rise in wages. The text of the document was similar to the Chartists crusade that set out their six demands. Presumably the Cordwainers had attended the recent Chartist meetings held in
Northampton and were influenced by their campaign. Whilst fully appreciating that Chisholm was not in Northampton in 1838, the above establishes the radicalism of the Jones family and the fact that they were certainly involved and very much aware of the Chartist movement.

Chisholm’s concern for land settlement of the poorer emigrants could well have stemmed from her childhood experience. Caroline’s father, as already indicated, died leaving his wife comfortably provided for, and a number of properties and monetary bequests for his twelve surviving children. Through his own hard efforts William Jones was enabled to become a man of property, but he did not own large areas of land; he owned a close, yard and gardens (gardens being a term for allotment).

That men such as William Jones aspired to owning land was not unusual in Northampton. It was in 1842 that Henry Billington Whitworth founded the Artisans’ and Labourers’ Friend Society, whose aim was to encourage “industry, prudence, and economy”. Land was rented out to working men as allotments. There were strict rules: the land had to be cultivated “to the satisfaction of the Committee” but no work was to be done on a Sunday. Anybody convicted of poaching, theft or drunkenness would be expelled (Brown, 1990, 30). This scheme was initiated prior to Chisholm’s plan put forward to the Legislative Council in Australia in 1843. There is no substantiated information that would suggest that Chisholm was aware of this Society. Although a William Jones was a member of the Committee and his name can be found in the early records of the Society held at Northampton Central Library. Chisholm’s half-brother, William Jones, inherited properties from his father in 1814. He also inherited a property from his Uncle Charles (his father’s brother) and acquired a number of further properties throughout his life, bequeathing such properties to all of his nine children and/or their families on his death in 1864. Regrettably only the names of Committee members are given, and there is no indication as to address. But Chisholm’s half-brother would have had excellent experience for such a Committee.

The Northampton Town and County Freehold Land Society was founded in 1848. The Society was inspired by the Birmingham Freehold Land Society which had been formed in the 1830s to extend the vote to those excluded by enabling them to qualify as freeholders of property to the value of at least forty-shillings a year. Members paid 1/6d. per-week until the Society had enough money to purchase a sizeable plot of freehold land. The land was then divided into equally sized allotments and the members “according to seniority of membership” charged about two-and-a-half pence, with the option of paying a mortgage executed by the Society’s Trustees (Brown, 1990, 31). Similar to the Chartist Land Scheme, plots were allocated by ballot,
but once a member had acquired a plot, he could do what he wanted, build a cottage, cultivate a garden etc., and either occupy the land himself or let it to others. But what the land enabled him to do, was vote.

A further society: The Northamptonshire Permanent Benefit Building Society was founded in 1851. This became known as Pierce’s Society \(^\text{10}\) with the aim of buying and selling land. The Society purchased its first two estates on either side of the Kingthorpe Road at Primrose Hill in January 1851. But the Society was less successful than the Freehold Land Society (Brown, 1990, 31).

Such societies were not a rarity as the book published by the Labourer’s Friend Society in 1836 testifies. The book was specifically compiled to publicise the various origins of the society that dated back to 1796. The earlier societies had been established for Bettering of the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor and for the Encouragement of Industry and the Reduction of the Poor-rates, culminating in the establishment of the Labourer’s Friend Society in 1830. The basic tenet of the various Societies that became the LFS was the belief in the allotment system to enable the poor to live without parochial assistance and raise the moral condition and happiness of the poor and the welfare of the community at large (LFS, 1836, vii).

It is not beyond the realms of possibility that William Jones (senior) was helped to prosperity by one of the earlier Societies that gave assistance to the poor to acquire small areas of land, and the land schemes organised in her home town of Northampton may very well have influenced Chisholm. Her own experiments with her Clearing Lease Scheme and her suggestions for a Land Ticket Scheme are not far removed from the schemes put forward by the Chartists. As indicated, such ideas were not original ideas, either for Chisholm or the Chartists.

**The Chartist “Land Company”**

Fergus O’Connor, one of the more radical leaders of the Chartist movement, founded the Land Company in 1845. The purpose of the Company was to allow families from the factory towns to have the opportunity to acquire smallholdings, where they could be self-sufficient and which would also allow them, as property owners, to qualify for a vote. A further aim of the Company was to settle as many of the working population as possible on the land, thereby cutting the labour force of its surplus with the hope of affecting a rise in wages for the remainder of the working population.
The basic idea of the scheme was that it allowed anyone to buy shares in the company. The shares went forward into a lottery, giving the winners an opportunity of a house and two to four acres of land. There were five estates built comprising of two-hundred-and-fifty smallholdings in each estate. The scheme, however, had its fair share of problems, culminating in a parliamentary enquiry and the Company's disbandment. O'Connor was both the creator and destroyer of the company; it was his carelessness that led to so much financial loss and difficulty.

**Chisholm's Clearing Lease and Land Ticket Schemes**

During Chisholm's first visit to Australia 1838-1846 she collaborated with Captain Robert Towns in purchasing land at Shell Harbour for the settlement of twenty-three families on long clearing leases (it had originally been hoped that fifty families would take part in the scheme.) The land was to be leased out in small lots at a low rental to men who undertook to clear it. Chisholm's plan was for the families to farm the land and return it in an improved condition at the end of the lease, of seven or fourteen years. On expiration of the lease it was hoped that an industrious man would be in a position to purchase the land. It was on the 14th November 1843 that Chisholm put forward her idea to the Legislative Council of NSW. By the 6th December 1843 she was setting off with about two-hundred-and-forty people for Shell Harbour.

The scheme had to overcome the problem of providing six months free rations for the families and the provision of tents until more substantial dwellings could be built. It was Chisholm's intention that one allotment should be set aside as a family allotment, to be cleared and cultivated to provide a supply of food for the whole community. After which the land was to be divided and apportioned to the different families - each family receiving ten to twenty acres. The families would not be expected to pay rent for the first two or three years, after which time they would be paying rent in produce or money. A schoolmaster was appointed to go with the party. He was to receive his land free of charge, the parents of the children would pay his share of the rent in labour and produce in return for the education of their children. The inducement for Captain Robert Towns, and others Chisholm hoped would follow, was an improvement to the land and an additional work force that could be called upon in an emergency and harvesting. Once the families had become established it was hoped they would become employers of labour.
The Legislative Council did not provide Chisholm with financial assistance, they preferred to implement their own scheme to assist distressed mechanics and labourers. A year later reporting on her scheme with Robert Towns, Chisholm admitted that there had been some failures, but that the plan had succeeded remarkably well in spite of the many problems thrown in her way. It was more than possible that the "squating" interests did much to discourage her attempts at land settlement. Chisholm did not repeat the experiment. If she had been given financial assistance, and been able to complete the plan on a larger scale, perhaps the achievements would have been greater. With an estimated 3,748 people in distress Chisholm's scheme, which helped only twenty-three families, was a very minor success. What Chisholm's scheme proved, however, was that such a plan was viable.

It was in a letter to the Editors of the Sydney Morning Herald of the 10th January 1844 that Chisholm put forward a further plan for the poor to raise money for land purchase with her proposal for a land ticket system. On her travels in the bush Chisholm had noticed that many of the immigrants had stored their cash in jam-jars and bottles which they hid in the ground, the sums ranging from £10 to £400 and in one case £900. Chisholm was aware that the depression and the failure of the banks had worried immigrants, but felt their money could be put to better use. At the Select Committee on Immigration in 1845, prior to her departure for England, Chisholm had hinted at her plan.  

Land Tickets were to be issued at 5/- each. Once a poor man had saved the amount he could purchase a ticket. These tickets were to be received as cash at the Government Land sales. When a man had accumulated twenty tickets he could exchange it for a single ticket to the value of twenty, bearing an interest at seven-per-cent, payable in land tickets for twelve months. At the end of such period if ten tickets had been added to the twenty, interest to be allowed at six-per-cent for six months, but not for a longer period, except more tickets are purchased. The value of the tickets was to remain stationary. Chisholm also suggested that in works of a public nature, the Government should pay the labourer twenty-five per-cent of his wages in land tickets. She also hoped a prudent man would save them, or they could be used to pay the butcher and baker. Chisholm further hoped the wives would look out for the tickets and save them for their children. She believed the tickets could become a favourite form of investment, and would tempt immigrants to buy and cultivate the land, making use of the money that she had seen lying idle in the ground.
As noted in Chisholm's letter on Land and Immigration published in the Melbourne Argus, June 30th 1855, she had unsuccessfully tried to generate Government support for her scheme in England. Chisholm had approached a gentleman of repute for his knowledge of finance. This gentleman had originally supported Chisholm's scheme and had interested influential bankers and businessmen, who had been equally enthusiastic. However, this gentleman had to back out of the scheme as he had received a letter from a man in power who asked that he "exert his influence to prevent the bankers and merchants from memorialising the Government in favour of Mrs. Chisholm's land-ticket scheme".

Chisholm spoke of her land-ticket scheme in her evidence before the House of Lords Committee on Colonisation from Ireland. She admitted that the scheme had not been received well in Sydney in 1844 because it was felt the scheme would be open to abuse by speculators. Those same criticisms were repeated in the columns of The Argus in 1855. Those with an interest in the land in Australia, those who did not want the labourer to settle on the land and feared that the labourer would too soon become a land owner himself, put severe difficulties in Chisholm's way. The scheme was rejected.

Both Chisholm's schemes pre-date the Chartist land scheme. What they have in common, however, is the basic idea of allocating small pieces of land to the poor. As Fergus O'Connor believed, Chisholm felt that by placing people on the land it would lessen the effects of distress, and lesson the numbers of people requiring employment in the cities, thereby enabling those left in the cities to be paid higher wages.

A 'Moral-Force' Chartist – Chisholm’s Political Lectures, Sydney, 1859-1861

As is seen from the above, Chisholm was probably more than aware of the Chartist cause in its early development, and as Copland notes, Chisholm supported the Chartist platform on her return to Australia in 1854. Copland, however, suggests that "she supported part of their platform" yet Chisholm's first lecture "is almost a facsimile of the People's Charter" (Moran, 1994, 5). Indeed the six points of the "People's Charter" are incorporated in all of her four political lectures held in Sydney from the summer of 1859 to the summer of 1861. As this chapter indicates there is no evidence to suggest that Chisholm was actually a member of the Chartist movement, but she was, as John Moran suggests, a "moral-force Chartist" (1994, 4). Moran's phraseology, however, gives the impression that Chisholm's approach was unusual. As a Victorian woman it would have been highly unusual if Chisholm had not been a "moral force" chartist. As noted below, Thomas Cooper revised his views on physical force.
Thompson details the movements' intentions and tactics as regards the use of violence and the “fear of government attack and the provocation of open conflict” (Thompson, 1971, 16-30, 26). Undoubtedly, as already noted, there were riots and disorder, but generally speaking the leaders of the various reform movements were very concerned that there should not be civil disorder. As Alex Wilson’s essay notes, it was a minority, albeit a “significant minority of Chartists [who] believed it necessary to overawe the Government and middle-classes, and that merely a token show of force would not suffice to put an end to intolerable oppression” (Wilson, 1970, 117).

Chisholm’s support of non-violence and praise of self-control in her lectures, therefore, would not have been unusual. That she was cheered in her first lecture when she remarked that “the people proved that they were never so formidable as when they behaved well” shows that her audiences supported her anti-violent approach (Empire, 9.7.1859). In her second lecture Chisholm concludes by urging her hearers “to work cautiously and with dignity .... so that their worst enemies would be forced to respect them” (Empire, 11.12.1860). Again in her third lecture she condemned the use of strikes, asserting that they “never were so effective in the struggle between capital and labour as public opinion” (Freeman’s Journal, 23.2.1861).

Although Chisholm did not believe in violence she was not afraid to strongly voice her beliefs. For instance she felt that the Australian “new Electoral Act was a sledge-hammer, which would enable them [the people] to work out a reform in the land question as well as in others” (Empire, 9.7.1859, my emphasis). Chisholm was more than aware that the introduction of the Act would enable new reforms - any male subject of Her Majesty, of twenty-one or over, being born in Australia or a naturalised Colonist of five years residency, qualified to be elected as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. The colony had a great “advantage which they did not enjoy in Victoria - they had a voice” (Empire, 9.7.1859). A “voice” she urged that should be heard in England.

On the question of property franchise, she left her audience in no doubt where her sympathises lay:

In reference to some remarks as to the transferring political power to other hands than those which had hitherto wielded it, she said that a section of the House of Commons had doubtless heard a good deal of this democratic spirit which was abroad, but she would tell them that those people of whom they seemed to be afraid were not desirous of governing, but were rather determined that they themselves should be governed well (Cheers). In reference to a call by one member to make a stand for the rights of property, she said it was evident that the people were now seen to be determined that warehouses and cattle should no longer have votes, but rather that the franchise should be conferred on men (Cheers).
The people both at home and in the colonies must insist that political influence shall no longer be associated with property; but rather that they shall be recognised as entitled to exercise political rights by virtue of their being men (Cheers) (Empire, 9.7.1859).

The NSW elections held on the 9th June 1859 were the first to be conducted by secret ballot (SMH, 9.6.1859). Chisholm was in total agreement with the Chartist principle of secret ballot. In her lectures she suggested that members of the audience should send newspapers home so that the people of England would know how calm elections were in Australia under the new system of secret ballot. Chisholm felt that “the knowledge of this great fact would have the effect of so much gunpowder on the minds of the English people. It would induce a corresponding action at home, and lead to an equally beneficial result” (Empire, 9.7.1859). She felt the secret ballot was “worth coming sixteen thousand miles to get hold of” (SMH, 9.7.1859).

From her experience Chisholm believed “millionaires were dangerous anywhere, but they were especially dangerous in the Legislature [of NSW]” (Empire, 9.7.1859). Chisholm attacked the “millionaire” politicians because she supported payment of members, and further believed that such “millionaire” politicians worked for no one but themselves. She also believed that “in vote by ballot, manhood suffrage and the payment of members rested the safety of monarchy” (Empire, 9.7.1859).

In all her lectures Chisholm very strongly voiced her opinions making it totally clear that she supported the “People’s Charter”. That Chisholm’s departure for England in 1866 was hardly noticed, could indeed be attributed to the fact that she was so outspoken in her lectures on social and political issues.

Women in the Chartist Movement

As a woman Chisholm was not unusual in voicing her views on Chartism. Much of what we are led to believe is that Victorian women did not take part in political affairs, yet the Chartist women were an integral part of the movement. Previously women had been involved with the anti-Poor Law and anti-slavery movements, and considerable numbers of women had been involved in bread riots and anti-enclosure protests for example, but Chartism was one of the first political movements to involve women, on a larger scale within its ranks. 20

Ironically the involvement of women in the more public sphere was to be purely in a subordinate role. 21

The Chartist movement advocated marriage as the highest state of humanity, and the men themselves
believed the women possessed tremendous influence and that the morals, religion and the intellect of the nation depended upon the influence of the women. But the women’s involvement was purely to assist the men in their fight for “universal suffrage” - universal “male” suffrage. Schwarzkopf highlights the fact that the women-only Female Chartist Associations “actually reinforced” the subordinate role of the female members (1991, 219).

Although Chartist leaders welcomed female support, that support was only acceptable if female commitment remained geared towards the restoration of a clearly demarcated sexual division of labour. There was also a genuine fear that to include “women’s suffrage” within the six point charter (as detailed above) would retard the progress of the Charter through Parliament. William Lovett, who acted as Secretary to the Working Men’s Association, included women’s suffrage in his original draft of the People’s Charter in 1838, but was obliged to delete the wording because of the strong anxieties among of the male members. Working class-women supported the Charter in the belief that their best interests lay in ensuring that men of their own class were elected to Parliament.

Thompson, however, argues that this view of women emerged during the 1840s. She cites evidence that women actively participated in the politics of the working communities in the early part of the century. For instance, women as well as men hawked around the country the illegal unstamped papers of the campaign against the newspaper taxes in the early 1830s (1993, 82/83). The unstamped press was certainly circulated in Northampton (see above) and when William Jones was imprisoned in August 1834 for selling unstamped papers in his shop, his wife, undaunted, continued to sell the papers whilst her husband was in prison (Maehl, 1983, 11). Thompson also notes that as late as December 1840 female Chartists were speaking to all-women audiences (1993, 89). That Chartist women did address meetings, run Female Chartist Associations, attend meetings and demonstrations as well as the more practical womanly concerns of preparing banners and flags, decorating halls and speakers’ wagons and cooking supper etc. shows the extent to which the women were involved in Chartism as well as the duality of their roles (ibid. 89).

Social reformers, radicals and members of the Chartist Movement

Thomas Cooper, Charles Dickens, Douglas Jerrold and Lord Shaftesbury have been included here because of their influence upon Chisholm. Both Dickens and Jerrold gave particular help to Chisholm by publicising her FCLS and emigration generally. Jerrold’s friendship was of importance to Chisholm and
through him the association with Cooper. Both men were active supporters of the Chartist cause. Lord Shaftesbury and his social reforms are those that Chisholm supported, and it was his patronship she sought when founding the FCLS.

**Thomas Cooper (1805-1892)**

Thomas Cooper was born in Leicester of working-class parents. He was a self-taught schoolteacher, journalist, and lecturer, before his involvement with the Chartist movement in 1840. Cooper's involvement with the movement stemmed from his reporting of one of the meetings for the *Leicester Mercury*. He took over the control of the local radical paper, the *Midland Counties Illuminator*. Cooper wrote songs and spoke at various demonstrations, and gained a reputation as a "physical-force" chartist. In 1842 he was arrested for sedition (he was an advocate of mass strike activity) and spent two years in jail, during which time he revised his opinions on physical force. Cooper argued with O'Connor over the Chartist Land Plan and was expelled from the movement in 1845. Although outside the Chartist movement, he launched the *Plain Speaker* in 1849 and *Cooper's Journal* in 1850. Cooper used these papers, which became very popular, in an attempt to convert the working-classes to radical politics.

Cooper was given an introduction to Douglas Jerrold in 1845, and Jerrold published one of Cooper's "simple tales" written in prison - "Charity begins at home" (Cooper, 1971, 276). When Jerrold started his *Weekly Newspaper* (see below) he asked Cooper to contribute articles. Cooper was asked to conduct a three-month tour of England's manufacturing counties and collect accounts "of the industrial, social and moral state of the people". These articles appeared under the title "Condition of the People of England" (Moran, 1994, 7). Although I cannot find any record of Cooper's life, or manuscript papers or letters, which show that he and Chisholm knew or were acquainted with one another, certainly the fact that he wrote for the same Journal as Chisholm would suggest that Chisholm was at least aware of Cooper and his politics. 22

Cooper toured the British Isles lecturing at Mechanics Institutes and other establishments. Chisholm adopted this form for advertising the benefits of emigration. Cooper commenced his lecture tours in 1847 and was certainly still doing so in 1855 when he gave lectures on the Crimean War. Chisholm was undertaking lectures throughout the British Isles, and on the continent, from 1849 until she left for Australia in 1854.
Cooper was a friend of the Howitts (Cooper, 1971, 314). William (1799-1888) and Mary (1792-1879) Howitt were very prolific writers, editors, and translators. They produced one-hundred-and-eighty full-length works and hundreds of articles about literature, art, religion and social change. They supported electoral reform, women's rights, and improved factory conditions, and other significant Victorian movements. It was in 1852 that William Howitt went to Australia with his two sons in search of gold. He wrote of his experiences in *A Boy's Adventures in the Wilds of Australia* (1854); *Land, Labour, and Gold* (1855) and *Tallangetta* (1857). It was in *Land, Labour and Gold* (as already noted in chapter seven) that Howitt wrote of Chisholm being "mischievous" during her lecture tours of the manufacturing districts of England in recommending people to emigrate to the colony of Victoria. William Howitt also contributed to Dickens' *Household Words* "Gold Hunting" (xiii, May 1856). But Howitt's involvement with the psychic world was not one of which Dickens approved (Ackroyd, 1990, 870). The Howitt's elder daughter, Anna Mary, also wrote articles for Dickens's *Household Words*.

Although his identity cannot be established with absolute certainty, it is nonetheless worth drawing attention to the fact that an 'Archibald C' had his poetry respectfully declined by Thomas Cooper for *Cooper's Journal* of the 23rd February 1850 (Cooper, reprint 1970, 118). The Chisholms were often short of money, and a daughter, Sarah, was born in January 1850. The baptism took place on January 30th at St. John the Evangelist Church in Islington. Archibald's application for the East India Company Army notes he had a classical education and his interest in poetry has been noted. It would not be inconceivable for Archibald to have tried to sell poetry for publication to enhance the family finances. Caroline's connection with Cooper would have made his publication an obvious choice.

**Charles Dickens - Social Reformer (1812-1870)**

Dickens cannot be classed as a radical (in that he did not belong to any radical movement), yet he is included here because of his interest in social reforms (which was radical at that time). Dickens was very active in philanthropic works. Not only was he involved with Angela Burdett Coutts, giving her advice and guidance on a number of her philanthropic projects, but he was particularly involved with the administration of "Urania Cottage" (discussed below). He supported thirteen separate hospitals and sanatoriums, and his banking records show he made at least forty-three donations to benevolent and provident funds. He was an officer of various diverse voluntary bodies and campaigned for the education of the poor. He gave various kinds of aid to mechanics' institutes, adult education, soup kitchens, emigration schemes, health and sanitary bodies, model dwellings associations and recreational societies. Dickens was also a generous supporter of
families in distress. After Douglas Jerrold’s death in 1857, for instance, Dickens helped raise money for the family (Pope, 1978, 10).

Dickens did most of the administrative work for Angela Burdett Coutts “Urania Cottage.” The cottage had been set up as a refuge for prostitutes. Other such homes had been set up previously, but in many ways the home that Burdett Coutts and Dickens established was a pioneer. The aim of the cottage, in Shepherd’s Bush, “was to give the girls back pride in themselves, to train them and then to encourage them to emigrate so that in a new environment they could start a fresh life” (Healey, 1992, 311). As Healey states, the girls were encouraged rather than punished (although they were expelled for frequent misdemeanours) and the cottage was a home, rather than an institution, which contained books and music and a garden (ibid.).

It was on the 24th February 1850 that Elizabeth Herbert wrote to Chisholm informing her she had arranged for Dickens to call on her a few days later at her home in Islington. As noted previously, Sir Sidney Herbert and his wife Elizabeth were involved in helping distressed needlewomen to emigrate, and Sidney Herbert was a member of the Executive Committee of Chisholm’s FCLS. It was as a result of the meeting between Chisholm and Dickens on the 26th February that Dickens published “A Bundle of Emigrants’ Letters” in the inaugural issue of Household Words. Dickens wrote to his sub-editor, W. H. Wills, on the 6th March 1850, that “A Bundle of Emigrants’ Letters” was a “little article of my own ... introducing some five or six originals which are extremely good”. The Office Book credits the article to Dickens and Chisholm. Chisholm supplied the “original” letters and furnished him with additional information on her experience with emigrants and the FCLS. She probably also supplied him with a copy of her pamphlet A.B.C. of Colonisation from which Dickens quoted (Lohrli, 1973, 226/7).

A number of articles in Household Words were concerned with emigration and the FCLS, but apart from “Pictures of Life in Australia” which was attributed to Chisholm and RHH26 (HW, 1, 307-310, 22.6.1850) the other articles were written mainly by Samuel Sidney and Henry Morley. John Sidney, brother of Samuel, contributed “Milking in Australia”, which appeared in the first issue of HW (HW, 1, 24, 30.3.1850; Lohrli, 1973). Dickens certainly added support to the cause of emigration, and supported Chisholm and her work and the FCLS in both HW and Household Narrative. Martin Chuzzlewit emigrated to America in Martin Chuzzlewit, published in 1842 and the Peggottys and the Micawbers emigrate to Australia in David Copperfield, published in 1849.
However, there is speculation as to Dickens’s regard of Chisholm. Chisholm is the commonly presumed model of Mrs. Jellyby in Dickens *Bleak House* (Chapter IV- published 1852-3). Mrs. Jellyby is a caricature of the woman with a mission. She promotes a scheme for the natives of Borrioboola-Gha on the Niger, and is so absorbed in this work that she neglects her home, her children and her husband, who eventually goes bankrupt. After the failure of the scheme she takes up the rights of women to sit in Parliament, which involves her with even more correspondence than the earlier scheme.

Certainly there are aspects of the caricature that ring true. In *Bleak House* Dickens describes the “tarnished brass plate on the door, with the inscription, JELLYBY.” An article that appeared in *The Illustrated Magazine of Art* in 1854 describes the Chisholm house “adorned with a very small brass plate, inscribed “Captain Chisholm”, which had evidently done years of good service in the East on some bullock trunk or travelling-chest” (vol. II, 1854, 178). And both Dickens and the *Magazine* write of a plumb, matronly woman with eyes that look through you. Chisholm was forty-two at the time of Dickens visit, and her children were aged fourteen, thirteen, eleven, three and one year nine months. A daughter, Sarah, was born in the January and would have been five/six weeks old at the time of Dickens visit (she died in the August of that year). The 1851 Census Return for Charlton Crescent, Islington, just over a year later, shows that only Chisholm’s son, Sidney, aged four, and the daughter Caroline, aged two, were at home. Chisholm’s mother was also present (see biographical details above). Archibald was at that time on the high seas travelling back to Australia. Were the elder sons away at school at the time of the census? Or was the eldest, Archibald, even away working - certainly the Chisholms were very poor at the time. It was in June 1853 that Florence Nightingale wrote that “the woman [Chisholm] is starving - living upon nine-pence a day”. I can find no record of the Chisholms being bankrupt. It begs the question whether the boys were at home when Dickens called. Certainly there was no daughter old enough to do Mrs. Chisholm’s correspondence, as Miss Caddy Jellyby did for her mother.

That Dickens may have based his caricature of Mrs. Jellyby on Chisholm no doubt arises from the fact that on March 4th 1850, shortly following his visit to Chisholm in Islington, he wrote to Angela Burdett Coutts: “I dream of Mrs. Chisholm, and her housekeeping. The dirty faces of her children are my continual companions” (Lohrli, 1973, 227). Dickens was amazed at Chisholm’s incredulity that the girls at Urania Cottage had a piano. He wrote to Burdett Coutts that he regretted he didn’t answer: “Yes - each girl a grand, downstairs - and a cottage in her bedroom - besides a small guitar in the wash-house” (Healey, 1978, 98). Dickens was disgusted by the way “certain philanthropists attended to distant causes while ignoring those
closer to home” (Ackroyd, 1990, 586) and this is the view he strongly depicts in *Bleak House*. It was not their “philanthropy” that he objected to (as is shown above, Dickens too was a philanthropist) but the fact that they “attended to distant causes” and overlooked those on their own doorstep. Dickens had more than a passing interest in emigration, he encouraged two of his own sons to emigrate to Australia and his novels and articles deal with the subject (Pope, 1978, 186). It would not have been Chisholm’s involvement in emigration per se that he objected to, but, based on his brief visit to Chisholm at her home, he believed she was neglecting her own family.

Kiddle, both in her biography and in an article firmly supported the view that Dickens was an admirer of Chisholm, and did not believe that his portrayal of Mrs. Jellyby was a caricature based on Chisholm. Kiddle cites House who notes that ten years before *Bleak House* was written, the African Civilisation Society and Niger Association had been formed and felt this was the model for Mrs. Jellyby’s scheme (Kiddle, 1957, 166). Interestingly Harriet Martineau 28 and Mrs Arthur Kinnaird 29 have also been suggested as role models for Mrs. Jellyby (Lohrli, 1973, 227; Pope, 1978, 246 respectively). Quite possibly Dickens combined elements of all three women into the caricature of Mrs. Jellyby.

Kiddle notes the helpful support of Chisholm in *Household Words* but feels “his description of Mrs. Jellyby does not detract from his admiration of Caroline Chisholm and her work” (Kiddle, 1957, 169). Kiddle did not have the benefit or knowledge of the contents of list of contributors and their contributions based on the *Household Words* Office Book (Lohrli, 1973; Stone, 1968). We now know who wrote on emigration topics, but Kiddle was right in her assumption that Chisholm’s influence can be seen in the articles. Samuel Sidney, who wrote a number of the articles on emigration, was certainly closely involved with Chisholm. But to suggest that Chisholm and Dickens were more than just acquaintances or that Dickens had a high regard for Chisholm is stretching the imagination. I can find no information that would support Kiddle’s viewpoint, and certainly Dickens’s letter to Burdett Coutts would seem to suggest that, although firmly supporting her philanthropic works, he had reservations of Chisholm as a person. Dickens was known not to have been a friend to Roman Catholics, and this too may well have coloured his opinion of Chisholm (Ackroyd, 1990, 456).
Douglas Jerrold

Douglas Jerrold, a radical Unitarianist, was the son of the actor, Douglas William Jerrold, and a friend of Charles Dickens. He was a sailor during the Napoleonic Wars, but left the sea to become a printer, journalist and playwright. As a dramatist he played a prominent role in the development of the English theatre. He was a formidable journalist and humorist. In the 1830s he published frequently in the Athenaeum, Blackwood’s Magazine and Punch Magazine. In Punch (founded in 1841) Jerrold’s articles, many of which were of a social political nature, appeared under the signature of “Q”. Jerrold’s publications attacked game laws, war, governmental politics, dishonest lawyers and religious hypocrisy. His plays included Black-Eyed Susan (1829) which had a record first year run of four-hundred nights in six theatres. His debut at Drury Lane was a domestic melodrama, The Rent Day (1832), which contained social criticism. He also wrote short stories, sketches and essays. The Punch serial “Mrs. Caudle’s Curtain Lectures” (1845) is probably one of his better known works.

Jerrold was not content to publish material for other magazines, he was editor of the Illuminated Magazine, and published Douglas Jerrold’s Shilling Magazine, and Douglas Jerrold’s Weekly Newspaper. It was in the Illuminated Magazine that Jerrold supported the “new People’s Charter” and gave support to Chisholm and her FCLS by publishing fifteen articles of Chisholm’s in his Weekly Newspaper.

That Jerrold supported the Chartist cause cannot be doubted. In Punch under the “Q” signature he wrote “The Milk of Poor Law Kindness” in which he asked when the poor would be “allowed to belong to this earth [not] as a matter of sufferance, but purely as a matter of right” (Punch, vol. iv, No. 81, 28.1.1843, 46). In Punch of 21st May 1842 he wrote that “Chartism is born of defeated hope, of disappointment of the fruits of the Reform Act ... fostered by ... a sordid, remorseless contempt of the inalienable rights of humanity. ... The Chartists themselves have a degree of intelligence, a power of concentration, a knowledge of the details of public business, heretofore unknown to great popular combinations of dissentients (“Q”, Punch vol. II, No. 45, 21.5.1842, 210).

Jerrold did not just write of his support of the cause, but he also became actively involved with the movement. In April 1847 the Peoples’ International League was founded. This followed on from Lovett’s Democratic Friends of All Nations, which was founded in 1844. At a public meeting held on Wednesday, 28th April 1847 in the Strand, the objects of the League were agreed as follows:
To enlighten the British Public as to the Political Condition and Relations of Foreign Countries
To disseminate the Principles of National Freedom and Progress
To embody and manifest an efficient Public Opinion in favour of the right of every People to Self-Government and the maintenance of their own Nationality
To Promote a good understanding between the Peoples of all countries.

Mr. Douglas Jerrold was one of the gentlemen appointed to be an officer of the Council of the League for the following year. Mr. Thomas Cooper was also appointed to the Council (Mather, 1980, 128-30).

Jerrold is not generally thought to have been a feminist supporter. Certainly women did not escape Jerrold’s love of satire, but research of Jerrold’s magazines, and his various published articles, has shown that there were many feminist articles included. A contemporary journalist wrote: “He had considerable faith in woman’s capacities for intellectual pursuits, while fully recognising the difficulties under which they laboured when struggling in the battle of life” (Gleadle, 1995, 44). Jerrold’s article “Wrongs of Woman - Hypocrisy of Man” expanded his view that literature, in all its forms, poetry, plays, tales praised women and blinded them to the real nature of their oppression. Jerrold’s *Weekly Newspaper* was a vehicle by which he raised awareness of the issue of female suffrage. He urged his readership to read contemporary works on the subject, and gave book notices of relevant publications.

Jerrold would have appreciated Chisholm’s endeavours, and understood the problems that she had to overcome because of her gender. Research has not been able to find a connection between Chisholm and Jerrold and there is little evidence of their friendship. However, that they were probably well acquainted is not in doubt. There must have been some form of communication between the two as regards the fifteen articles for *Jerrold’s Weekly Newspaper*. The *ILN* coverage of Chisholm’s departure for Australia in 1854 notes that Douglas Jerrold, friend of Caroline Chisholm, was amongst the crowd of well wishers that gathered to see her off (*ILN*, 15.4.1854, 337). On hearing that Jerrold wished to be present at her farewell, Chisholm wrote that she was pleased to find that he proposed to pay her a farewell visit on board. She went on to add that as he was her first friend connected with the London Press it was particularly gratifying to her and she hoped to see him before then (Walter Jerrold, 1919, 601). This one letter shows that their relationship was more than just a business matter. It also indicates that Jerrold, rather than Dickens, was Chisholm’s first introduction to the London press.

Chisholm’s novelette *Little Joe*, leaves us in no doubt of her feelings and admiration of Jerrold:
they only found three books of devotion, Goldsmith's *Greece, Chambers’ Journal* and *Household Words*, with a few copies of the *Herald* and *Empire*, and some numbers of *Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper*. ... Be careful of *Lloyd’s*. ... I was so lucky in getting this number - it gives an account of the death of poor Douglas Jerrold”.

“Douglas Jerrold, indeed, was a man” ... “We hear of testimonials and monuments erected which cost thousands; but fame - fame; what is fame, but the cottager’s breath? Thousands upon thousands have felt the generous heroism of Douglas Jerrold’s spirit, and if they cannot raise a monument of granite to his memory, they will one of feeling, by leaving his name a cherished one in the hearts of their children” (Moran, 1991, 75/76).

Interestingly, perhaps the extract also gives us an indication of Chisholm’s own choice of reading. 33

**Lord Shaftesbury (Anthony Ashley Cooper - Lord Ashley) 1801-1885** 34

Like Dickens, Shaftesbury is included here as a social reformer. Indeed Lord Shaftesbury was acknowledged during his own lifetime as a leading parliamentarian, social reformer, and Church of England Evangelical. He was elected to Parliament as a Tory in 1826. He was particularly involved with the reform of asylums and with industrial reforms, especially with young children who worked twelve, fourteen, or more hours a day in the mills of the north of England (the ten hours movement.) He was also concerned with the plight of women and children working the mines and the plight of chimney sweeps, as well as the terrible conditions in urban boarding houses and the urgent need for urban sanitation reform, among other of his interests. He was President of the Ragged School Union from 1846 until his death. The Union considered emigration as an essential element of their overall plan.

Shaftesbury’s interest in emigration extended to his heading the Committee of the Family Colonisation Loan Society originated by Chisholm. Shaftesbury was no mere figurehead of the Society, media reports suggest that he regularly attended the Society’s meetings at Charlton Crescent and was present at the public meetings organised by the Society.35 Chisholm dedicated (by permission) an open letter (pamphlet) to Lord Ashley in August 1849. It was not until Chisholm had fully resolved all the problems of her FCLS scheme that she approached the men she wished to be on her Committee (Chisholm, FCLS, August 1849).

One must admire Chisholm for inviting Shaftesbury to head her Committee. He was a well-known figure, with wide interests in social reform and an ardent evangelist. Originally Shaftesbury had voted against the Catholic Emancipation Act (1829) but was later to record his vote for Emancipation as a member of the Commons and of the Government (Hammond & Hammond, 1969, 5). His own strong beliefs made him an
excellent foil against those who accused Chisholm of “romanising” Australia. Although Battiscombe is under a misapprehension as to Chisholm's identity, she nonetheless was probably right in her assumption that Ashley’s “bigoted fellow Protestants” did not approve of his co-operation with a Roman Catholic woman (1974, 206).36 The Right Hon. Vernon Smith MP, at a “Testimonial to Mrs Chisholm” held at the London Tavern on Tuesday 9th August 1853, remarked that:

there was no possible motive for her [Chisholm's] exertions, but humanity and benevolence. She was a Roman Catholic and some opposition had been excited against her in this respect from the idea that her object was conversion. The best answer to this objection was that he and the Earl of Shaftesbury belonged to the Society, and he believed that nobody would accuse that noble Earl of taking any steps to favour of the Roman Catholic religion" (The Times, 10.8.1853).

Chisholm was a clever strategist.

Chisholm must also have admired Shaftesbury, for in her last political lecture in Sydney in June 1861 entitled “Our Home Life” it was reported by the Empire:

She [Chisholm] had been asked in Melbourne to give an evening to “the education of the poor”. She replied that she would rather give a lecture on the education of the rich. It was the rich who needed education (laughter and cheers) not mere book learning, but such training as the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Honourable Mr. Herbert, and Lord Grosvenor could give them, acquired by observation of men. When she (Mrs Chisholm) expressed her opinion on the subject, the Earl of Shaftesbury said “Mrs. Chisholm is right”, and added that he could bring six mechanics meanly dressed, but in intellect and knowledge of the world superior to six gentlemen (Cheers) (Empire, 14.6.1861).

Certainly Chisholm supported the early closing movement in Australia, and in her lecture above was also concerned with the provision of housing for the poor in Sydney. Shaftesbury’s own interests in the ten-hour bill and his campaign for low-cost working class accommodation, his interest in the Ragged Schools Union and the education of destitute children, are those with which Chisholm had every sympathy.

The feeling was no doubt reciprocated, for Shaftesbury remarked of Chisholm that she had “the heart of a woman, but the mind of a man” (Murtagh, 1966. 9). In Victorian terms, a compliment indeed.

Conclusion

In an attempt to assess Chisholm’s motivation I have felt it important to look at the influences upon her life, and I feel that radicalism and early Chartism, as well as the later effects of Chartism, were an important aspect of Chisholm’s life. Her father, who was sixty-four when Caroline was born in 1808, had accumulated his wealth and was living comfortably in Northampton by that time. His brother, Plowman
Jones, a lace manufacturer, who lived all his life in the village of Wootton, left considerably less, but was able to leave some wealth to his six surviving children when he died in 1821. That the families were close is not in doubt. Plowman acted as Executor to his brother’s estate, and Caroline’s brother Thomas was named as an Executor in his Uncle Plowman’s Will. That they often visited each other’s homes is not an unrealistic assumption. Chisholm would have noted the contrast in circumstances and been aware of her father’s advancement through the acquisition of land and property.

The influence of radicalism and Chartism is an aspect of Chisholm’s life which previous major biographers have ignored. It is difficult to understand why Kiddie paid such scant attention to Chisholm’s lectures, apart from noting that she “gave her blessing to a good half of the Chartist programme” (1957, 245). Because of her dislike of violence, Kiddie makes the assumption that Chisholm, like Dickens, “did not approve of Chartism, or political movements as a means of redressing the grievances of the poor, for [Dickens and Chisholm] had a “horror of the mob” (Kiddle, 1957, 138, quoted House, 1941, 179). If Kiddie had known of Chisholm’s articles written for Douglas Jerrold’s Weekly Newspaper, and known of Chisholm’s novelette Little Joe, perhaps Dickens support of Chisholm’s FCLS, and of emigration generally in Household Words, would not have taken on a deeper significance. Kiddie was aware of the ILN report of Chisholm’s departure from England on the Ballarat (15.4.1854) but makes no comment on the presence of Douglas Jerrold and Samuel Sidney among Chisholm’s friends from London (Kiddle, 1957, 187). Chisholm’s relationship with Jerrold, as noted above, was of a far more significant nature than that with Dickens. Although Dickens may well have had a “good opinion of Caroline Chisholm”, as Kiddie remarks his opinion was more to do with her work than with her as a person (1957, 169). If Kiddie had had the full text of Dickens’s letter to Burdett Coutts after his meeting with Chisholm she may well have revised her opinion of Dickens’s feeling toward Chisholm as a person and not have defended Chisholm so adamantly as a role model for Mrs. Jellyby in Bleak House (1957, 142).

Writing in 1973, Hoban was able to amass new documentation regarding Chisholm’s life, but like Kiddle she pays little attention to the effects of Chartism. Hoban does note the political lectures, but again does not fully analyse their content. Hoban was concerned for the beatification of Chisholm, and whilst I fully appreciate the strong influence and belief of Chisholm’s Catholicism, it is clear that Chartism played an equally important role in her life.

May 6th 1793 – Petition submitted to the House of Commons alleging imperfections in the electoral system.

*Northern Star*, June 22nd 1838 – Under the heading of “Northampton” and sub heading “National Defence Fund” G. Jones writes: “Having seen an observation made in another paper, that there ought to be one general fund towards defraying the expenses attendant on the trials of those patriots of their country who are now under heavy bail, or suffering incarceration in a prison, for the glorious cause of liberty, I am happy to say there was a subscription set on foot at the Working Men’s Association, on Tuesday evening last. Now, if you, through your valuable paper, will appoint some place where we may safely deposit our money when collected, you will much oblige the Working Men’s Association, and yours, a constant reader, G. Jones”.

In his *Reminiscences of a Chartist*, Gammage recalls a meeting in May 1839 that was addressed by John Collins of Birmingham, and Charles Jones from Wales, which was held in front of the shop where he worked in Market Square (Maehl, 1983, 42). *Pigot’s Directory* 1830 records Thomas Mooney, Coachbuilder, Market Square.

From 1815 onwards newspapers carried a tax - a 4d stamp, the effect of which was to price newspapers out of the reach of the poor. It was in the autumn of 1830 (three months after the July Revolution in France) that the illegal unstamped anti-establishment papers appeared in London selling at 1d. By 1836 circulation had surpassed that of the legally stamped press, and duty was consequently reduced to 1d, thereby making the unstamped press redundant. Working class radicals in the 1830s believed it was one of their leading tasks to print and circulate the papers detailing working-class radical and social theory and reiterating the right of the working man to vote and for him to receive the fruits of his own labour (Hollis, 1970, Preface).

As noted above, it was illegal to print and circulate “unstamped” papers. William Jones, newsvendor of Northampton in Free School Lane, near the Green, was imprisoned for two months on August 22 1834 for circulating the “unstamped” press under 60 George III, c 9, by ‘authority of the Stamp Office (Maehl, 1983, 39/40). As yet research has not been able to link this William Jones with Caroline’s family.

Northampton Central Public Library, Boot and Shoe Collection, 3145.

“Truck” was the practice of paying workers with goods rather than cash.

The first Chartist meeting in Northampton was held on Monday, 30th July 1838, and Henry Vincent, of the Working Men’s Association, addressed a mass rally on the Race Course in Northampton on the 9th August 1838. For reports of the meetings see *The Northampton Mercury* and the *Northampton Herald* 4th August 1838; *Northampton Herald*, 11th August 1838.

The Society was nicknamed “Pierce’s” after W. J. Pierce who was the long-term manager, and a Conservative Councillor (Brown, 1990, 31).


Captain Robert Towns (1794-1873) was born in England. He settled in Sydney in 1843, where he already held investments and property (he had been visiting Australia on various occasions since 1827). He became a successful merchant and ship-owner, trading in the Pacific and elsewhere. He acquired much land, particularly in Queensland in the 1860s. It was in 1863 that Towns introduced “blackbirding” - the importation of Pacific Islanders - to work on his cotton plantations near Brisbane. A settlement at Cleveland Bay was named “Townsville”. From 1850 to 1855 and 1861 to 1876 Towns was a Director of the Bank of NSW. He was involved with the Bank’s reorganisation in 1851, and its President in 1853-5 and again 1866-7. He was a Member of the NSW Legislative Council 1856-61 and 1863-73 and President of the
Sydney Chamber of Commerce several times. He wrote: *South Sea Island Immigration for Cotton Culture*, 1863 (Bassett, 1987, 255).


14 BPP, IUP, Colonies, Australia 9, 723-730.


16 There were four lectures in all:


- Monday, 18th February 1861, Hall of the Society of St. Benedict’s, Abercrombie Street, Sydney. Theme: “The Early Closing Movement”. Reported: *Freeman’s Journal*, 23.2.1861; *SMH*, 22.2.1861. (There seems to be a discrepancy in the date of the meeting. The *Freeman’s Journal* dated Saturday 23rd February says the meeting was held on the Monday evening whilst the *SMH* report on Friday 22nd February notes the lecture was delivered “yesterday evening”).

- Thursday, 13th June 1861, The Temperance Hall, Pitt Street, Sydney. The lecture was held in aid of the Free Reading Room of the Alliance for the Suppression of Intemperance. Theme: “Our Home Life”. Reported *Empire*, 14.6.1861; *Freeman’s Journal*, 15.6.1861; *SMH*, 14.6.1861.

All the lectures were well attended, and by personages of some note. The Lectures have been published by Moran, 1994, who analyses the issues covered and details the venue and people present or mentioned in the lectures.

17 Chisholm was referring to the rush to the Port Curtis gold-fields. She comments: “On that occasion the people did honour to themselves by preserving the greatest order at a time of the greatest excitement. They did credit to the teaching of O’Connell, who, while he was an Irishman, was the first distinguished man who had in a remarkable manner, inculcated the virtue of self-control. And what was the consequence of this? Why, that the people proved that they were never so formidable as when they behaved well. Telegraphs were exchanged, and re-exchanged, and a man-of-war was sent to Port Curtis to aid in the dispersing of the people, to counteract the influence of their disappointment; but the result proved that notwithstanding the disappointment and the turmoil, no such precautions were necessary. (This shows Chisholm’s awareness of O’Connell as well as her amazement that an “Irishman” could control his emotions.)

18 The “sledge-hammer” Chisholm referred to was the Electoral Law Amendment Act of 1858, which in effect gave “universal manhood suffrage” but with a “residential qualification” (Moran, 1994, 32/33). The Act also introduced voting by secret ballot.

19 It was in 1872 that the first elections in England were held by secret ballot.

20 For further information concerning the involvement of women in bread riots, anti-enclosure protests etc. see Thomis and Grimmett’s work *Women in Protest in 1800-1850*, and E. P. Thompson’s *Customs in Common*.

21 There were exceptions, as the report of *The Times* of the 20th and 22nd October 1842 testify (pages 3 & 4 respectively.) The report of the 22nd October shows the contemporary attitude toward women who stepped outside the private sphere. The opening paragraph reads:

A singular natural phenomenon is reported to have taken place on Monday last in the National Charter Association-hall, Old Bailey. A meeting was held of hen Chartists, “to co-operate with the male Association, and for other objects connected with the interest of the People’s Charter”. The principal benefit actually elicited at the meeting was a strong expression of dissatisfaction, on the part of the females, at not
being allowed to make fools of themselves in Parliament; which they flatter themselves they could accomplish, if people would let them try.


23 Mackenzie wrote that Archibald had a “retiring disposition, of studious habits and had a great fondness of languages (Emigrant's Guide, 6). As already noted from his service record, he spoke “Hindoostanee a little” (BLOIC, l/Mill/II.41, 375). Pearson notes Archibald was a Shakespearean scholar (1924, 73).

24 I have discussed this matter with Mr. Stephen Roberts, a Chartist historian and colleague of Dr. Dorothy Thompson. He was of the opinion that the assumption was highly possible. There is no way of substantiating that the poetry was, or was not, written by Archibald Chisholm.

25 Dickens was involved with the planning and launching of ‘Urania Cottage’ during 1846-7. He continued to be involved with the cottage until 1858.

26 RHH - Richard Henry Horne, or Hengist. Contributed articles for more than fifty periodicals - British, Australian and American. Wrote poetry, poetic dramas and books. Was involved with HW from the beginning.

27 Household Narrative was published monthly during 1850. Because of financial difficulties it ceased publication at the end of 1850. Articles concerning Chisholm appeared in the January, 18/19; May, 116; June, 140; July, 165; and October, 235.

28 Anne Lohri suggests that Harriet Martineau, who was also a HW contributor, was generally credited in contemporary report as being Mrs. Jellyby’s original.

29 Mary Jane Kinnaird (nee Hoare) was one of Victorian England’s leading evangelical women. She particularly supported the Biblewomen’s Mission, the Christian Colportage Association, The Foreign Aid Society, the Foreign Evangelisation Society, the Waldensian Mission (in Italy), the Calvin Memorial Hall (in Geneva) the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission (in India), the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society, the Prayer Union and the YWCA (of which Mrs. Kinnaird was in effect a co-founder.) Mrs. Kinnaird’s biographer felt called upon to disclaim the “Mrs Jellyby” image, and to stress that Mrs. Kinnaird was no less attentive to her domestic responsibilities (Pope, 1978, 245/46).

30 A chronological list of “Q” papers can be found in the appendix to the article “Douglas Jerrold’s “Q” Papers in Punch” written by Bruce A White and published in Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol. XV, number 4, Winter 1982, 137.

31 Douglas Jerrold’s Weekly Newspaper, No. 63, October 1847, 1336.

32 Michael Slater, Professor of Victorian Literature at Birkbeck College, University of London, is in the process of publishing a new biography of Jerrold. He has found no mention of Chisholm in any of the Jerrold letters he has examined in libraries both here and in the USA. He has not found any mention of her in any other works on Jerrold, other than the reference in Walter Jerrold’s biography.

33 The Herald and Empire no doubt refer to the Sydney Morning Herald, and the Sydney paper, The Empire. Chambers’ Journal would be the Chambers’ Edinburgh Journal, price 1½d. The Journal was conducted by William and Robert Chambers, also editors of Chamber’s Information for the People, and Chamber’s Educational Course, etc. The paper was of liberal persuasion. The Journal carried articles on Chisholm on March 30th, 1850; September 25th 1852 and October 15th 1853. Dickens Household Words was also liberal in viewpoint, and again, as noted, supported Chisholm’s work. Lloyds Weekly London Newspaper was more radical and sensational in style.

34 Shaftesbury succeeded to his ancestral title as seventh earl in 1851. Shaftesbury is variously known as Lord Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Shaftesbury.
35 Chamber's Edinburgh Journal, 15.10.1853, 243, notes Shaftesbury attended meetings held at Charlton Crescent to inform prospective emigrants of conditions in Australia. Also note the report of the ILN, 28.2.1852. Lord Shaftesbury opened the meeting of the FCLS held at the Royal British Institution, Tabernacle Row, City Road, London on Wednesday, 18th February 1852. The Earl of Shaftesbury (the paper reports) “passed a high eulogy on the talents and self-denial of Mrs Chisholm, saying “The children shall arise and call her blessed”.

36 Battiscombe wrote: “Most of the boys went to Australia, in later years [after 1848] girls were more often sent to Canada under the auspices of a Miss Chisholm, a Roman Catholic lady whose co-operation with him called down upon Ashley’s head the wrath of his more bigoted fellow Protestants” (1974, 206).
CHAPTER NINE

CATHOLICISM

As has been shown in the previous chapter, the effect of radicalism in Northampton and the radical tendencies of members of the Jones family and the later development of Chartism, would all have influenced Chisholm. This chapter will examine the role of religion as a second major field of influence, encouraging Chisholm to devote her life to the welfare of others. Although it is difficult at this distance in time to understand the fear, hostility and intensity of ill-feeling toward the Roman Catholic Church and its adherents during Chisholm’s life-time, this chapter will examine the complications and problems that Chisholm faced as a convert to the faith, and the strength that that faith gave her.

The fear, hostility and intensity of ill-will toward the Roman Catholic Church and its adherents stems from the foundation of the Church of England [or Anglican Church] by Henry VIII. The minority who remained faithful to the Church of Rome often found themselves looked upon with suspicion and denied many civil rights. The Catholic Relief Act of 1778 began the struggle for complete Catholic emancipation. The Act abolished the reward of £100 to informers against priests and schoolmasters and abolished the punishment of perpetual imprisonment against them. The 1581 Act against saying or hearing Mass still remained in force. The Relief Act permitted Catholics to hold real property, and to acquire it by purchase or inheritance, and it abolished the right of the nearest Protestant heir to lay claim to the estates of his Catholic parents or relatives. Catholics were still exposed to severe penalties for some religious ceremonies, and education was restricted. They were excluded from the House of Lords, the House of Commons, from becoming servants of the crown, from the Bar, from the exercise of the parliamentary franchise, and from commissions in the army and navy. The Act still contained clauses regarding enrolment of estate deeds, and they had to pay a double land tax (MacCaffrey 1909, Vol. 2, 4). Additional relief was granted in a further Act in 1791.

As Hussey notes, the Act of Union in 1800 abolished the Irish parliament and gave Ireland one hundred MPs and twenty eight representative peers in the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland at Westminster. The Act added too rather than solved Anglo-Irish problems. The Irish resented the loss of their Parliament and were grieved that the Act did not remove political disadvantages of Catholic Irishmen. Daniel O'Connell established the Catholic Association in 1823. His main aims were repeal of the Union and the restoration of the Parliament at Dublin, which, with full political rights for Catholics, could have led
in time to self-government for Ireland. It was the possibility of revolution in Ireland that led to the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, enabling Catholics to vote, hold public office, sit in Parliament and plead at the Bar. There had been petitions and agitations throughout the period, which fuelled anti-Catholic feeling, notably the Gordon Riots of 1780 (Hussey, 1971, 20-21). Lord George Gordon, who was the head of the Protestant Association in 1780, petitioned Parliament to retain anti-Catholic laws. The House of Commons refused to debate the issue, the consequence of which was widespread rioting directed at Catholic shops, and at the homes of wealthy Catholics. There was arson and theft and the Bank of England was attacked. The Government took their time in calling in the troops to restore order. Approximately seven hundred people were killed, and many properties destroyed during the riots (Lines, 1990, 94).

The Catholics may have obtained emancipation, but “it was not so easy to eradicate the feelings and habits induced by centuries of persecution” (MacCaffrey, 1909, Vol. 2, 34). Anti-Catholicism was still prevalent. *The Autobiography of a Beggar Boy*, by James Dawson Burn, one of the few working men’s autobiographies, first published in 1855, shows quite clearly how the detail above would have affected a Catholic in reality. He recalls the attitude toward members of the Roman Catholic faith during the early part of the nineteenth century. He writes of his stepfather’s faith and gives a very descriptive view of the intolerance that members of the Catholic Church had to contend with. He wrote:

> It will be remembered that people professing Catholicism in those days were marked with the hateful *brand* of the national stigma. They were therefore continually labouring under a painful sense of their unmerited wrongs. The members of the Church of Rome, though British subjects, and contributing to the national wealth, and submitting to all the conditions of society, were debared nearly all the rights and privileges of common citizens. They were not only continually subject to the gross and brutal attacks of the ignorant, but their wrongs were frequently used as stepping-stones to state preferment by the rich and powerful. It was thus that the deadly embers of religious animosity were kept alive, and one class of society was continually made the foot-ball of the other. I have no doubt but my step-father’s mind must have been soured by the overbearing conduct of his comrades while in the army, who took occasion to prove their sense of religion by a system of heartless persecution, which was at that time sure to find favour with their superiors (Burn, 1978, 42).

That Burn’s step-father faced religious persecution in the army (presumably the British army) raises the question as to whether or not Archibald suffered the same fate in the East India Company army, and whether Chisholm, as the Captain’s wife, also experienced the same difficulties. It would appear that Burn’s stepfather was from the lower ranks, but Burn makes it clear that even the upper ranks within the Army were disinclined to censure religious persecution. There is nothing to suggest that things were different within the East India Company army.
William Cobbett wrote at length in May 1811 on the question of “Dissenters, Methodists and Catholics”. He recalled that the Reformation “originated not in any dislike on the part of the people to the tenets or ceremonies of the Catholic Church, but in the laziness, the neglects, and, in some cases, oppressions of the Clergy, aided by a quarrel between the King and the Pope.” He was dismayed and indignant when he heard a “Churchman or a Dissenter abuse ... the Catholics”. He was equally indignant when he heard a Dissenter and Methodist complain about persecution but joined together to abuse Catholics and “shut the Catholic out from political liberty on account of his religious tenets.” Cobbett felt it “stupid as well as very insolent to talk in this way of the Catholics; to represent them as doomed to perdition, who compose five-sixths of the population of Europe” (Cobbett, 1997, 109, 107).

Burn later writes of the passing of the Emancipation Act. He saw the year 1829 “as one of the most eventful in the history of the first half of the nineteenth century”. He emphasised that a great portion of this year, the whole country was in an alarming state of excitement. The labours of the Catholic Association were about producing their desired effect. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel had opposed the Catholic claims with all the moral force they could bring to bear upon the question; but at length, seeing those claims could be no longer resisted with safety to the state, they made a virtue of necessity, and carried the measure, in the face of taunts and vollies of abuse from their former colleagues. During six months, the Anti-Catholic spirit was in a continual state of effervescence; and petitions and counter-petitions were poured into the Houses of Parliament in wagon-loads. All the trickery of low cunning, and the malignancy of sectarian zeal, with no small portion of honest hatred, were brought to bear against the passing of this measure (ibid. 132, 133).

Gladstone’s son, William Ewart, was also very much aware of the anti-Catholicism that abounded in Oxford where he was at college. He wrote to his father that the lower classes with which he had contact - the college bed makers and the “old egg-woman” were all fearful of the concessions to Catholicism. He felt his father would be astonished “how unanimous and how strong is the feeling among the freeholders ... against the Catholic question” (Arnstein, 1982, 5).

The comments of Burn, Cobbett and Gladstone junior graphically depict what it was like to be a Catholic in a Protestant world, and show the very deep feelings against the Catholic faith during the early part of the nineteenth century to the time of the Emancipation Act. Such feelings however continued to be rife well into the century. The fears and suspicions against Catholics were aroused in 1850 when the Pope decided to create certain offices within the Catholic Church for administrative purposes. The Catholic Church in England had greatly increased with the influx of Irish Catholic immigrants and on the 29th September 1850, Pope Pius IX restored the English hierarchy by the Letter Apostolic Universalis Ecclesiae and erected one
meteoropolitan see and twelve suffragan bishoprics, amongst them Northampton. Incensed, the Bishop of Durham wrote publicly to the Prime Minister complaining of the “insolent and insidious” nature of the “Papal Aggression” implied by the creation of the Catholic hierarchy. The Prime Minister, Lord John Russell replied in The Times, on 7th November 1850, agreeing with the Archbishop “in considering ‘the late aggression of the Pope upon our Protestantism’ [as] insolent and insidious” (Norman 1968, 159).

Hussey suggested that bigoted “Victorian Protestantism fastened on certain features of the Roman Catholic Church which it disliked intensely and irrationally”. He continued:

Among these were the celibacy of the priest and the special role assigned to him. The unmarried priest would surely seduce innocent girls in the confessional and there were swarms of tendentious pamphlets and trashy novels which told lurid and improbable tales of innocent girls who were abducted into convents where they were tortured to death. The practice of auricular confession was seen as a powerful threat to the unity of the family; the cunning priest through the confessional would influence the wives and daughters so as to undermine the paternal supremacy of the husband (1971, 125).

Further fears of Catholicism had been aroused when J. H. Newman was received into the Roman Church in 1845 and the Oxford clerics and fellows of colleges who similarly defected in the ensuing decade. Such defections were “regarded, even among the highly educated, with a fearful hostility nourished through generations by Protestant horror stories of idolatory and superstition, of priestly tyranny, persecution and vice, and sinister Jesuit plots” (Burrow, 1978, 154). As Burrow further notes:

New converts to Rome were popularly called ‘perverts’ rather than converts, and anti-Catholic feeling ran high in the 1850s. Gladstone [senior], himself a High Churchman, whose sister Helen was one such convert, referred to the newspaper report of the event as ‘the record of our shame’ and urged his father to expel Helen from the family home. Three of the four sons of the great Evangelical Christian William Wilberforce became Roman Catholics; the remaining Anglican Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, wrote of his brother Henry’s defection: ‘I heartily wish he might settle abroad: but having him here after this dreadful fall seems to me beyond measure miserable; and his broken vows and violated faith weigh heavily on my soul. May God forgive him’ (ibid.).

That Samuel Wilberforce, an Anglican Bishop, should regard his brother’s conversion to the Catholic faith as “defection” and a “dreadful fall” making him “miserable beyond measure” explicitly demonstrates the depth of ill-will against Catholic converts.

It is doubtful, however, whether Chisholm’s own family reacted quite as strongly as Samuel Wilberforce. The will of Chisholm’s sister Harriet indicates not only that the families were in contact with one another (in Australia and America) but that Harriet, who was involved with the Wesleyan Chapel, had no qualms in
making a financial bequest from the sale of three properties in Great Russell Street, Northampton, to her Catholic nephew, Henry Chisholm, and her niece Charlotte, the wife of Reverend John Broad, who spent seven years as curate at All Saints, Northampton. What Harriet’s will demonstrates is the Jones family’s broad mindedness, as opposed to Victorian bigotry, which in turn suggests that Chisholm and her siblings were brought up within an enlightened atmosphere.

Further evidence of this enlightened atmosphere is found in the story that Chisholm recalled of her playing with two dolls as a child, of under seven years. To her the dolls were “a Wesleyan minister and a Catholic priest” who were “very refractory, and would not be obedient”. She named them after two persons she “knew who were always quarrelling, and spent hours in listening to their supposed debates, to try and find out how I could manage them”. She put the two dolls into a boat, and told them “if they were not careful they would be drowned; and having landed them alive, she knelt down to pray to God to make them love each other” (Mackenzie 1852, 4).

Chisholm’s home town was not immune to anti-Catholicism. Anti-Catholicism in Northampton is demonstrated by an advertisement that was carried in The Northampton Mercury on Saturday, April 5th 1828. The Archdeacon of Northampton respectfully informed the “Clergy of the Diocese of Peterborough that PETITIONS to both HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT Against further Concessions to the Roman Catholics” was “lying for signatures” at nine homes of the Clergy within the county of Northamptonshire, as well at the Registrar’s Offices in Northampton and Peterborough. No doubt one of the petitions that poured into the Houses of Parliament to which Burn refers above. Significantly the Northampton Religious and Useful Knowledge Society was founded in 1839 specifically to combat popery and infidelity by challenging the local Mechanics Institution. In the early 1850s the local Conservative leader, John Palmer Kilpin, reputedly circulated a rumour about a poor servant girl whose conversion to Roman Catholicism had allegedly driven her mad (Paz 1992, 234 quoting Northampton Herald 9 & 11.11.1850).

It is also significant that Northampton celebrated the 5th November 1850 to a far greater extent than it had done so in the past. The Northampton Herald reported that “the feeling of Northampton against Popery, and the chance of a return to the darkness of past ages, may be judged of by the displays on Tuesday, the hopes of the “Holy Father” cannot be of a very sanguine kind” (9.11.1850).
As Paz recognises, “Guy Fawkes Day was once the most important popular holiday in England, and thus the most common expression of anti-Catholicism”. That the people of Northampton chose to celebrate the occasion with fires in the streets (as opposed to in the grounds of the churches as previously) indicates a rise in anti-Catholic feelings. During the 1840s the celebrations had been relatively quiet (Paz, 1992, 233). Yet Northamptonshire at this time was one of the least Catholic of English counties. The 1851 Religious Census for Northamptonshire revealed that there were only “six [Catholic] chapels and seven hundred and five sittings” in the county. The census, which revealed the strength of the Baptists and Congregationalists within the county, also revealed that Catholics were a religious minority (Greenall, 2000, 91). Yet anti-Catholicism in Northampton was rising. Northampton town had, as Paz suggests, “a history of three-way public religious controversy amongst Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Nonconformists …[and] its politics were of such a mix that religious issues took on great significance” (Paz, 1992, 229-230). Guy Fawkes celebrations and disturbances continued to be a problem for the authorities in 1853. It was in March of that year that Chisholm delivered an address on “Emigration to Australia” in the Lecture Room of the Mechanics’ Institute and on a following evening at the Music-room of the Corn Exchange. Interestingly the Northampton Mercury, who reported the meeting, noted that “Mrs Chisholm said she expected to revisit Northampton. She had been requested to give some information to the Religious and Useful Knowledge Society” (5.3.1853).

As has already been noted and debated in chapter three, previous biographers have suggested that Chisholm’s father, William Jones, befriended, and then housed, a French priest whom he rescued from a stone-throwing crowd. Chisholm reputedly recalled this episode, which therefore probably places the occurrence towards the end of her father’s life in 1814 when she was nearly six years old. The incident not only demonstrates strong anti-Catholicism in Northampton, but also highlights William Jones’s strength of character and ecumenical enlightened behaviour in his disregard of the animosity toward the priest and his courage in sheltering him in the family home. If Anglican Bishops and High Churchmen like Gladstone can disown their kith and kin then it is highly likely that the Jones family would have been ridiculed for rescuing and befriending a Catholic priest (probably Fr. Pierre Hersent – see below). That William Jones showed such courage and tolerance toward the Priest could well have had an impact on the young Chisholm. It would not be an unreasonable assumption to suggest that her father’s example may have influenced Chisholm and could well have been the reasoning behind her promising to “know neither country or creed, but to try and serve all justly and impartially” (Chisholm, 1842, 4). Although doubts have been raised as to
the validity of this incident the basis of this account, together with the will of Harriet Goode (nee Jones) mentioned above, demonstrate that William Jones was not a bigoted Victorian but a tolerant and caring man.

Extensive investigations have been undertaken to establish exactly where and when Chisholm would have been received into the church, but regrettably those investigations have been inconclusive. All avenues of research have been pursued, including search into a reference in the biography of Bishop Francis Amherst. 3

The biography refers to the incident of Caroline’s father befriending a Catholic priest:

A curious anecdote is told of the conversion of this family [Jones] to the faith. During the time of one of the popular outbursts against Catholicism, a venerable priest walking through the town of Northampton was greeted by the rabble with insults and derision. As he walked quietly on the mob thickened, and from jeers proceeded to pelt him with filth and stones, after the manner of “true Protestants” of those days. It was evident that the poor man’s life was in danger, and Mr. Jones, a gentleman living in Northampton, disgusted at the brutality of the mob and the narrow bigotry of their teachers and abettors, went into the midst and rescued the unfortunate priest, taking him into his own house, binding up his wounds and showing every kindness and attention. The good priest was most grateful and prayed that the family of his benefactors might be rewarded and blessed for their goodness. This resulted in their enquiring more fully as to the tenets and truth of the Catholic faith and being received into the Church (Roskell, 1903, 327).

Roskell does not reference the incident, and the biographer later suggests, incorrectly, that Chisholm died in Dublin. 4 In view of the very basic error of the place of Chisholm’s death, it is difficult to know just how far you can rely on such material. That Roskell made such a fundamental error is surprising given the knowledge that the Amhersts were on friendly terms with the Chisholm family and Bishop Francis spent vacations with them in Scotland. 5 However Roskell’s reference to the Jones family converting to the faith was researched, but no evidence was forthcoming. Two short biographical works on Chisholm suggest she converted to the faith when she was nineteen (Suttor, 1965, 140, and Turner, 1992, 121). These references have been investigated without success. That the wills of Chisholm’s sister Harriet (mentioned above) and her husband show close connections with the Wesleyan Chapel in the “Upper Part of Grafton Street” (Harriet left £50 to the chapel) would seem to indicate that Harriet and her husband were not Catholics at the time of their death. In all probability Harriet did not convert to the Roman Catholic faith. It should also be noted that Chisholm’s father, in 1814, and her mother in 1859, were both buried in the grounds of St. Sepulchre’s Church. Other members of the Jones family were also buried within the church grounds. In view of this evidence and the unreliability of Roskell’s biography it would seem unlikely that the Jones family did convert to Catholicism prior to Chisholm’s marriage.
There was no resident Missionary in Northampton until November 1823, apart from a very short period in 1821, when Father Cornelius McGrath was there, but it would appear that a Father Fletcher would, at least sometimes, visit the sick. Dr. John Fletcher, D.D. was appointed to Weston Underwood (near Northampton) in 1809 as Chaplain to Lady Throckmorton who was a committed Catholic. Father William Foley, who was appointed the first resident priest, also ran a school in Northampton, a gentleman’s boarding and preparatory school, St. Andrews. In a letter to Father F. C. Husenbeth of the 31st August 1826, Foley writes of Lady Throckmorton “going soon to Brighton”. The Doctor [Fletcher] is to be her Chaplain of course”. A further letter of Father Foley to Father Husenbeth of the 15th October 1826 states that the Doctor has “taken a house in this town [Northampton] for Lady Throckmorton and they are coming, if they can, this week.” Dr. Fletcher remained in the house in Abington Street as Lady Throckmorton’s Chaplain for ten years. Research centred on the assumption that it was possibly Lady Throckmorton’s Chaplain, Dr. Fletcher, who may have received the Jones family, or Caroline, prior to her marriage, into the Catholic Church. Records and documentation concerning the Throckmorton family are kept at the Warwickshire Records Office. There is no trace of Caroline’s conversion, nor that of the Jones family. Regrettably Father Foley’s registers for the years 1821 to 1844 have been lost. However on the 6th March 1830 Father Foley wrote to Father Husenbeth indicating that he had sent to the “Bishop 185 for my number of Catholics, not reckoning soldiers”. On the 27th April he wrote that “there is a great enquiry about our Holy Religion; I have this year twenty Communicants more than last year and have now sixteen converts under instruction besides more with whom I am conferring” (Osbourne, 1994, 74,75). Foley’s letter mentions no names. What Father Foley’s letter does tell us is that communicants at that time did indeed receive instruction before conversion and possibly Caroline Jones may have been one of those converts under instruction.

Research also focused on the French priest, Fr. Pierre Hersent who, (as noted previously, may well have been the Priest befriended by William Jones) resided at Overthorpe, near Banbury, Oxon. The chapel there was the first post-Reformation Catholic chapel to be opened in Northamptonshire. It was in July 1827 that Fr. Hersent opened a chapel at Aston-le-Walls, on the edge of the county to the north. This saved the congregation the nine-mile journey to Overthorpe. Fr. O’Gorman was appointed as the first resident priest. The Catholic Miscellany of January 1828 records that thirty-three young Protestants attended services at Aston-le-Walls in 1827 and converted to the faith. Regrettably the records are not complete. The chapel at Overthorpe was closed in 1833.6
A pamphlet Roman Catholic Church “Rome’s recruits” reprinted from the Whitehall Review with various additions and corrections, listed those Protestants who had become Catholics since the Tractarian Movement. It was published 1878 (sic 1898). Disappointingly this merely listed Caroline Chisholm as wife of the Major. No other details were given. That it gives Caroline’s name as Chisholm and not Jones would also seem to discount Bishop Francis Kerril Amherst's record that the Jones family converted to the faith. In all probability Chisholm did convert to the faith at the time of her marriage to Archibald in December 1830. In view of the very deep seated ill-feeling towards Catholics and converts, who were “marked with the hateful brand of the national stigma”, and where in Northampton crowds threw stones at priests, Chisholm’s conversion to the Roman Catholic Church shows great courage and tenacity.

Two specific reasons led to the research to establish the place of Chisholm’s conversion. Firstly to fill a gap. Secondly to have an understanding as to why Chisholm “related at a public meeting that her strong faith in having a divine mission to perform led her to give her intended husband one month to consider whether he would accept of a wife who would make all sacrifices to carry into effect her public duties” (Mackenzie, 1853, 5-6). This statement raised the question as to whether Chisholm’s “divine mission to perform” stemmed from her Anglican upbringing or from her Catholic beliefs. From the evidence above, it would appear that Chisholm’s “divine mission to perform” probably arose from her Anglican faith, which was later reinforced by her Catholicism.

Although the Emancipation Act had been passed in April 1829, Caroline and Archibald were still required by law to be married in an Anglican Church by Anglican clergy, who were the only clergy legally empowered to perform wedding services. The “Reverend Spencer Gunning performed the service (by permission of the Reverend B. Winthrope, Vicar of St. Sepulchre’s)”. 7 Reverend Gunning came from Dumfries and presumably was an acquaintance of Archibald. Although the wedding was not held in front of a Catholic priest, the marriage was still valid in the eyes of the Catholic Church. It was not until 1908 that Canon Law required that Catholics had to marry in front of a Catholic priest in England. 8 Interestingly the marriage of the Prince of Wales with Maria Fitzherbert in 1785 was illegal in terms of the British constitution. The ceremony had taken place in a drawing room at Park Street London and although conducted by an Anglican clergyman the wedding was not performed in an established Church. There were two witnesses present, Fitzherbert’s brother Jack Smythe and her Uncle Henry Errington, both of them Catholics. The marriage was illegal and the clergyman and witnesses were technically guilty of a felony.
The ceremony was however valid according to the laws of the Catholic Church, which then did not require the marriages of Catholics in England to be solemnised by a Catholic priest (see Wilkins, 1905, 80-88).

Catholicism for Chisholm was not just a means to an end to enable marriage to Archibald. Evidence suggests that she wholeheartedly believed in her adopted faith. Her faith was very important to her and sustained her throughout her life. However it is clear from Chisholm’s writing (particularly *Female Immigration*) that she considered that her help should be of benefit to all in the community, and not just those from her religion. It could be said that her work was ecumenical. Even though John Dunmore Lang (see below) criticised Chisholm, he nonetheless admitted that he was “fully satisfied of the valuable services which that truly benevolent lady has rendered to many poor immigrants in this colony for years past” and subscribed to the testimonial collected for Chisholm on her departure for England in 1846 (*Chronicle*, 7.3.1846).

It was in *Female Immigration* that Chisholm wrote:

> On the Easter Sunday, I was enabled, at the altar of our Lord, to make an offering of my talents to the God who gave them. I promised to know *neither country or creed*, but to try and serve all *justly* and impartially. I asked only to be enabled to keep these poor girls from being tempted, by their need, to mortal sin; and resolved that, to accomplish this, I would in every way sacrifice my feelings - surrender all comfort - nor, in fact, consider my own wishes or feelings, but wholly devote myself to the work I had in hand. I felt my offering was accepted, and that God’s blessing was on my work: but it was his will to permit many serious difficulties to be thrown in my way; and to conduct me through a rugged path of deep humiliation (*Chisholm*, 1852, 4).

As Luscombe writes in his essay, this paragraph has been quoted freely by many authors. “Frequent repetition has perhaps robbed it of its true impact, but it provides, as no other words can, the depth of religious feeling that animated Chisholm and inspired her selfless work” (1967, 510).

In spite of the fact that Chisholm lived in an age of extreme religious intolerance, and that it was an era of anti-Catholicism, there is no doubt that Chisholm worked for the moral good of the whole community. Not only did she serve all but she united both Protestants and Catholics to work together. While in Madras, Chisholm would have helped the English and Scottish Protestant girls as well as the many Irish Catholics (Connole, 1986, 241-252). The Female School of Industry for the daughters of European Soldiers gave a practical education to all. Chisholm insisted that both Protestant and Catholic clergy attend the Immigrants’ Barracks in Sydney. She helped Jewish girls to emigrate. Cohen, in a paper read before the Australian
Jewish Historical Society during August 1944, acknowledged that Chisholm “provided a stimulus to our
brethren to seek those shores [Australia]” (1944, 67-77). Cohen made reference to the speech that Chisholm
made to the Emigration Committee of the Jewish Ladies Benevolent Loan and Visiting Society, detailing the
conditions in Australia, the advantages of emigration, the cost of such a move, and the part played by the
Family Colonisation Society (Cohen, 1944, 73). In her paper Cohen drew attention to the Jewish Chronicle
of the 22nd July 1853 which reported that the “Auxiliary of the Jewish Ladies’ Benevolent Loan and
Visiting Society begs to inform the public that they have made arrangements to send out to Australia twenty
Jewish young women under the immediate charge of Mrs. Chisholm by the ship ‘Caroline Chisholm’, which
is due to sail in September.” Cohen regretted and was saddened that members of the Australian Jewish
Historical Society of 1944 were not aware of Chisholm’s work and her assistance to “organised Jewish
emigration” (ibid.).

Father Murtagh sums up Chisholm’s ecumenical work:

She was surrounded by bitter sectarian strife, yet she was ecumenical, getting Protestants and
Catholics to work together for the common good of Society. And let us not forget that, although she was a devout Catholic, the foundation of her Christian life was laid in her excellent Protestant upbringing and she never lost her distinctive evangelical style (Murtagh, 1966, 15).

As has already been noted in chapter three, some of the beliefs of her Protestant upbringing were not
forgotten for she still advocated that the rich had a duty to the poor in line with strict evangelical tradition.

It was in August of 1853 that Punch printed a Carol to support the testimonial being raised for Chisholm in
recognition of her work. The Carol praises Chisholm’s ecumenical efforts in placing emigrants in
employment in the interior and ends by suggesting that it was “A second Moses, surely, it was who did it
all/It was a second Moses in bonnet and in shawl”.

Although originally the Catholic Church did not support Chisholm, Pope Pius IX learnt of her work.
Chisholm’s son William had been studying at the Propaganda College in Rome to become a Priest. Due to
ill-health he had to give up his studies. Chisholm combined a visit to Rome to fetch her son with a lecture
The Freeman’s Journal details her reception by the Holy Father:

She was about to make the usual obeisances on being presented when the Pope rose and took
her by the arm and said: “Caroline Chisholm, eccelentissima, preserveranza, bravo”, and
clapped his hands to show his approbation of her conduct. She could speak but very little Italian, and he was not very well acquainted with her language, but they soon understood each other. He told her that the plough was good for the country, good for men, women and children, and recommended her to persevere in her efforts to introduce agriculture into Australia (15th June 1861).

The Pope presented Chisholm with several gifts, including a gold medal and a marble bust of her, which are now treasured items of the Chisholm family in Sydney. Regrettably the Vatican Archives have no record of Chisholm’s audience, or of how the Pope was aware of her work, or who recommended Chisholm to receive the bust and medal. Bishop Ullathorne was Vicar General of Australia from 1832 until 1840, and was later to become the Bishop of Birmingham from 1850 until 1888. It would not be unreasonable to assume that Ullathorne, who had a great share in terminating the system of transportation of convicts would have kept in touch with developments in Australia, and would be more than likely aware of Chisholm’s work of assisting emigrants (Mathew, 1955, 197).

Chisholm addressed a meeting in Birmingham for those persons interested in migration, but Fr. Ullathorne was not among those who attended. The meeting that was held at noon on Tuesday, 6th April 1852 at 49 Ann Street, would have been a difficult one for Chisholm. The Reverend J. A. James referred Mrs. Chisholm to the articles in the British Banner. Although Chisholm “repelled” Lang’s remarks, Mr. James and the Reverend J. C. Millar, whilst “handsomely acknowledging the devoted zeal of Mrs. Chisholm”, could not commit themselves “to a plan which seemed to offer great difficulties to a Protestant” (Aris’s B’ham Gazette, 12.4.1852). The ILN, referring to the meeting, remarked

In these times of Papal aggression, when the Roman Church is found linked with enemies of freedom and of free England in every state of Europe, it is not unnatural that many should, at first sight, look with suspicion on the efforts of a Roman Catholic lady of so much talent and energy; but, fortunately, Mrs. Chisholm can appeal, in proof of her tolerant, impartial, unproselytising spirit, to a long life of action.

That the paper choose to defend Chisholm’s “unproselytising spirit” by establishing that the “Roman Church” was found “linked with enemies of freedom and of free England” adequately demonstrates the “Papal aggression” that was prevalent at that time.

The paper John Bull of the 30th July 1853 further illustrates the difficulties that Chisholm faced as a Roman Catholic woman. Their report of her visit to Rome read:

Mrs. Chisholm and the Propaganda. — The Popish journals announce that “Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, the celebrated female emigrants’ protectress, arrived at Rome on the evening of the 8th instant, being anxious to pay a visit to her son, who is educating as a
Priest in the Propaganda College, previous to embarking for Australia”. It is not, we believe, generally understood by the public that so close a link of connexion exists between Mrs. Chisholm and the Popish Propaganda.

The paper managed to get the details wrong. Chisholm was collecting her son, whose health had made it impossible for him to continue his studies for the priesthood, prior to their return to Australia. The paper obviously intended to discredit and stir anti-Catholic feeling against Chisholm.

It was during a visit to Ireland that Mr. Michael J. Barry felt compelled to jump to Chisholm’s defence. At the Entertainment to Mrs. Chisholm, held on Monday evening, May 7th 1852 in Cork. Mr. Barry firmly stated that “there was nothing of a sectarian character in the emigration” over which Chisholm presided. Mr. Barry felt he had to comment on this matter because he believed “misapprehension ... existed on that head, and that misapprehension had probably been fostered in some instances by interested parties” (Cork Examiner, 12.5.1852).

The situation for Catholics in Australia was not dissimilar to the situation at home in England. The first Catholic Vicar-General of Australia, William Ullathorne, who arrived there in 1833, reputedly commented that he found the penal colony “a cesspool” into which had been “poured down scum upon scum and dregs upon dregs of the offscourings of mankind”. He was horrified that a nation was being built upon such scum who were “a curse and a plague” (O’Farrell, 1969, 1). It was into this “cesspool” of a prison that the Roman Catholic faith arrived in Australia.

The first Catholics in Australia were convicts, and were in the main Irish. But whereas the English and Scottish convicts tended to be ordinary in that they were largely transported for theft, about one-fifth of the Irish transportees were political offenders. The Irish convicts tended to be peasants and the English and Scots convicts (Protestants) came from the towns. Those in charge, the governors, administrators, prison officers, leading churchmen and citizens etc. tended to be of the Protestant faith, and by definition, English and Scots. It was the British political and social institutions and the Protestant religion that held the authority. By virtue of Ireland’s continued opposition to British rule throughout history, (and the fact that many of the convicts were political offenders), the Irish Catholics were considered “barbarians” by those in charge. The first recorded Mass for the prisoners were celebrated in 1803. This was fifteen years after the colony’s foundation. The privilege was allowed under strong supervision, but was rescinded within a year. Mass was not celebrated again publicly until 1820.
John Bede Polding O.S.B. was consecrated in London as Australia’s first Bishop in June 1834, arriving in Sydney in September 1835. At that time the colonial society was far more concerned about land settlement, exploration, abolition of the convict system, education and the development of a representative government than with Church affairs. The 1836 census recorded a total of 21,898 Roman Catholics in the colonies at that time, with six priests serving the widely scattered flock.

Polding requested help from Mother Mary Aikenhead to send a community of Sisters to care for the convicts at the Female Factory and the Orphan School in Paramatta as well as the poor in the colony. The Sisters of Charity arrived in the colony the same year as Chisholm in December 1838. They were the first Religious Institute of women to arrive in Australia. But Polding had an inability to “accord to women a recognisable role in the Church”. He had a monastic outlook and concurred with the nineteenth-century view of women as the weaker sex (O’Donoghue, 1982, 149). Polding therefore gave Chisholm very little recognition and was unable to use the Sisters of Charity to their best advantage (ibid. 149, 44). Suttor believed that Chisholm’s “apostolic sanctity” was beyond Polding’s range of vision (Suttor, 1965, 49).

Mother Mary Augustine Aikenhead, whose dream was to work for the poor, founded the Sisters of Charity in Dublin in 1815. As well as the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, the Sisters took a fourth vow of “service to the poor”. The Irish Sisters initially visited and assisted poor people in orphanages, hospitals, gaols and in their homes. Later they opened a house of refuge for young girls and started giving religious instruction in schools. With the help of a growing congregation and generous donations, Mother Mary Aikenhead was able to open and conduct Catholic schools and hospitals for poor people in Ireland. The Sisters in Australia emulated their mission in Ireland. Initially they visited the Female Factory twice a day, the Women’s Hospital once a day, and daily visits to the Orphan School where they taught catechism and needlework, and visits to the poor in their homes every day. The Sydney Ladies’ Committee had, as indicated earlier, felt unable to continue charitable work at the Female Factory, but the Sisters successfully negotiated changes at the Factory that resulted in improved living conditions for the inmates. They continued their work at Paramatta until the Factory closed in 1848. Following the closure of the factory three Sisters left the colony to continue their work in Hobart Town, Tasmania. Within two years the Sisters opened a convent in College Street in Sydney. They continued their work with the needy, the poor and the sick, visiting them in their homes, the schools, the gaol, the Emigrants’ Home, Benevolent Asylum and
Infirmary (which became Sydney Hospital).

It was in 1856 that the Sisters bought “Tannons” a property at Potts Point, Sydney. The house was to become the first Catholic hospital in Australia, St. Vincent’s Hospital. The first Convent School in Australia was also opened in the back rooms of the house. The Sisters were entirely dependent on the public’s support to maintain the hospital and their community. St. Vincent’s High School for girls was opened in 1871 and in 1882 the primary and secondary schools were brought together to form the St. Vincent’s (Ladies’) College. The Hospital relocated to Darlinghurst in 1870. The site at Potts Point continued in use until the early 1990s, but now houses boarding school accommodation for St. Vincent’s College.

There does not seem to have been any connection between Chisholm and the Sisters of Charity other than that on her return to England in 1846 on the ship Dublin Chisholm acted as a protector to Sister M. M. Cator (Cater) who wished to return to her native country. Chisholm agreed to see her lodged in some religious house in England (Cullen, 1938, 71).

Chisholm did visit both the Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of Charity during her lecture tour of Ireland. She was “received with affectionate solicitude, and conducted with her friends over the whole establishment by the charitable Sister in charge, who afforded her every information and exhibited to her all its arrangements. With the neatness, the order, and the tranquillity which reigned throughout, she [Chisholm] expressed herself greatly pleased” (Freeman’s Journal, 24th May 1852). Possibly Chisholm renewed her acquaintance with Sister Cator.

In spite of Polding’s difficulties in using the Sisters of Charity to their best advantage in Australia, they achieved a great deal. Campion suggests that Polding disliked Chisholm, believing her to be “unfeminine”. Whether Polding saw Chisholm as “unfeminine” or regarded her as one of the “weaker sex”, she would undoubtedly felt the effects of Polding’s lack of interest in her work (Campion, 1933, 25). It was in Female Immigration that Chisholm wrote of the difficulties she encountered because of her faith.

It is a remarkable fact, that, at the very time the Protestants were afraid of my ‘Popish Plot’, several of the leading Catholics had withdrawn their support; and I was daily and hourly requested to give up all thoughts of the ‘Home’. A few dismal days passed; indeed, I had nothing to cheer me but an assurance of success, if there were no failing on my part: I could have done without help, but this continued opposition wearied me. Two gentlemen, one a clergyman, called on me; they urged me to give up (1842, 6).
The Catholic clergy approved of the use of the Barracks, but were of the opinion that the Clergymen and ministers of any denomination should not be expected to solicit subscriptions in their churches for the relief of emigrants, as had been proposed. The Clergy felt it was the duty of ship owners and the Government to support the emigrants until work was found. Chisholm “knew their [the clergy’s] intentions were friendly towards” her, and she respected them, but she could not “feel persuaded of their humanity or judgement” (1842, 6). What this incident does show, however, is Chisholm’s practicality in approaching the Clergy, of all denominations, to raise funds for her home.

Chisholm obviously found the continual strong opposition wearisome and was hurt by the wording of some of the letters she received. In Female Immigration Chisholm graphically details her reaction to a letter that she received from one of the clergy. It was “of so painful a nature, that I am astonished how my mind held out: I felt a giving way of the body first; I found I should be driven from the field by those who ought to raise the standard and cry, “On, on!”” (1842, 6). Chisholm uses such strong language that one can almost suppose that she was on the verge of collapse at the publication of this missive from the very people that she thought would have given her support. Regrettably Chisholm does not give any further information concerning the letter. However she draws attention to a further letter that was “another blow ... hurled against” her “from the hand of a friend ... a missile of great strength” that was printed in The Chronicle on the 16th September 1841 (ibid.). Chisholm “felt it keenly; no other person in the colony could have thrown more serious difficulties in my path: these things are permitted to try our faith and exercise our patience”. It was Fr. Brennan who had written to the Chronicle, he concluded his letter suggesting the editors should unite to put the case to His Excellency and the Council, who, he felt sure will not hesitate to relieve from want, and protect from vice, the poor but virtuous immigrant. It will be much better for you to do this than to waste your energies in endeavouring to promote a private scheme of benevolence, perfectly Utopian, and only excusable as the effect of an amiable delusion (Chronicle, 16.9.1841).

One can understand why Chisholm “felt a dreariness of spirit creep over” her to have her scheme referred to as an “amiable delusion” and why she thought it more “prudent to leave Sydney for a few days”. She believed, however, that “it was the will of God to prevent this” and detailed how she missed the steamer and in so doing came across “the Highland beauty” Flora, who was contemplating suicide. She managed to talk Flora out of her plans and found her lodgings. Although Chisholm was “much tired and fatigued ... [her] spirits returned: I felt God’s blessing was on my work. From this time, I never thought of human help; I
neglected no steps to conciliate; I increased my exertions; but from the hour I was on the beach with Flora, fear left me”.

These incidents illustrate the power of the opposition from Chisholm’s own clergy and the devastating effect that this had upon her. What is also shown is the power and depth of Chisholm’s spiritual convictions and her faith in God’s blessing on her work.

As already noted, Chisholm’s faith was severely tested by the actions of the Scottish Presbyterian minister, Dr. John Dunmore Lang, who also worked in the field of emigration. He had originally arrived in Sydney with his parents in 1824 but returned to England to obtain his Doctorate of Divinity with an annual stipend of £300. He returned to Australia c1826 (twelve years before Caroline and her family). Lang commuted between England and Australia promoting both educational institutions and emigration. He firmly believed that the grinding poverty of Britain could readily be relieved for some by the boundless opportunities in Australia (ADB, vol. 2, 79). Lang’s recruitment of emigrants, however, favoured Presbyterians or Lutheran missionaries or German lay assistants as opposed to Roman Catholics for he saw the Roman Catholic Church making every effort “not only to rivet the chains of popery on a deluded people in the Australian Colonies, but to extend the reign of superstition over the neighbouring and highly interesting isles of the Pacific” (ADB, vol. 2, 77-8).

Both Lang and Chisholm and her family left Australia for England in 1846. Before Chisholm departed, Lang accused her of being “a zealous and devoted Roman Catholic” trying to romanise the colony (SMH, 14.3.1846). Once back in England Lang again attacked Chisholm’s work in articles in the British Banner, which had a circulation chiefly among the more extreme Protestants. The articles began in March 1848 and did not cease until Lang again left England in November 1849. Lang wrote a particularly virulent article on board the Clifton while she lay off Gravesend before sailing to Australia. The article was published in the British Banner on 21st November 1849. Lang’s main concern was to attack Earl Grey and the Colonial Office for their neglect and discouragement of his schemes. Lang furiously attacked Earl Grey for allowing the emigration of Irish orphan girls from the Irish workhouses to Australia, which began in the spring of 1848. Lang thought it a measure “simply to supply Roman Catholic wives for the English and Scottish Protestants of the humbler classes in Australia”. The article went on to suggest that these “mixed marriages” were engineered by an “artful female Jesuit, the able but concealed agent of the Romish priesthood in Australia, who had thus adroitly managed to attach both your lordships ... to her apron strings.”
Chisholm’s reply to Lang’s virulent attack and accusations published at the time of her departure from Australia in April 1846 show her devotion to her faith and the subscription of her work:

It has been acknowledged that I have done some good to the colony, favoured neither country nor creed, and in truth, charity knows no such distinction - asks not to what nation or religious profession the object of her compassion belongs - this is my principle and part of my creed, - ‘the good of the whole’, is my pledge. ... To do good is often weary work; to watch our motives, and to endeavour to keep them pure and holy is a struggle - a constant warfare with human nature; - to act on the Samaritan principle requires the grace of God; conscious of my own weakness, anxious to do good to all men, am I not to be allowed to address my Maker after a weary day’s work in the way that my conscience dictates; I dearly love justice and the praise of men may be pleasant to me; but a consciousness of my own integrity is more so; for when I lose the approbation of my own mind, I forfeit one of the sweetest comforts that God permits a human being to enjoy (SMH, 20.3.1846 - CC letter to “The Colonists of NSW”).

Chisholm reiterated her vow to serve all creeds and nationalities, and she quite clearly affirmed that it was a struggle to keep to those motives, but with God’s help she had done so. Although she enjoyed praise, her own integrity and a clear conscience were more important to her. She believed it was a basic human right to be able to pray to God in the manner she felt appropriate and had no compunction in saying so.

Lang’s opposition to Chisholm was no doubt a mixture of anti-Catholicism and perhaps jealousy and hurt pride that a Roman Catholic, and a woman, who had only been working in the field of emigration for seven years, was more popular than himself. Evidence suggests that Lang had been anxious to become a paid accredited agent/watchdog putting forward Australia’s interests in England. The proposal was put forward at the same time as a proposal to present Mrs. Chisholm with a testimonial and gift before she left Australia, but Lang was not granted his wish.

This was not the first occasion that Lang had commented upon Irish Catholics in NSW. He had complained in 1837 that only Irish convicts were sent to NSW. He noted that no less than one-third of the total population of the colony of NSW in 1837 was composed of Irish Roman Catholics, of whom nineteen-twentieths were convicts or emancipated convict (Lang, 1837, iv-v). In The Question of Questions, published in 1841 after his fifth voyage to England the previous year, Lang attacks the bounty system but also talked of his fear that the colony would be transformed into a “Province of Popedom”. He wrote:

posterity would declare that in the year, 1838, His Excellency, Sir George Gipps, and his two Councils found NSW a thoroughly Protestant Colony; but that in the short space of three years thereafter, they had done more to transform it into a mere Province of Popedom, a mere receptacle for the worst portion of the population of Europe than had been done by all the injudicious acts of all his predecessors for fifty years before (Lang, 1841).
Historically at the time of Lang’s writing, Irish Catholics were emigrating in nearly as large a number as their English and Scottish counterparts. The Irish faced a harsher economic existence especially during periods of potato famines, and particularly during the Great Hunger. Statistics compiled by Madgwick of assisted immigrants into NSW between 1839 and 1851 indicate that 48% of the total 78,415 immigrants were from Ireland (Madgwick, 1969, 234). Chisholm established her Immigrant’s Home in Sydney in 1841, at this time, and until she left Australia in 1846, she was concerned for the welfare of immigrants arriving in NSW and finding them work in the interior. Her concern for the wider sphere of emigration developed during the latter period of her stay in Australia and particularly on her return to England with the establishment of the FCLS in 1849.

The figures Madgwick quotes are for “assisted immigrants”. The first ship of Chisholm’s FCLS, the Slains Castle, sailed from England in September 1850, arriving in Melbourne in January 1851. The FCLS immigrants were not classified as “government-assisted emigrants” in the Immigration Agent’s Report and therefore are not included in Madgwick’s calculations (Haines, 1997, 217). However, what it does indicate is that Lang blamed Chisholm for a natural phenomenon. Interestingly, Lang’s own emigrants were “selected and despatched with a view to their suitability to take up life in a new country, but the sine qua non of their suitability was their attachment to the Protestant cause” (Child, 1936, 87). Certainly Chisholm worked for the benefit of all creeds whilst Lang worked deliberately to further Protestant interests.

At a time when there was talk of a “Popish” plot, The Emigrants’ Guide published in 1845 (Mackenzie, D., 44) speaks of their being no “Established Church or state religion”. Reverend Mackenzie wrote that there were three established churches or religions in NSW, namely the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian and the Roman Catholic, equally recognised and supported by the colonial government. But if one looks at the figures for religious denominations in 1841 (the date of the census) there were 73,727 members of the Church of England; 35,690 members of the Roman Catholic faith, and 13,153 members of the Church of Scotland. 3,236 members supported the Wesleyan Methodists, 1,857 supported other Protestant religions. There were 856 people described as Jews, and 207 described as Mohamedans and Pagans. When Roman Catholics numbered less than half of the members of the Church of England, the accusation that Chisholm, among others, was romanising the colony, can hardly be justified (Mackenzie, D., 1845, 44).

However the tide has now turned. As a Roman Catholic Chisholm walked a “rugged path of deep
humiliation" received at the hands of both her own, the Protestant and Presbyterian clergy, but now the Roman Church seeks to have her canonised. It was in the 1960s that efforts began towards beatification of Chisholm. It was hoped that she would become Australia's first female saint. As the Reverend James Murtagh writes in his pamphlet *Caroline Chisholm - was she a Saint?*

... she re-established the dignity of womanhood and the family after the moral degradation of the convict era ... she established her family colonisation scheme in the face of religious prejudice and opposition from vested interests. She changed the whole attitude of the home and colonial governments on female emigration and by the time her work was done she was responsible for settling some 20,000 people in security and independence in Australia. She achieved all this without wealth or rank and with very meagre official support (1966, 9).

Mary Hoban, as already noted, was one among many who supported the cause of Chisholm's beatification. Hoban gave the following reasons (with emphasis) for her support:

1. Her aim was to work for the moral good of the whole community without exception. Her promise to “serve all” involved her in great personal sacrifices.

2. She personifies the Lay Apostolate.

3. She exemplifies the true role of Woman.

4. She and her husband illustrate the married state as a way of sanctification.

5. She worked for the family as the basic social unit.

6. She worked for Migrants.

7. She expressed Christian views on public questions of her day - world hunger, slavery, aborigines, land monopoly etc.

8. She combined Christianity with effective and sensitive social work.

9. Her inter-church co-operation promoted goodwill.

10. She was deeply concerned for the welfare of Australia.

The current situation with regard to Chisholm’s beatification is unclear. It was in 1981 following the death of Mary Hoban that the Catholic Women's League of Victoria and Wagga Wagga resolved to take up the Cause of Caroline Chisholm. The Bishops Conference held in Australia in March 1990 did not express any view regarding the proposal that steps be taken towards beginning a Process of Beatification. But prior to the Conference in response to the National Catholic Women’s League the Bishops took the following steps:

(i) arranged the preparation of, and approved, a prayer so that hopefully widespread prayer regarding the matter might take place.

(ii) encouraged further research into the various areas which the first part of any eventual process would examine, particularly “renown for sanctity” (in her lifetime and since).
(iii) Contacted the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster (in whose diocese Caroline died and where, according to customary procedure, an eventual Process might have to begin or, in part, take place).

(iv) sought the preliminary advice of historians and

(v) contacted a priest in Rome, a specialist in such Processes.

The prayer arranged in (i) above reads:

Heavenly Father, in your boundless love, you provide for your people. In the person of Caroline Chisholm you cared for the women of this growing nation and implanted here a concern for the dignity of womanhood. Bless her and let her life of selfless service and social concern be a model and an inspiration to Christian people today.

It appears that the initiative for the beatification process must come from the Archbishop of Westminster, but it is not known whether an approach to the Archbishop or any further steps have been taken.

Those championing the cause for Chisholm’s beatification can no longer hope that she will become Australia’s first female saint. The Australian Newcastle Herald (1.2.92) suggested that the cause for Mother Mary MacKillop seems likely to succeed, although Chisholm’s supporters had felt that Chisholm was the more deserving of sainthood in that the scope of her work was far broader than that of MacKillop. 14 MacKillop’s cause for her beatification was accepted by the Vatican and she was designated “Blessed” Mother Mary MacKillop in 1995. 15 Whether or not Chisholm achieves beatification, there is no doubt that her religion was of great importance to her throughout her life. It may have been a humiliation at times, but it was also her comfort and her strength.

While we may fully appreciate, understand and commend the cause of Chisholm’s beatification, such a cause creates an image of Chisholm that detracts from the overall view of her as a person. As with Florence Nightingale, the image of her as the Lady of the Lamp in the Crimea inhibited an understanding of her true character. The image denied any acknowledgement of the tremendous amount of work she undertook for the health of the army on her return from the Crimea. That Chisholm’s supporters are seeking the process of her beatification creates an image of the “saintly” good woman, which, as with Nightingale, denies any acknowledgement of the vastness of her work. Such a projection can make it difficult for people to see past the “saintly” woman. As noted in the Introduction, it “denigrates her achievements as a person” (5). Chisholm was an ordinary woman who led an extraordinary life.

1 The sees of 1851 were Westminster, Beverley, Birmingham, Clifton, Hexham (later Hexham and Newcastle), Liverpool, Newport and Menevia, Northampton, Nottingham, Plymouth, Salford, Shrewsbury
and Southwark. The title of Beverley disappeared in 1818 when the diocese was divided between the new sees of Leeds and Middlesborough (Mathew, 1955, 199).

Northampton Record Office, Northampton Wills, 1873.8.173. Will No. 73. Harriet Goode, nee Jones died on the 12 December 1872. Her will required her Trustees to sell three properties, 112, 114 and 116 Great Russell Street, Northampton. The proceeds to be divided between niece Charlotte, the wife of Reverend John Broad, nephew John Manning of Rugby, Warwick, Cabinet Maker, and nephew Henry Chisholm, Melbourne, Australia. Later in the will Harriet’s nieces Mrs. Charlotte Radford and Mrs. Caroline Holland both residing at Brooklyn, New York, America, are mentioned.

Francis Kerril Amherst born March 21st 1819. He became Bishop of Northampton in 1858, from which he resigned in 1879. Appointed Bishop of Sozusa, 1880. Died August 21st 1883.

Quite possibly Roskell was confused with Chisholm’s daughter who married Edward Dwyer Grey. He later became the Mayor of Dublin. Chisholm’s daughter, Caroline, died in Ireland.

Information supplied by Margaret Osborne, Archivist, Catholic Cathedral, Northampton.


Northampton Mercury, 1.1.1831. Notice of Marriage: “On Monday last at St. Sepulchre’s Church, by the Reverend Spencer Gumming (by permission of the Reverend B. Winthrope) Captain Archibald Chisholm, of the Honourable East India Company’s Service, to Caroline, youngest daughter of the late Mr. William Jones of this place”.


A reference to Lord Clarendon, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, who, with Earl Grey was accused of being Mrs. Chisholm’s dupe.

Statistics compiled of the approximate 123,000 men and 25,000 women who were transported to NSW and Van Diemen’s Land (and of whom 1.8 per cent had died on the voyage out) one-third were Roman Catholic and two-thirds were Protestants (Robson, 1994, 8).

Regrettably the Log of the Voyage from London to Port Phillip per Barque “Stains Castle” kept by Mr. A. L. Whitby that I have acquired, with the kind permission of Mr. Allan Hillier of Melbourne, lists the names of all the passengers, but does not note their religion or place or birth. I have not been able to acquire from Australia a copy of the Immigration Agents Report made on the arrival of the ship.

See Paul Gardiner S.J; An Extraordinary Australian: Mary MacKillop, published E. J. Dwyer, David Ell Press.

There is an interesting connection between Caroline Chisholm and the Blessed Mary MacKillop. Archibald Chisholm’s half brother, Alexander Thomas emigrated to Australia. Alexander stood as Sponsor with Sarah Cameron at the Baptism of Maria Ellen MacKillop at St. Francis’ Church, Melbourne on the 28th February 1842. The Baptism Certificate notes her date of birth as 15.1.1842, and her parents Alexander MacKillop and Flora Ann McDonald.
CHAPTER TEN

PHILANTHROPY

The purpose of this chapter is to give a brief overall view of the major feminine ideal of the nineteenth century and examine how that ideal influenced and shaped the lives of men and women of the period. The chapter will study the ways in which middle-class women used the ideology to allow them to step outside the private/domestic realm of the house into the more public/political domain of the men to undertake charitable and philanthropic work. From such a study it will become apparent that the same ideology that gave middle-class women the freedom to undertake such work impinged upon the lives of lower middle-class and working class women.

The problems of ideology as a historical concept will also be discussed, for as Caine rightly suggests, "the question whether one can in fact talk about separate spheres in the nineteenth century, and what precisely the separation involved, is becoming increasingly complex" (Caine, 1999, 92). The complexity to which Caine refers includes not only the differing ways that the nineteenth century middle-class society viewed, evolved and developed the ideology, but the ways in which we view those developments today.

The chapter will assess how the ideology of the period influenced and shaped Chisholm's life, and examine the ways in which she adopted the ideology of the separate spheres to legitimise her work in the public realm. The study of Chisholm's work and her concerns for the morality of female emigrants demonstrates and reflects the complexity of the nineteenth century ideal of womanhood.

The generally perceived view of the angel in the house figure is that of the Victorian woman whose domain was the private, domestic sphere of the home. By contrast the public world of business and commerce belonged to her husband. Contemporary writings clearly illustrate that at an "ideological level, the doctrine of separate male and female spheres was [a] widely accepted" concept (ibid.). This separation of spheres evolved from the later half of the eighteenth century with the development of industrialisation and the growth of a capitalist economy from which grew a middle-class social structure (Davidoff & Hall, 1987). Where once all the family, the men, women and children, worked together on the land to provide food for the family, making clothes or undertaking piecework manufacturing or artisan crafts, middle-class women withdrew from paid labour in the home or family business. The family economy was replaced by a
family dependent upon a “single (usually male) income earner” and the fact that the woman was no longer required to work became symbolic of the middle-class family's status within society (Caine, 1999, 92). The moral ideal of a woman's place in the home was "underpinned by legal, political and social practices which subordinated women" (Davidoff & Hall, 1987, 25). Middle-class women were finding themselves increasingly dependent on, and subordinate to, the men who inherited wealth and earned the money.

One aspect behind the ideology of separate gender spheres of the sexes was the belief that the woman of the house was superior in her moral judgements. Her function was to salve the male conscience, lead him away from sexual temptation, morally guide him and comfort him on his return home from the rigours of the outside world, as well as be the guide, exemplar and educator for her children. The assumption that the woman was the moral authority over religious and sexual matters arose from certain very real concerns of the Anglicans, Evangelicals, Congregationalists, Quakers and Unitarians. They were concerned to uplift the morals of society that had been poorly influenced by the rowdy and robustious court of George III with its gambling, drunkenness and debauchery. They firmly believed “that the new world of political economy necessitated a new sphere of domestic economy, that men could operate in that amoral world only if they could be rescued by women’s moral vigilance at home” (Davidoff & Hall, 1987, 74-75). By the 1860s moral vigilance and sexual decorum meant that for respectable middle-class women the subject of sexual matters, prostitution and venereal disease, was “off limits” (Perkin, 1993, 231).

However the morally superior middle-class woman was believed to be “easily corruptible. Eve, not Adam, had been tempted by the serpent, and this showed that women were innately sinful” (Perkin, 1993, 229). "Sexual promiscuity" Perkin adds, “was held to be more abominable in a woman than in a man, “because she violates, as it were, the very law of her nature in a sense in which he does not” (ibid.). Such attitude shows the duality of sexual behaviour – what was deemed as acceptable behaviour for men was seen as unacceptable for women. In literature of the period, for instance that of Thackeray and Dickens, the “fallen woman” although generally treated with sympathy, was always ostracised by the end of the book where she would “pay for her crime” (ibid. 231). Indeed much time and effort was spent on the reformation of the prostitute by “Prime Ministers, novelists, clergymen, physicians, philanthropists, and social reformers” (ibid. 230). Yet at the same time most men, from all walks of life, “accepted prostitution as an inevitable feature of society, needed for the satisfaction of male sexual desire before and outside marriage”. Henry Mayhew in his work *London Labour and the London Poor* detailed six categories of prostitutes: kept mistresses; prima donnas; women living together in well-kept lodging houses; women living in low lodging houses;
sailors' and soldiers' women; park women; thieves' women" (ibid. 221). Added to which was the further
category of the courtesan prostitute, the well-kept woman living in very comfortable accommodation with a
carriage at her beck and call (ibid. 220). The woman who was perceived to have "fallen" from moral
vigilance was stereotyped as damned whore and women were deemed to have "fallen" whether they were
abused by their employer or from sheer desperation subsidised their meagre wages by prostitution.

The image of the "damned whore" was one that was particularly prevalent amongst the convicts transported
to Australia. Writing of the early female convicts, Shaw wrote "how many were prostitutes will never be
known, almost all contemporaries regarded them as particularly abandoned". Shaw continued "and even if
these contemporaries exaggerated, the picture they presented is a singularly unattractive one!" (Shaw, 1998,
164). Indeed Summers believed that "the social and economic conditions of the first fifty years of white
colonisation of Australia fostered whores rather than wives" - an image that was "brought to Australia with
the First Fleet" (Summers, 1994, 313). The "sexual abuse of female convicts began on ships" but after
1811 the women were transported on separate ships, but even then the women had to contend with members
of the crew (ibid. 314). The circumstances were no better when the ship arrived in port. One settler wrote
to England that "on the arrival of a female convict ship, the custom has been to suffer the inhabitants of the
colony each to select one at his pleasure, not only as servants but as avowed objects of intercourse, ...
rendering the whole colony little better than an extensive brothel" (ibid. 315). The situation had improved
somewhat by mid-century, but even so Dickens felt impassioned enough to publish an article in Household
Words on the "Safety for Female Emigrants", complaining of the "many instances of brutality and
immorality" on British ships. 3 A situation that Chisholm also found intolerable and will be discussed
below.

The respectable middle-class woman may have been seen as morally superior, but she was judged to be both
physically and mentally inferior to the male. As Purvis notes, "women's physical and mental inferiority, in
comparison with men's, was emphasised and scientific evidence sought in studies of the body and the
brain". This "scientific justification", Purvis suggests, "gave credibility to other 'social' aspects of male-
female relations and social commentators apparently accepted these ideas without being sceptical of the
evidence" (Purvis, 1989, 49). That contemporary writers did believe the results of scientific studies can be
seen in the writing of Sarah Ellis who wrote that the daughters of England should be content to be inferior in
mental power to men in the same way that they were inferior in bodily strength (1842, 3).
The woman was therefore at one and the same time superior in her moral judgements, but inferior physically and mentally to the man. Her inferiority made her dependent upon, and subordinate, to the men of the household, the father, the brother, the husband. Studies have shown, however, that the woman's dependence and inferiority and the "decline of women's capacity to act openly as partners to their husbands in business did not mean that they did not contribute financially and managerially to income-earning activities" (Davidoff & Hall, 1987, 272-316). And as the century progressed "the recognition that many women lacked family duties or financial support brought a demand for paid employment or public involvement through local and charitable institutions for these women" (Caine, 1999, 92). Women's work in philanthropy and parochial educational establishments became the traditional roles for middle-class women and as such was "designated as 'public' activities – and hence became part of the growing demand for a proper voice for women in the public sphere" (ibid.). Indeed van Drenth and de Haan argue it was "women's developing role in public care" as seen in the work of Fry and Butler that "is directly linked to a very important issue in the history of women: the rise of the women's movement" (1999, 12).

Further contradictory elements, as Davidoff and Hall illustrated, operated within the idealisation of the dominant ideology. "Idealized womanhood was asexual and chaste, yet the supreme goal for women was marriage and motherhood, conditions which publicly proclaimed sexuality" (Davidoff & Hall, 1988, 322). There was also the further tension that women were physically and mentally inferior to men, yet adult women had power and influence over their younger sons (ibid.).

Yet a further tension was that this commonly held view of the dominant Victorian ideology of the "angel in the house" was of the "upper and middle-class woman". The idealisation of womanhood needed to be adapted for the woman from the working-classes who worked on the land, as factory worker, as servant, or wife attending to her children. Working-class women often found themselves working in employment that was particularly poorly paid for extremely long hours. There are, however, two aspects of the lives of working women: that of the single female and that of the married woman. Married woman with children generally sought work that allowed for a growing family - in agriculture or home-based, such as laundering, taking in lodgers or sewing. Single females, not encumbered by offspring, were more mobile and could find work as servants or within the factory system.

Employment within the factory system however was seen as a threat to family life. As Gomersall notes, "the cheap 'competition' of working women also threatened – or was seen to threaten – the job security, wage
levels and the status of men, both as workers and as ‘honourable’ men and husbands and fathers” (1997, 4).
The middle-classes were also concerned that young females working in the factory would not have time to
learn domestic skills from their mothers, which in turn would not make them the ideal good wife and
mother. Of further concern was that the female factory, workshop or mill worker would be exposed to “the
worst kind of vulgarity and coarseness in women – sexual knowledge and sexual promiscuity”, and as a
consequence female factory workers were seen as the “most degraded of their sex” (Purvis, 1989, 63).

The patriarchal ideology of the woman’s place within the home and consequent subordination to the male
that became the middle-class woman’s role within the family had an effect upon working women. The
middle-class view of the working-classes, however, was determined by their view, or image, that they had of
the lower classes. An image, as Purvis notes, that was “rarely ... based on first-hand knowledge of the
actual realities of such an existence, since middle-class people would not be encouraged to venture into
poorer districts” (1989, 63). The middle-classes adapted their ideological view of womanhood to more
appropriate forms for the working-classes. “Thus the dominant ideals upheld for working-class girls were
those of the good worker and especially the good domestic servant, while the dominant ideal for working-
class women was that of the good wife and mother” (ibid. 67). Purvis explains the adaptation of the
ideology:

In contrast with a middle-class girl, a working-class girl was expected to provide for herself;
thus the ideal of the ‘good worker’ defined femininity in terms of an ability to earn a living.
However, since waged labour for women was a fundamental departure from the central belief
of middle-class family ideologies that a woman’s place was in the home, a particular form of
paid work was considered most appropriate for working-class girls – namely domestic service.
The ‘good domestic servant’ was seen as an extension of domesticity, a form of femininity
appropriate for girls of the lower orders.

The ideal of the ‘good wife and mother’ ... was of someone who was a practical housewife, an
efficient housekeeper, a helpmate to her spouse and a competent mother. Like the middle-
class ‘perfect wife and mother’, she was engaged full-time in domesticity, but a much greater
emphasis was placed upon obtaining manual domestic skills (ibid. 67, 68).

This adaptation of the ideology had dual benefits for the middle-classes. The female domestic servant was
still based in the home, with the added advantage that there would be a good supply of labour for the middle-
classes. There was also the further benefit that the working-class girl would learn domestic skills which,
when her turn came, would make her a better wife and mother. As Purvis recognised, “political and
economic gains lay in a scheme which guaranteed a well-kept home, cared-for children and a contented
husband”. With such contentment, it was felt, the working-classes would be less likely to challenge the
social order and increase the pool of healthy workers which in turn would ensure economic growth (Purvis, 1989, 67).

The ideal of the “good wife and mother” in working-class terms was someone who “was a practical housewife, and efficient housekeeper, a helpmate to her spouse and a competent mother ... engaged full time in domesticity” (ibid. 68). But unlike middle-class women, the woman from the working-classes did not have the financial means to employ servants. She had to work hard to maintain her well-ordered and clean home. The middle-class view of the ideal working-class mother was one who did not only work hard to keep a clean and ordered home, she also had to “possess qualities of honesty, frugality, thrift and self-sacrifice ... believe in self-help and demonstrate, in the face of adversity, steadfastness and calm” (ibid.).

What the above amply illustrates is the complexity of the simple image of the angel in the house for the Victorians “differentiated between women in different social classes by upholding class-specific ideals of femininity”. In other words, what the middle-classes considered as appropriate for their own womenfolk was “often considered inappropriate, irrelevant and unattainable for working-class women” (Purvis, 1989, 48). As Purvis stresses, “patriarchal ideologies which emphasised male dominance over women were intertwined, and yet came into conflict, with family ideologies which emphasised that women should be located within the private sphere of the home, ideally as full-time wives and mothers” (ibid. 70). Yet perversely by mid-century various factors culminated in the need for more and more women to find employment to support themselves. Economic pressures as living standards improved resulted in middle-class incomes declining. There was a surplus of the number of single women over single men that led to fewer single men for the single women to marry, and middle-class men were postponing marriage until later in life when they could financially support a wife and family.

The “connectedness of history” to which Eliot referred (see chapter one) is illustrated by the middle-class strategy used to influence working-class women to adopt the ideal of the angel in the house - the pressures of external factors affecting the private lives of the working-class woman. One way of encouraging the working-class woman to adopt the middle-class ideal was the payment of low wages in the factory. Writing in 1835 Dr. Andrew Ure suggested that the differentials between male and female workers had been “pitied on this account with perhaps an injudicious sympathy, since the low price of their labour here tends to make household duties their most profitable as well as agreeable occupation, and prevents them from being tempted by the mill to abandon the care of their offspring at home” (quoted Lown, 1990, 181). Where
women did work in the factory employers tried to recreate the domestic ideal by adopting the patriarchal ideology, the woman subservient to the male in the workforce, which the low payment of wages to women reinforced. What the middle-classes seemed unable to grasp was the reality of poverty which meant that working-class women had to work in the factory, low wages or not, to help maintain even a humble existence.

Another way that the dominant middle-class ideology pervaded and influenced the lower classes was through the philanthropic endeavours of the middle-classes. The middle-class woman who had time on her hands and a desire to expand her field of caring for others outside the home, legitimised this by adapting and enlarging the ideology of domesticity. For instance, a number of middle-class women undertook philanthropic works in educational establishments such as the Mechanics Institutes and working men's college movements, where “ideological assumptions were to influence both the form and content of the provision offered to working-class women” (Purvis, 1989, 70). Many religious, moral and literary tracts and pamphlets were written and printed by the middle-classes to set an example and encourage working-class women to follow the domestic ideology. For example the *Annals of the Poor*, illustrates life stories “of females in humble life who have been exemplary for their extraordinary perseverance under difficulties, their ingenious industry, and their self-sacrificing benevolence” (ibid. 68). There is an irony that the middle-class domestic/private patriarchal ideology gave middle-class women freedom from domestic chores that enabled them to fill their time with philanthropic/charitable endeavours, in some cases moving into the public/political male domain, when that very ideology was being used to contain and restrict working-class women.

But as with the perception of the angel in the house figure the perception of the nineteenth century philanthropist and of philanthropy is also complex and can be viewed on various levels. Even the word philanthropy can be viewed in two differing ways. It is associated with charity and “notions of benevolence and of favour”, and defined as “the right to humane treatment” (van Drenth & de Haan, 1999, 44).

Firstly we can examine the various reasons that lay behind nineteenth century women’s motivation to undertake philanthropic work. For some women it may have been a pursuit purely to fill their time. They felt the need to fulfil the “basic human urges to be useful, to be recognised, to be informed, to be diverted, to keep up with the Jones’s, to gossip [and] to be loved” (Prochaska, 1980, 125). However, as Summers rightly suggests, “it is belittling and insulting to suggest that [all] women had only a negative motivation for
their actions, ... and it is historically unhelpful to suggest that thousands of individuals acted without positive motivation or the exercise of choice" (Summers, 1979, 38).

Other women believed that it was their duty to help the poor. Hannah More, for instance, and evangelical women of her persuasion, believed in a hierarchical structure of society that was divinely ordered. They firmly believed that they had a special duty to the poor. The rich had a duty to help the poor, but the poor had a duty to accept their place within society. More also believed it was a cruelty and an unkindness to educate people above their station in life. Yet she advocated a consistent programme of philanthropy that should be performed with kindness and cheerfulness. Christians were to use their time and their wealth, not for luxury and dissipation, but for the good of others (Collingwood, 1990, 107). Such approach is reflected in the remarks of Summers who observed that house to house visiting was “the iron fist of coercion” that “could be supplemented or even replaced by the velvet glove of friendship. Visiting the poor in their own homes could do more than demonstrate the benevolent and neighbourly intentions towards them of the rich; it could also help to isolate the poor from each other” (1979, 37).

Octavia Hill’s work towards the end of the century, for instance, whilst providing the poor with better living conditions, was very much a way of, as she herself put it, “rouse[ing] the habits of industry and effort, without which they [the poor] must finally sink. ... The plan was one which depended on just governing more than on helping” (Darley, 1990, 106). Hill clarified her view in her paper entitled The Importance of Aiding the Poor without Almsgiving: “there are two main principles to be observed in any plan for raising the poorest class in England. One is that personal influence must be brought strongly to bear on the individuals. The other that the rich must abstain from any form of almsgiving” (ibid. 116). Hill’s “iron fist” was that her tenants had to pay rent promptly and keep their room(s) clean and tidy, as well as the stair wells etc. and she would plough profits back into the housing developments to improve living conditions. Tenants who did not toe the line would be letting their neighbours down, and would therefore become isolated. Late payment of the rent, or continual misbehaviour meant eviction. Hill’s “velvet glove of friendship”, and later of her band of rent collectors, was that they would listen and advise on all manner of things from childcare, the welfare of the sick and financial matters. That advice, however, was moderated by the middle-class viewpoint.

Hill foreshadowed the Charity Organisation Society “with its dislike of dependency, to such an extent that one might almost see the COS as the mirror of her ideas” (Darley, 1990,117). The dual aims of the COS
were to “co-ordinate the many charitable efforts being made and prevent their overlapping, and to offer adequate help in cases of distress by investigating circumstances and trying to put people on their feet” (Bruce, 1978 123). As Bruce notes, “all its [the COS] intentions were admirable, but poor people disliked being investigated as much as charities disliked being co-ordinated, and the COS became little more than another voluntary charitable organisation” (ibid.). The COS was unpopular and much criticised in its day. There was continual conflict amongst members. The “young officers, merchants, noblemen, lawyers, bankers” were “a little hard and dry in their manner of urging their views [on social welfare] but few of them [had] real, living, personal intercourse with the poor”. At the opposite end of the scale were the “willing but over-impulsive women visitors from the District Visiting societies ... a large body of kindly, liberal, devoted workers among the poor, who never look[ed] beyond the immediate result of the special gift, who ... [were] injuring them irreparably by ill-considered doles” (Darley, 1990, 127/8). As Bruce rightly notes, however, “the Society ... saw the need for the rehabilitation of those demoralised by poverty, and through its insistence on thorough investigations and adequate help made a significant contribution to social policy and practice” (1978, 123). It became the “pioneer of the family case-work” which it continued under the name of the Family Welfare Association, adopted in 1944 (ibid.).

For other nineteenth century women religious conviction lay behind their philanthropic works, “it was their belief inspired by Christ, that love could transform society” (Prochaska, 1980, 15). Religion was both an inspiration and a way of legitimising a move into the public sphere. In her essay Cassandra, Nightingale, for instance, may have written bitterly of the total boredom that women suffered, suggesting that “when they go to bed [they felt] as if they were going mad”. Yet Nightingale believed that “on February 7th 1837, God spoke to me and called me to His service” (Strachey, 1989, 408; Woodham-Smith, 1992, 16). It was this calling that lay behind Nightingale’s motivation. As with the work of Fry and Butler for example, and Chisholm herself, it was their “religious belief which made them see women and men as human beings of equal value” (van Drenth & de Haan, 1999, 13). Indeed Fry, for instance, used her religious faith as a means of justifying her desire to work with female prisoners in Newgate Prison in London.

At the same time, however, Davidoff and Hall point out that women who had “encountered real religion” were often worried about the effects of marriage on their spiritual lives (1988,90/91). Nightingale, for instance, believed that marriage to Monckton Milnes would be “like suicide” to “voluntarily ... put it out of ... [her] power ever to be able to seize the chance of forming for ... [herself] a true and rich life” (Huxley, 1975, 40-1). Fry, after eight years of married life, believed that her “course ... [had] been very different to
which I had expected, and instead of being, as I had hoped, a useful instrument in the Church Militant, here I am a careworn wife and mother, outwardly, nearly devoted to the things of this life” (van Drenth & de Haan, 1999, 66). Conversely Chisholm, as noted below, made it perfectly clear to her future husband that marriage would not interfere with his future wife’s “strong faith in having a divine mission to perform” and it would not inhibit her from carrying into “effect her public duties” (Mackenzie, 1853, 5-6). As the findings of van Drenth and de Haan suggest, “religion played a more complex, positive as well as continuous role in the history of the women’s movement” than has previously been acknowledged. Such statement accords with the comments by Sandra Holton, Alison MacKinnon, and Margaret Allen that “feminism and religious belief in the past were not necessarily working against each other” (van Drenth & de Haan, 1999,66).

Secondly, the other aspect of nineteenth century women’s philanthropic activities is the effect that those activities had upon those who undertook them, and the effect that those activities had upon those who were the recipients of them. Even here there is the complexity of how nineteenth century philanthropists perceived their motives and actions, and how we today perceive them.

The use of the term velvet glove above may be allegorical, but the attire that the visiting upper or middle-class woman wore was important. It denoted class. Such class signs functioned, as Langland suggests, “as a protective shield, allowing women to venture into situations that might otherwise be extraordinarily dangerous to them” (Langland, 1995, 57). Jane Ellice Hopkins, writing in 1875, for instance, recommended “that the visitor not condescend to her audience, but dress as if for her own drawing room. Her silk dress, ... signals her “respect” for the working men” (ibid.). Her silk dress not only signified respect in this sense, but also acted as a marker for the woman’s “class inviolability as a lady, who must be accorded the same respect in rough haunts as she is in the drawing room” (ibid.).

Mary Ann Hedge articulated the tension that Hopkins felt. Writing in 1819, Hedge wrote that “women must be careful even how they follow a virtuous impulse; they must calculate the consequences that may arise even from benevolence itself, and study to combine goodness of heart, with propriety of manners, and the duties imposed upon them by society” (Davidoff & Hall, 1988, 430). As Davidoff and Hall rightly suggest, there were still strict demarcation lines between the sexes. It was “in the 1830s and 1840s [that] ‘tea and Bible’ ladies were accused of neglecting their homes, and thereby causing more moral mischief than all their exertions could eradicate among the poor” (Summers, 1979, 58). Nightingale was obviously aware of such condemnation. She noted in her work Cassandra written in 1852 “if a mother would ... have a pursuit of
her own; with her family, if any of them like it; without them if they don’t or can’t do it, like Mrs. Fry or Mrs. Chisholm. But then what a cry the world makes!” (Stratchy 1989, 29). Certainly there was a furore among Quakers that Fry neglected her children, and if Dickens used Chisholm as a model for his caricature of Mrs. Jellyby in Bleak House, then the inference is that her children were inadequately supervised (see chapter eight, Dickens).

Examining middle-class female philanthropic house to house visiting today, we can see the dual implications of the women’s actions. On the one hand, as already stated, it strengthened the middle-class ideology of the ideal woman “by propagating their [middle-class] values in a wider sphere”. On the other hand house to house visiting was a “threat to those classes – many of whom preferred to keep the poor at a safe distance”. Indeed the middle-classes were moving to the outskirts of towns and cities to get away from the fumes and smells of the factory and from the poor. The implication went much deeper for “women who took up charitable work were tacitly or openly condemning” the withdrawal from working areas and the “growth of a self-contained bourgeois culture. The constant reminders to which visitors were subject, that they must not gloss over distinctions of class, reflected the fear that acts of charity might rebound on the charitable by calling the whole structure into question” (Summers, 1979, 58).

There is very little information on record as to the emotions and feelings of the poor on receiving charitable assistance. But as Summers notes “we can infer from some philanthropic sources that the poor in their own homes were capable of putting up considerable social resistance to visitors, that they resented condescension, and maintained an independence of spirit while still on their own ground” (1979, 44). A different story when the poor had been removed to the workhouse where they were “accessible in every way” (ibid.). The Reverend J. S. Brewer writing in 1855 pointed out the great advantage of visiting the poor in the workhouse where they have “no occupation, and allowed to exercise none”. He went on to suggest that “they are in a more suitable frame of mind to listen to you, more thankful for your attentions, more ready to confide in you, more unaffected and more natural” (ibid.). In other words, pliant.

Contemporary male writers such as Reverend Brewer, did not consider the “political dimension of women’s visiting”. They could not see past the ideal of Victorian womanhood. Women were not seen as “political animals”. They were the “ornaments of the wealthy home, both aesthetically and spiritually” and “it was assumed that women graced the homes of the poor as they graced their own, exuding a wonderful and mysterious influence without abandoning an essentially passive role; certainly without dealing in threats and
promises" (Summers, 1979, 45). Such writers could not admit that “in dispensing material assistance and using influence on behalf of the poor, [women] could not but exercise considerable leverage upon them” (ibid.). In reality “visiting the poor gave women a taste of power outside their own homes” (ibid.). That sense of power, however, because of the social structure of society, did not allow for “any specific sense of female solidarity”. As Summer notes, “the perspective common to middle-class men and women” often meant that the female visitor “saw the poorer woman as the potential agent of domesticity, the means by which working men might be brought home off the streets, out of the pubs and more into line with their [middle-class] functions as fathers, husbands and sons” (Summers, 1979, 59). The poorer women as a consequence could be said to be ‘a civilising influence’ upon the male members of the household. The visitors “considerable leverage” upon the poor was in effect leverage upon the woman of the house to “increase her obligations and her work-load” (ibid.).

By contrast the philanthropic role of middle-class men was at the other end of the spectrum. Whereas the women were the doers the men were, generally speaking, the organisers. As Davidoff and Hall note, “men organised themselves in myriad ways, promoting their economic interests, providing soup kitchens for the poor, cultivating the arts, reaching into populated urban areas and rural outposts” (1988, 416). Such organisation usually resulted in the setting up of committees and associations, and, again as Davidoff and Hall comment, “this network of association redefined civil society, creating new arenas of social power and constructing a formidable base for middle-class men” (ibid.). Work of the committees and associations would often appear in newspaper reports, which added respectability and stature to the middle-class men who organised the events. The men also gained respect and acknowledgement for their endowment of buildings, from water fountains to donations to, for example, hospitals, schools, mechanics’ institutes as well as endowments for public parks. As the women gained experience and a sense of power from their house to house visiting, so too did middle-class men gain experience and increased confidence from their organisations and associations. Such organisations and associations were male dominated, and had no room for women and the experience and confidence that the men gained from these bodies “contributed to their claims for political power, as heads of households, representing their wives, children, servants and other dependants” (ibid.).

One example is the work of Samuel Courtauld whose enterprise started from very lowly beginnings in 1819. By the time of his death in 1881, Courtauld’s influence and his endowment of local enterprises led a former weaver from the company’s mill to remark that “Courtauld’s was the town” * (Lown, 1990, 136).
Courtauld's philanthropic ventures, however, were constructed “upon a familial model requiring marked
distinctions between the responsibilities and activities of men and women” (ibid. 140). Courtauld saw
himself as “the dutiful Victorian father-figure” and his “paternalism towards the women and girls of the
town were education, housing, childcare and recreation” (ibid. 141). But as Lown notes, in each of these
areas there was gender segregation “sometimes physically, sometimes ideologically, sometimes both. The
maxim of separate spheres was central to Courtauld’s projects, shaping every activity accordingly” (ibid.).
But such paternalism was also a way of furthering the interests of the firm, both from the point of view of
“adapting workers to their tasks” and from the economic viewpoint of publicising the company. It was also
a way of endorsing middle-class views. Samuel Courtauld firmly endorsed, for example, maternity and
child-welfare by the promotion of monthly maternal meetings run by middle-class women, who propagated
their middle-class views of maternity and child-welfare.

Male Friendly and Benefit Societies, of which there were 20,000 in 1858 with a membership of about two
millions and an accumulated worth of nine millions were organised for the benefit of working classes
(Hardwick, 1869, 22). Such organisations, however, were also patriarchal in that they “safeguarded the
bargaining powers of their members, but assured the maintenance of male domination in household
arrangements” (Lown, 1990, 24). As Joseph Ashby noted “women had no part in the Friendly Societies
unless as widows of members” (Ashby, 1961, 162). However, Friendly Societies exclusively for women
did exist. For example, the Female Foresters, Female Druids, Female Gardeners, Female Rechabites, Odd
Females, Odd Sisters and the Ancient Shepherdesses (Neff, 1966, 35).

What the above demonstrates is the complexity of nineteenth century philanthropy and the motivation
behind those who undertook philanthropic activities. The work of van Drenth and de Haan found that the
motivation that lay behind women’s philanthropic work was a combination of several merging aspects
(1999, 43-47). Religion may well have played an important factor, but several cultural factors also played
an important part. The Evangelical spiritual revival and its concern for moral reform may have advocated
the doctrine of the separate spheres of the sexes, but as noted above, that gave women the leisure to follow
philanthropic pursuits outside the home. Thus “disproving any notion of ‘containment’, and proves instead
that evangelicalism had a strong activating component ... It released a progressive energy” (ibid. 43).
People caught up within the religious revival of the time, such as the “Methodists, Quakers, Evangelical
Anglicans, ... regarded it as their essential duty to help others and to fight injustice; this was ‘simple
obedience’ to the “divine principle of loving our neighbour as ourselves”” (ibid.). It may be a strange
concept for the twenty-first century mind to come to terms with, but female philanthropists devoted themselves to various philanthropic activities for "no other reason than to try to help others in less fortunate or outright degrading circumstances, and often for decades" (ibid. 44).

The good intentions of the women however were interconnected and entwined with the growing fears of a revolution in England, with the development of industrialisation and with the growth of the middle-classes with its differentiation of gender and class. As Lown notes the classification of gender and class are not separate, absolute or fixed "as both forms of social relationships and sources of personal identity they are constructed and reconstructed simultaneously. They are also subject to negotiation and dispute, reassessment and change" (Lown 1990, 210). In the nineteenth century, as Lown further remarks, "both categories were at the centre of continual struggles to map out new-world views and new constellations of relationships. Those caught up in the struggles had different interests at stake according to what they stood to gain or lose in the process of renegotiation and redefinition" (ibid.). In the field of philanthropy the interaction between gender and class played its part.

The above helps us to have some understanding of Chisholm's motivation and adds a further dimension to the complexity of our way of examining nineteenth century philanthropy. Chisholm's Anglican upbringing and the culture of the period no doubt had a strong influence and lay behind her belief that she had a "duty to help others and to fight injustice". As can be seen in the quotation below, Chisholm believed that a "Superior Being" had given many individuals "time and leisure" to be employed "for the general good". Such comment indicates Chisholm's sympathy with the views of the Evangelicals, and harks back to her childhood and the Jones family worship at St. Sepulchre's in Northampton.

Chisholm, however, was unusual in that she was from the lower middle-classes. She remarked at a lecture in Liverpool that emigrants did not "feel so much surprise when they see me on board ship, because they know I do not leave a very comfortable home. It is very different with me. My life is a rough life at best and they do not feel surprise" (Liverpool Mercury, April 1853). An insight into Chisholm's view on philanthropy can be seen from her comments at that same lecture. Chisholm stated that she believed that it was the duty of those with leisure to protect those less fortunate than they were. She spoke of two Societies of ladies in Liverpool:
Each working and each anxious to do good; and I am quite sure if they go on they will find their means of doing good will increase. Emigration is not one of those charities that lulls the Christian asleep. They will find, if they pursue steadily the path, that they will have so many trials to encounter, so many real difficulties, so many disappointments, so much ingratitude — they will find that there is nothing but the real good that is done that will enable them to go on. But when I speak of ingratitude, I mean the ingratitude that results from ignorance. There are great numbers who cannot understand the real good that people are anxious to perform, and frequently attribute selfish motives when they see ladies leaving their comfortable homes to go on board ships as many ladies do here. .... When they see ladies going amongst them who are giving up every comfort, it is something they cannot understand. They see, amidst all the noise and confusion, going from ship to ship, ladies who at home are accustomed to luxury. They say, “Why is this?” Ladies will find many very suspicious of their motives for doing this; but if they persevere to the end, making the good of the whole their object, they may rest assured of having a larger amount of satisfaction than I think they could derive from any struggling community, .... and as emigration that is now going on is of that character which no man can stop, it becomes the duty of all those who have leisure to watch over the movement, and to endeavour to moralise it, and to throw as much into it of good as can be done. It is their duty to watch over the people, and to impress upon those who are leaving their wives and families the great risk and danger they run in doing so. It is their duty to watch the ships and to see and to make those men familiar with the arrangements that are necessary to protect their wives and children from loss of character on board ship. It is their duty to see that this emigration is conducted in a moral and decent manner. It is their duty to say whether this emigration shall become a reproach or a blessing to the nation (ibid.).

Chisholm’s comments capture so much of our contemporary views of philanthropy and yet, within them, she is reflecting upon instances in her own life. It is as if the first five plus lines are a reflection of the trials and tribulations that she faced when she first thought of starting the Sydney Immigrants’ Home. In the first year’s report of the home, she wrote of the “many serious difficulties to be thrown” in her way, and of the “rugged path of deep humiliation” (1842, 4). It was Chisholm’s act of saving Flora from suicide that convinced her that she should persevere with her thoughts of opening the home. This was the real good that enabled Chisholm to go on. No doubt it was circumstances such as this that Chisholm felt constituted the real good that would enable the ladies in Liverpool to continue their work (Liverpool Mercury, 1853, 9). Undoubtedly the reference that emigration does not lull the Christian asleep was a reflection of the amount of time and effort she herself had put into emigration work.

Chisholm also noted that the women undertaking philanthropic work in connection with the emigrants' ships “will find many very suspicious of their motives.” This comment can be viewed in differing ways. Firstly, Chisholm may well have been referring to the emigrants themselves, who would be suspicious of the ladies visiting the ship, for the various reasons as noted above. Chisholm believed that the Ladies Societies had a threefold duty: to ensure that the men were aware that they should protect the wives and children on board from the disreputable sailor and male emigrant; that they should try to ensure that the men did not go overseas leaving their wives to cope with the problems of bringing up a family on their own, and to ensure that the ships were of a standard to carry the emigrants safely to their destination. The suspicions of the
ladies of Liverpool perhaps stemmed from their interest in the emigrants' moral welfare and the moral propriety between men and women on board ship. Quite likely this was interpreted as interference. The emigrants may well have believed that it was their choice whether or not the wife and family should remain in England while the husband and father emigrated to Australia for instance.

Secondly, Chisholm may well have been reflecting on the attitudes that she herself had met with. As already mentioned, the disgruntled ship owners were put to considerable cost to upgrade their ships along the lines Chisholm advocated for the emigrants sailing under the auspices of the FCLS. Perhaps more significantly both Protestant and Catholic clergy were suspicious of her motives on opening the home, and many throughout her working life were suspicious of her faith and believed that she was working to romanise Australia.

Chisholm’s comment that if the “Ladies .... persevere to the end” they would derive “a larger amount of satisfaction than I think they could .... from any other source that is open to them at the present day” reflects Chisholm’s views on the need for the women of this class to find an outlet for their resources and that for such women of leisure, philanthropic work was one of the few openings to them at that time. Chisholm was certainly reiterating Nightingale’s statement in Cassandra that middle-class women were sent mad with nothing to do all day. Perhaps too Chisholm was thinking that she herself was enabled to have a more fulfilling and satisfying life, through her philanthropic efforts. As a woman from the lower middle-class her work enabled her to move with ease among all levels of society and to achieve far more than she ever could have done as an ordinary lower-class woman.

The complexity of nineteenth century philanthropy is seen in the complexity of Chisholm’s philanthropic actions. On the one hand she did not follow the strict demarcation lines between the sexes. It was Chisholm who organised the Committees, particularly the male Committee of the Family Colonisation Loan Society headed by the Earl of Shaftesbury (Lord Ashley) as well as Ladies’ Committees to help run the various homes in Australia. Chisholm wrote pamphlets and papers addressed to men of power setting forth her views and criticising their actions, or lack of action. She lectured to large audiences on the topic of emigration. On the other hand she did act within the strict demarcation lines between the sexes. She followed the thinking of the time that women should look to the morals of society and act as the civilisers. She placed women in localities in the interior of Australia where she knew men were looking for wives, and she found the women jobs as servants, thereby perpetuating the ideology of the angel in the house.
As with nineteenth century philanthropy, the ideology of the angel in the house, was pervasive yet complex.

So how can we assess that ideology as it may have shaped and influenced Chisholm’s life? As already noted, without diaries, journals and few personal and business letters, it is difficult to trace the influences on her life. A recollection of Chisholm’s childhood, however, appeared in Sidney’s *Emigrant’s Journal* in August 1849. Chisholm recalled that her first attempts at colonisation were:

> carried on in a wash-hand basin, before I was six years old. I made boats of broad beans, expended all my money in touchwood dolls - removed families - located them in the bed-quilt, and sent the boats, filled with wheat, back to their friends, of which I kept a store, in a thimble case. At length I upset the basin, which I judged to be a facsimile of the sea, spoil’d a new bed, got punished, and afterwards carried out my plan in a dark cellar, with a rushlight stuck upon a tin-kettle; and, strange as it may seem, many of the ideas which I have since carried out, first gained possession of my mind at that period; and, singular as it may appear, I had a Wesleyan minister and a Catholic priest in the same boat. Two of my dolls were very refractory, and would not be obedient; this made me name them after two persons I knew who were constantly quarrelling, and I spent hours in listening to their supposed debates, to try and find out how I could manage them; at length I put the two into a boat, and told them if they were not careful they would be drowned; and having landed them alive, I knelt down to pray to God to make them love each other” (Sidney’s *Emigrant’s Journal*, Aug. 1849, 269).

Although we have to bear in mind that these remarks are Chisholm’s adult recollections, it would seem from this extract that at six years old Chisholm was not aware of or strongly influenced by the middle-class ideology.

She was not afraid to tell the dolls, which represented a Wesleyan minister and a Catholic priest (by definition, male) that if they “were not careful they would be drowned”. That a young child of six should spend time imagining the “debates” between a Wesleyan minister and a Catholic priest suggests, as suggested in the chapter on Catholicism, that in reality the young child had probably been exposed to such discussions. This would also seem to be consistent with the suggestion that William Jones had taken a Catholic priest into the family home. Nonetheless, such imaginary company does not overawe the young girl, for she tried to “find out how I could manage them”. In Chisholm’s mind it was “families” that she was caring for in the context of outside the home. What this extract implies is the possibility that the young Chisholm may very well have taken on board some of the attitudes of the female members of the family who were not overawed by the opposite sex.

Perhaps even at this young age Chisholm had been involved in some form of charitable activity. As already noted, possibly her mother had made her aware that their better circumstances should be shared with...
the less well-off of the neighbourhood, and Chisholm often wrote of the generosity of the poor to the poor (see page 51). Certainly Mackenzie suggested that "as womanhood dawned, the poor became the object of her [Chisholm's] attention; the trivial vanities of teenhood were neglected in the performance of duties to her indigent neighbours; considering the fulfilment of Christ's ordinances beyond that of personal ease and selfish vanity, she appeared to live for the sake of others, entirely forgetful of self" (Emigrant's Guide, 1853, 5). In this instance Mackenzie is suggesting that Chisholm absorbed the ideology of putting others first, and moving into the outside world through philanthropic acts.

Chisholm wrote the passage as a woman remembering the thoughts of herself as a young girl. As she wrote the passage she might well have noted the irony that even as a young girl she often spent all her pocket money on "removing families". In later life she, Archibald and the family were often short of money because of her expending money helping families to a better life in Australia. The phrases Chisholm used: "strange as it may seem" and "singular as it may appear" indicate a woman reflecting on her childhood thoughts with the realisation that the origination of certain values informing her moral purpose and approach in later life were being shaped in the young girl as she played with her boats of broad beans.

Chisholm certainly does not appear to have taken on board the angel in the house ideology in reply to Archibald's proposal of marriage. Mackenzie informs us that

Mrs. Chisholm related at a public meeting that her strong faith in having a divine mission to perform led her to give her intended husband one month to consider whether he would accept of a wife who would make all sacrifices to carry into effect her public duties (Emigrant's Guide, 1853, 5/6).

Earlier biographers have not thought Chisholm's statement significant enough to unravel its implications. In one short sentence Mackenzie gives us a great deal of information and two factors immediately leap off the page. Firstly Chisholm not only told her husband of her condition of marriage. She was also not afraid to admit that she had done so at a "public meeting". What is regrettable is that research has not been able to find a report of this public meeting and therefore the date of that meeting is not known. As Chisholm undertook her lecture tours during the early 1850s before her return to Australia in 1854, it is presumed to be during this period. Her lectures in Australia in 1859/60 do not contain any reference to the above.

Secondly, and more significantly, is that in 1830, as a young woman of twenty-two, Chisholm actually made such a statement to her "intended husband". This was not the expected behaviour of a young woman of the
period. Yet if we look back to the earlier quotation of Chisholm as a young child of six, we can see some of the same characteristics coming through. Caroline wanted to “manage” her own life. What is also apparent is that she was not afraid of public opinion. Australian feminists of the 1960s and 1970s failed to see the implication of Chisholm making such an uncommon request of her future husband, and failed to note her independent nature and her bid to be something other than the “angel in the house”.

Previous biographers have paid little attention to the fact that Chisholm was acting contrary to all the popular teachings of the period. Mrs. Ellis, whose ideal for a wife was “softness and weakness, delicacy and modesty, a small waist and curving shoulders, an endearing ignorance of everything that went on beyond household and social life” would hardly have approved of Chisholm’s actions (quoted Dunbar 1953, 20). Chisholm emphatically ignored Ellis’s dictate to “deny her feelings, and conceal her talents”. Florence Nightingale was not as self-confident, assured and unswerving in resolve as Chisholm was. Richard Monckton Milnes, an MP from among the elite of British society, had to wait seven years (from 1842-49) before Nightingale gave an answer to his proposal of marriage. As the wife of such a man, and a man who shared her enthusiasm for reform, she would have had every opportunity to follow her goals and aims in life. As already noted, Nightingale felt marriage to Milnes would seem to like “suicide” (Huxley, 1975, 40-41). Likewise writing in 1885 in Autobiographical Sketches, Annie Besant lamented her decision to marry the Reverend Frank Besant. Marriage for Annie meant giving up her “dreams of the ‘religious life’” (quoted Murray, 1982, 112). That Chisholm should have chosen to give Archibald time to consider her desire “to make all sacrifices to carry into effect her public duties” shows her independent nature and her strong faith and determination to perform what she saw as her “divine mission”. Unlike Nightingale, who rejected proposals of marriage, because she saw it hampering her desire to follow her mission, and Besant, who gave up her dreams to reluctantly support her husband’s calling.

There is a further aspect to Chisholm’s choice of Archibald as a marriage partner. Archibald was ten years older than Caroline, which, as Davidoff and Hall illustrate, was not unusual (1998, 323). Israel also comments that there are many nineteenth century novels that relate the marriages of young women and old/older men. This, of course, does not mean to suggest that the novels are empirically true, but it does, as Israel acknowledges, highlight “how plausible stories that collectively participate in a wider nineteenth-century narrative project might be.” For example Israel cites the works of Charles and Emilia Dilke who “engaged in a genre of stories of young women who marry professors”, as well as the works of Charlotte Brontë, particularly The Professor, but also Villette and Shirley (Israel, 1999, 99). George Eliot allows the
young Dorothea Brooke to marry the older Mr. Casaubon, in the hope that a “fuller life would open up before her” and that she would “enter on a higher grade of initiation”. She would have “room for the energies which stirred uneasily under the dimness and pressure of her own ignorance and the petty peremptoriness of the world’s habits” (1965, 67). These novels all stress the “tutelary quality of such marriages” and the “considerable age differences between the partners” (Israel, 1999, 99). The plausibility of such narratives raises the issue of Chisholm’s choice of Archibald as a marriage partner. Was that choice made because Caroline saw Archibald’s army career as widening her own horizons and his higher social standing an opportunity to undertake a wider sphere of philanthropic works than she had been used to? Was marriage to Archibald a way of escaping the quiet, provincial town where nothing of any startling consequence seemed to happen? Did Caroline see Archibald as an educator?

If Chisholm was not unusual in marrying a man ten years her senior, what was unusual was that Archibald not only accepted Caroline’s request, but that he continued to support her, financially, emotionally and physically, throughout their marriage life. He was tremendously loyal and supportive of his wife, and at times, as in India, it would not have been easy for him to give Chisholm the support she required. It is not generally noted that Archibald was as remarkable as Chisholm was herself. To have a wife so obviously entering into the male domain of the public sphere would not have made life easy for him. Yet upon retirement he served as Honorary Secretary, and on the Finance Committee of the FCLS. Certainly Chisholm’s work was a tremendous drain on the family resources – yet they appear to have been a loving couple. Their last child was born when Caroline was forty-three and Archibald fifty-three. In nineteenth century terms, theirs was a most unconventional marriage and, with the normative conception of woman’s place as confined to the private sphere, most unacceptable.

Some critics have found Chisholm’s treatment of her children unacceptable. For example, Richie writes, “there is a sad irony in this woman’s claim to the custodianship of the welfare of humankind while seeming to neglect her own children” (1975, 74). As indicated above, in Cassandra Nightingale propounded that women should have a pursuit of their own and implied that there had been an outcry that Chisholm and Fry had neglected their families. Certainly the Quakers were most unhappy that all of Fry’s eleven children married outside the faith, and thereby considered that she had indeed neglected her children. Research has not uncovered criticism of Chisholm by her contemporaries. That Richie accused Chisholm of neglect overlooks the fact that most nineteenth century middle-class establishments had at least one female assistant.11 The middle-classes aped their betters - the aristocracy had nannies and governesses to look
after their children. Miss Galvin looked after Chisholm's children at Windsor while their mother was working in Sydney. Chisholm writes of her anguish in parting with the boys in her work in *Female Immigration* – the children would have been exposed to the illnesses suffered by the immigrants. This does not make allowance, however, for leaving the children during a Christmas period when Chisholm led a party of immigrants into the interior. There is evidence, however, that in later life Caroline and Archibald had a good relationship with their children. This would seem to contradict the criticism of neglect.

Australian feminists have been critical of Chisholm and her moral attitude that female emigrants would be a civilising influence on the colony of NSW. What they did not allow was that, as noted above, within the dominant ideology of the differing spheres of the sexes was the belief that women were judged to be morally superior to men. Peter Gaskell, writing in 1833, explained the power of women's moral influence:

> The moral influence of woman upon man's character and domestic happiness, is mainly attributable to her natural and instinctive habits. Her love, her tenderness, her affectionate solicitude for his comfort and enjoyment, her devotedness, her unwearying care, her maternal fondness, her conjugal attractions, exercise a most ennobling impression upon his nature, and do more towards making him a good husband, a good father, and a useful citizen, than all the dogmas of political economy (quoted Poovey 1989, 8).

What Gaskell is suggesting is that women's "moral influence" goes beyond the home in that her "ennobling impression upon his nature" will not only make him "a good husband, a good father" but also a "useful citizen". Through their "moral influence" women become a "civilising" influence upon society. Trollope also wrote that as for "most middle-class men of the mid-Victorian period, familial and domestic order was at the heart of social order" (Hall, 1998, 191).

Chisholm's writing, when viewed in this context, is not dissimilar. Chisholm wrote in *Emigration and Transportation*:

> If Her Majesty's Government be really desirous of seeing a well-conducted community spring up in these Colonies, the social wants of the people must be considered. If the paternal Government wish to entitle itself to that honoured appellation, it must look to the materials it may send as a nucleus for the formation of a good and a great people. For all the clergy you can despatch, all the schoolmasters you can appoint, all the churches you can build, and all the books you can export, will never do much good, without what a gentleman in that Colony very appropriately called "God's police" - wives and little children - good and virtuous women (1847, 17).

Chisholm, and the gentleman whose quotation she used, were not alone in believing that the family – the women and children, acted as civilisers. But it was Chisholm's use of the phrase of "God's Police" and its implication of women as civilising agents that the 1960s and 1970s Australian feminists chose to see as the
embodiment of her work. They believed that in finding women employment as servants, and in areas where
the women would have the opportunity to marry, Chisholm was devaluing the women’s role and status. A
devaluation that they believed had continued up until the time of their writing. Indeed Schaffer wrote that
“the articulation of the stereotype of God’s Police is attributed to Caroline Chisholm, a moral reformer who
in the 1840s called for the emigration from England of ‘God’s police - wives and little children - good and
virtuous women”. Quite clearly, however, Chisholm was not the original articulator of the phrase.
Chisholm borrowed the phrase from “a gentleman” in Australia. Schaffer goes further, and suggests that
both Chisholm and Daisy Bates “have been located historically within the stereotype of God’s police”
(ibid. ‘63). Chisholm did use the phrase, and did see women in terms of regenerators of the Colony.
Chisholm, however, was working within the framework of the ideology that women were morally superior
and that the working class girl should be a good worker, a good domestic servant. Chisholm, like many of
her contemporaries, believed that familial and domestic order was at the heart of social order. The
positioning of Chisholm as the originator of the image of God’s Police does not allow for the tremendous
effectiveness of Chisholm’s contribution in the public domain and her own example as a woman. Dale
Spender, when detailing the work of Daisy Bates, wrote, “although criticisms can now be made of her
[Bates] when she is judged by current standards, her integrity cannot be questioned” (Spender, 1988, 197).
Spender, perhaps unwittingly, begged the question as to whether we should be judging those in history by
“current standards”?

Schaffer does concede that Chisholm and Bates have been stereotyped in this manner, and is the first to
admit that both women “would appear to be early [female] models who break away from a dependent role in
relation to men”. The married status of the two women “did not alter their effectiveness in the public
sphere” and they “were public figures of renown, who worked independently, both in and out of the bush, in
isolation and in the public eye” (ibid. 63).

In The Real Matilda, Dixon not only brushed Chisholm aside as “born in England” but perceived her, as she
believed others perceived Chisholm at the time of her writing in 1976, as “a do-gooder - but not really with
it? In any case a woman ...” (1987, 289, 96). Dixon was concerned with the inferior status of women in
Australian culture, an inferiority stemming from attitudes that had evolved, she believed, from male convicts
or colonial authorities with little self-esteem. To enable them to be superior to the women, such men treated
women negatively. In 1976 Dixon believed that the social status of women in Australia was considerably
lower than in other comparable western countries.
In making her judgements, however, Dixon did not take into account the high esteem with which nineteenth century contemporaries regarded unmarried women who were prepared to be frugal and industrious. John Capper's *Emigrant's Guide to Australia*, published in 1853, for example, notes that drawing-room accomplishments were of no value, but the virtues of "churning, baking, preserving, cheese-making, and similar matters" were highly prized (Pownall, 1964, 150). Capper continues: "such a helper [a wife] will not only be no expense, but she will actually often earn nearly as much as the husband" (ibid. 151). Mrs. Clacy writing of her *Visit to the Gold Diggings of Australia* in 1852-53, commented that the scarcity of women in Australia would prove an advantage: "the worst risk you run is getting married and finding yourself treated with twenty times the respect you may meet with in England. Here (as far as number goes) women beat the "lords of creation"; in Australia it is the reverse, and there we may be pretty sure of having our own way" (Clacy, 1963, 151). Mrs. Clacy obviously did not feel that women were showing signs of low self-esteem, to the contrary she felt pretty sure that women would get their own way and would be treated with "twenty times the respect you may meet with in England".

By placing single women as servants in the interior, and in situations where they were likely to be married, Chisholm, in the opinion of Dixon and Summers, contributed to the constraint and low self-esteem of women in Australian culture in the later half of the twentieth century. Chisholm would have believed that by rescuing women from working the streets and placing them in work, albeit work as servants, she was contributing to their self-worth. She would have seen herself as rescuing the "damned whore" and wished to protect women from that dichotomy as Dickens, with the financial help of Angela Burdett-Coutts, founded Urania Cottage and rehabilitated and retrained the prostitutes in London to send out to Australia as free settlers. Indeed Chisholm stated in a letter to the editor of the Melbourne *Argus* that "we ought not to forget that if this country is to become a great nation, we must endeavour to uphold in the females who come here principals of self-reliance and independence" (17.2.1855).

Chisholm was concerned for the morals of the country but she was also concerned that the females should be self-reliant and independent - not subservient. Indeed Chisholm in her lectures often used such phrases that showed that she felt the women were in control of the men, and that she did not see women solely as servants. In her lecture at Northampton in March 1853 Chisholm quite emphatically exclaimed "I never can imagine that Almighty God sent females into the world to be cooks and housemaids all their days" (*Northampton Mercury*, 5.3.1853). When discussing her Land Ticket system in the *Argus* in June 1855 Chisholm wrote that the "wives, without the aid of Sir Charles Hotham, the police, or protection societies,
would know how to keep them [the men] in perfect order" (30.6.1855). If the women had “low self-esteem” they would not have attempted to “keep them [the men] in perfect order”. They would not have the courage to do so. Chisholm did not see her work as “stimulating” emigration, but saw her work as a “simple object … to provide for the comfort of the emigrant in a practical and respectable manner”. She “observed the sufferings, the struggles, and the privations of thousands here [in England]; and saw also the obstacles which lay between the sufferers here and the place where their condition might be improved.”

This is the voice of a woman who genuinely believed that she was helping women to a better life in Australia. She was not alone in her view. Dalziel commented that

The patriarchal subordination of wife to husband did not appear to be a general characteristic of nineteenth century pioneering society. Working-class women leaving the slums of Britain could only gain from improved material circumstances, no matter how meagre they yet seemed to be; middle-class women confronting a busy but purposeful and stimulating life frequently felt the colonies had offered them a fuller existence (1977).

In her open letter to Earl Grey (Emigration and Transportation) Chisholm very strongly suggests that the penal system had doomed “tens of thousands to the demoralising state of bachelorism.” She felt that the reformed prisoners were “more sensitively alive than any other to connecting their families in marriage to doubtful characters”. Chisholm also firmly reiterated that “to send abandoned women [the damned whores] to our Colonies [Australia] is an act of cruelty to them” because they would not be “sought for as wives; respectable families will not receive them as servants”. The current system of emigration, Chisholm wrote, “is one that demands a remedy. If for a moment the religious and moral claims of an infant Colony are not regarded as of sufficient importance to make the Government do what appears to be a plain duty, the political consequences of this neglect may become one day of a very serious and irremediable character” (1846 17/18). Chisholm very astutely suggests the serious political implications of neglecting the colony’s religious and moral claims. She strongly highlights the need to improve the Emigration Rules to ensure that “abandoned women” were not swept off the “streets of England by those seeking a quick profit”. She is also apprehensive for the women themselves, who would not be treated kindly when they arrived in the colony. Chisholm was concerned about the state of the colony, concerned for the good and virtuous women - God’s Police - and concerned for the welfare of the women labelled as damned whores. Chisholm was also not afraid of adamantly stating her beliefs: “that the system demands a remedy” and almost bullying Earl Grey into taking action by reminding him, almost threateningly, of the political consequences.
Chisholm’s deep concern for female emigrants generally, can be seen in many of her writings. For example she showed concern in a letter of the 28th February 1847 to Benjamin Hawes at the Colonial Office when she voiced her concern that women were told by prospective employers that they should “remember, you must have no children when you are with me; that breaks our agreement”. Likewise in the *A.B.C. of Colonisation* Chisholm indignantly stated that she held it “to be derogatory to the high and moral feeling of Englishmen, that under the insignia of the Royal Arms of England, modest British matrons should be asked the question [by Her Majesty’s Land and Emigration Commissioners], “Whether any increase to the family is expected, and when? (1850, 5). Chisholm was greatly concerned and indignant that women should be asked if they were pregnant. She believed that it was a human right that the women should not be exposed to such indignities, nor, like their husbands, should they have to declare their religion or country of origin, as long as they were loyal and peaceable British subjects.

Chisholm was also deeply concerned by the victimisation of orphan girls on board ship “by men calling themselves Christians; how modest maidens have been brutalised over and insulted by those whose peculiar duty it was to protect them” (ibid. 10). Chisholm believed it was a basic human right that women and children should be free to travel unmolested. Dickens, as already noted, was equally concerned about the brutality on board ship.

Chisholm was incensed by “female pauper emigration” believing that females were treated like cattle to be shipped abroad. As noted above in chapter three, Chisholm took the matter very seriously. When she heard of the appalling treatment of Margaret Anne Bolton, who had been doused with cold water and left tied to the mast for several hours on board the *Carthaginian*, she successfully prosecuted the Ship’s Captain and surgeon (see page 80). Chisholm, foreign born or not, was not going to allow Bolton to suffer the brutality, the indignity, and the consequent low self-esteem, from men who were supposedly in charge of her welfare.

Chisholm’s approach towards her work needs to be placed against the background of attitudes and cultural, ideological beliefs that were prevalent at the time. Chisholm was undoubtedly concerned about the morality of the colony. But her concern for the moral regeneration of the colony through “good and virtuous” women who would act as “God’s police” did not mean that she did not care for the welfare of the women. The above quotations show the contrary.
They also rebut Dr. Beverley Kingston’s scathing remark that “Chisholm’s juxtaposition of moral imperatives and her womanly modesty ... did a dis-service to her causes by continually insisting on her female inferiority” (1977, 317). Whilst fully agreeing with Kingston that Chisholm did indeed protest her “reluctance ‘as a lady’ to come before the public as a writer of letters to editors and politicians and as a public speaker”, and incidentally also in her pamphlets and documents, she nonetheless went on to state her objectives clearly and precisely, and the actual content of Chisholm’s publications make no apology for her sex (ibid.). She strategically used the patriarchal ideology to her own ends – she wanted the men in power to read and digest and act upon her literature, and lectures. She therefore apologised for her audaciousness, but said and wrote with due disregard of her position as a mere woman. Caine rightly suggests, “for much of the nineteenth century, feminists reworked and rethought conventional ideas and images as a way both of articulating and gaining widespread acknowledgement of their views” (1999, 82).

It is doubtful that Shaftesbury and Herbert, for instance, would have given Chisholm the time of day if they took exception to Chisholm’s protestations of “female inferiority”. They would not lend their names to a cause that was any way suspect or likely to fail. They had, after all, their own reputations to consider and, as noted, it was Shaftesbury who said of Chisholm that she had the heart of a woman but the mind of a man (Murtagh, 1966, 9). This was a compliment attesting to her ability to carry out her causes.

The Westminster Review in their article on the twelfth “Annual Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Officers” would hardly have singled out Chisholm together with Herbert and Shaftesbury for “all praise [for their] practical charity” if they had thought the less of her for her apologies of writing as a woman.19 The Review went on to say “without waiting for the calculations of the politician or the economist [they – Chisholm, Herbert, and Shaftesbury] go straight to the unconstrained, unpatronised but judicious accomplishment of the object [emigration] before them” (1852, 399). That the Review linked Chisholm’s name to those of Herbert and Shaftesbury is an indication of her stature in their eyes.

Mention is made of Chisholm in reports of the colony in the British Parliament Papers. The complimentary reports of Chisholm attest to the high opinion of her by colonial officials. For example, two reports, contain praiseworthy comments: “the colonial Government have been led by the appeals of Mrs. Chisholm, a lady who has distinguished herself by her humanity and her activity in connection with emigration”.20 The second report stated “Mrs. Chisholm, a lady whose enlightened and benevolent exertions in behalf of immigrants, have been such as to merit the acknowledgement and thanks of the whole colony”.21
such reports would not have been written if the colonial officials had any doubts of Chisholm’s abilities or took offence because she apologised for “being a woman”.

What becomes apparent from the above is that Chisholm was an ordinary woman doing extraordinary deeds at a time when women were perceived, as Ruskin would have it, “for sweet ordering, arrangement, and decision” (1951, 98). She was a woman of her time but an outstanding woman of her time. She had incredible resolve and determination and was very formidable. She had a good sense of humour, but could be unthinking and sarcastic. She was certainly not frightened of letting people, including men in position of influence and power, know what she was really thinking, while her “rather frivolous table-talk” sometimes disappointed her admirers (Suttor, 1965, 48). Chisholm herself said that “pride”, although natural, was a feeling that needed to be watched and regulated (1842, 62). Perhaps Chisholm did not watch and regulate the feeling of pride enough, for there are many instances of Chisholm’s pride throughout her works and lectures.

What should also now be fully apparent are the strange and singular complexities of Chisholm’s character. On the one hand she is totally concerned for the morals of young female emigrants and is concerned for the morals of the colony. She is aware of the evangelical beliefs of the “sense of the duties of each class to all others”, influences which no doubt stemmed from her childhood. On the other hand she goes against the Victorian ideology of the angel in the house by insisting that Archibald consider for a month whether or not he wished to marry her on her own terms, i.e. that she be allowed to follow “her divine mission” to carry out public duties. It shows her strength of character and her determination as a woman. Chisholm apologises for coming before the public as a woman, but nonetheless does so using strong and forthright language. As a woman working in the Victorian era she defied the gender ideology of the time. She prosecuted a Captain and Surgeon, she was the figurehead of her own organisation, and she appointed well-known men to her Committee. That she “appeared on public platforms (emigration meetings) and espoused political causes as a “right” (her political lectures and evidence to Select Committees and House of Lords Committees) runs against the grain of Victorian gender roles and relations. Chisholm spanned two worlds of the Georgian and Victorian eras and took something from each of them. That it did not trouble Chisholm appearing on public platforms and dispensing with chairmen perhaps reflects that earlier Georgian era when women, such as Harriet Martineau for instance, did such things as a matter of course (Kingston, 1977, 318). Conversely Chisholm found employment for women as servants, and often placed the women in employment where she knew men were looking for wives. From a twenty-first century perspective, Chisholm was perpetuating the
subordination of women, commissions of which Summers and other Australian feminists complain. Such complaint, however, shows a lack of historical imagination and does not take into account the absence of viable alternatives open to Chisholm during the mid-nineteenth century. Chisholm was doing her best for these women within the framework of her time. Her actions cannot be judged simply by standards formed in our own time. For this reason, to reiterate Gutiérrez’s words, quoted in the Introduction, “the biographer should be totally involved not only with his or her character but also with woman’s real world” (1992, 55).

1 For example, Sara Ellis, *The Wives of England, The Daughters of England* etc.; Coventry Patmore’s poem *The Angel in the House*, published 1854-1863; and Ruskin’s most successful work: *Sesame and Lilies*, first published in 1865. Davidoff and Hall have shown how evangelical writers such as William Cowper, Hannah More and Thomas Gisborne in the period 1780-1820 were influential in spreading such ideas (1987, Chapter 3).

2 The term “middle-class” is used in its widest sense to include all those who came between manual workers earning wages on the one hand and the landed gentry on the other (Clarke, 1973, 5).


5 Hill came from a family involved with social reforms. Her grandfather was the sanitary reformer Dr. Southwood Smith. Religion did not play an important role in Hill’s life, although for a short while she was involved with the Christian Sociologists. Her views on the treatment of the poor, however, were similar to that of More.

6 Darley writes: “Hill always claimed to have been a member of the COS since 1867; but it did not then exist and she must have been referring to one of its immediate forebears, the London Association for the Prevention of Pauperism and Crime, whose prospectus had been drafted by Ruskin. It changed its name to the Society for Organising Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity in April 1869. By the time of its first annual meeting, it was known in shorthand as the Charity Organisation Society (1990, 117).

7 Cassandra formed part of the second volume of Florence Nightingale’s unpublished book *Suggestions for Thought to Searchers after Religious Truth*. The book was written by Nightingale in 1852 and finally put together in 1859, after her return from the Crimea. It was privately printed, but was not published.

8 Halstead, Essex.


10 What a study of Chisholm’s family background has told us is that the Jones family was comfortably provided for by William Jones. Census returns also tell us that Chisholm’s siblings and half-brothers and sisters, all worked in humble trades, i.e. cooper, painter and glazier, draper, and on the railways. The 1851 census for example shows that Chisholm’s mother, Sarah Jones, is a ‘proprietor of houses’, yet living with her at 11 Mayorhold are Thomas Jones, her grandson and his wife, Mary Ann, who work as shoemaker and shoe-binder respectively. There were no servants in the house on the night of the census.

11 In England the 1851 census return for Islington indicates that both Chisholm and her mother were present at Charlton Crescent. Mary Smith, a young unmarried girl from Northampton, aged fifteen is listed as servant (In all probability Mary Smith could have been a distant relative of Chisholm’s. Her elder half
sister, Mary, married Joseph Smith in 1791. I only have record of their son Joseph, who married Louisa, and had seven children. Mary and Joseph may well have had (an)other son(s) and the Mary Smith on the Islington census could well have been a granddaughter of Chisholm’s half-sister.

12 Regrettably detailed research has not been able to uncover exactly who Miss Galvin was.

13 Perhaps Chisholm’s comments concerning Jeyes in Little Joe – “although a proud man, ... one whom wealth had blinded to his duties, was not hard-hearted” - was a reflection on her own life style and her devotion to her work? The difference being Jeyes’ withdrawal from domestic life was for monetary gain rather than for the welfare of others.

14 See Memo from Archibald, senior, to his son Henry in connection with the former’s pension, and request to locate the bust and medal that was given to Chisholm by the Pope (quoted Hoban, 1984, 416). Chisholm’s letter to Mrs. Elizabeth Rathbone, dated 22.9.1865 from 6 O’Connell Street, Sydney, indicates that Chisholm was lodging with Archibald, and that her married son Henry often visited for meals. Chisholm also thanked Rathbone for looking after Archibald senior, the two girls and Sydney, who had returned to England: “I need not I am sure say how much how deeply I feel your motherly kindness to my children”. Letter, Rathbone Papers, RPV1.1477, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool.

15 Schaffer notates her comment from Anne Summers, Damned Whores and God’s Police, prologue (Schaffer, 1990, 63).

16 Daisy May Bates, nee O’Dwyer, 1863-1951. Bates, born in Tipperary, Ireland, was sent to Australia in 1884 for her health. Twice married (apparently bigamously) she left her second husband, Jack Bates, by whom she had a son, to return to England and work in London as a journalist. She returned to Western Australia and began working and studying in Aboriginal missions, compiling a native dictionary for the government. From 1912-45 she lived with the Aborigines collecting and recording information regarding customs and legends. A prolific writer, she published hundreds of articles on the Aborigines and fought for welfare reforms. She was greatly regarded by the Aborigines who called her “Kabbarili” or “wise-woman”. Co-edited The Passing of the Aborigines (1938) with Ernestine Hill. The book was very influential. Wrote her autobiography My Natives and I, which was published in serial form in the newspapers. Received CBE in 1934 (Bassett, 1987, 23 & Spender, 1998, 11).


18 It was only in 1975 that the Sex Discrimination Act made such questions illegal.

19 The Westminster Review (1824-1914) was a prestigious magazine. It was established by James Mill, a supporter of Bentham, as the journal of the ‘philosophical radicals’ in opposition to the Edinburgh Review and the Quarterly Review. Byron, Coleridge, Tennyson and Carlyle were among the literary figures it supported. The journal survived several changes of name and ownership. Under the editorship of John Chapman from 1851 published Froude, Pattison, Pater, George Eliot and others (Drabble & Stringer, 1990, 608).


CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSION

This thesis has been concerned with a woman whose significant work in helping others has been largely forgotten. Attempting to remember her properly has been the main aim of the thesis. This has involved reconstructing her biography, from both primary and secondary sources, each with their own different flaws. Beyond the attempted resurrection lies the question of the purpose of historical biography. Robert Blake’s essay, “The Art of Biography”, offers a useful description of “what a biography is supposed to do”:

A biography is doing or should be doing at least two things. One is to give a record of the historical facts. Biographies in that sense are works of reference and unless they are accurate, get the person’s date of birth right, mention his principal achievements, say who the subject married and tell us when he or she died, they are of no use. An accurate biography may be dull and lifeless. It may be the sort of work, which, as someone said of a book by a friend of mine, “when you put it down it is very difficult to pick up again”. But if it is correct and accurate it has at least achieved something. A biography which is incorrect and inaccurate might be lively, well written, moving, entertaining, elegant and so on, but its inaccuracy rules it out as a biography. It may be in one sense a work displaying literary art, but the critic must condemn it for it fails to do the first thing which every biography must do, namely: get the facts right in so far as this is possible and not make them up when this is impossible (Homberger & Charmley, 1988, 76).

Yet “facts”, as Blake further notes, “do not speak for themselves”. They need to be interpreted, but in such a way that the interpretation does not obscure the evidence (ibid. 77). The interpretation must stem from the evidence, and not from preconceived ideas that may be in opposition to it. The biographer has all the advantages of hindsight, but she/he must “never forget that to his subject and his subject’s contemporaries their future was as much a mystery and a blank as our future is to us” (ibid. 89). The biographer must be aware of perspective – how far the subject can be detached from the times, and how much information can be given of the time in which the subject lived (ibid.). Blake concluded that “the truth is that works of biography and history are always imperfect” (ibid. 93). Imperfect in that they can never be the definitive work.

The structure of this thesis has tried to cope simultaneously with the problems and difficulties of biography and historical research, and has broadened out from the more conventional biographical form to show the “subtle and intangible developments and events of the times”, private and political, that helped Chisholm mature and grow. As in all lives there is a two way process – the effect of our being upon others, and theirs
upon us. In the wider context there is a further two way process – the effects of the political events on our lives, and diffusive effects, however small, that individuals may have on the wider political stage.

Chisholm’s life is seen as exemplary, not in the sense of her as a “saint”, as some of her previous biographers have seen her, but in the sense of her as an ordinary woman who achieved so much in her extraordinary life. Chisholm’s religiosity gave her the courage and the strength to fight for the humane treatment of others. Yet in the past she has been castigated for not being a feminist in that she did not “fight for equal rights and/or activities aimed at ending male domination and privileges” and placed single female emigrants in domestic employment in the interior of Australia where, on occasion, she knew local bachelors were looking for wives (van Drenth & de Haan, 1999, 46). But as this thesis noted at the outset, there has, in van Drenth and de Haan’s words, been a “lack of clear criteria or a consistent framework for women’s public activities [in the nineteenth century, which] has led to a remarkably divergent treatment of those activities by historians” (ibid.). Those women who did not actively support the fight for equal rights have on occasion been marginalised or stigmatised with the label of anti-feminism. But the Rome of the women’s movement was not done in a day. In the mid-nineteenth century Chisholm fought for the education, health and welfare of others, in a role which can best be described as a “women’s activist” (see Introduction). Chisholm was one of the early pioneers striving for independence to help others, and as such she was an example to other women. The lack of clear criteria has led to historical confusion and errors and has meant that some historians have not been able to see the past through the present. This has contributed to Chisholm’s lack of historical acknowledgement.

Other causes for her lack of acknowledgement by historians stem from a variety of reasons as already noted. The success of the nineteenth century emigration movement, and the discovery of gold, together with the events of the Crimean War, meant that there was no longer a need for Chisholm’s emigration work. Emigration per se up until recently (the early 1990s) has never been a subject that has been covered in depth by British historians. Chisholm’s political lectures and her attack on the unlocking of the land would also have contributed to her being persona non grata. And unlike Florence Nightingale, she had no iconic association or extensive body of work for historians to research. Neither did she have Nightingale’s tremendous wealth and the power and influence that that brought her. Chisholm’s work has largely remained in the dark cellars of history.
George Eliot could have been writing the epitaph for Chisholm when she commented on Dorothea's life at the end of *Middlemarch*. Eliot wrote: “that things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life, and rest in unvisited tombs.” Caroline Chisholm rests, with Archibald, in an “unvisited tomb”.

A few local volunteers look after the grave, but Northampton, the town of her birth, does not even have a commemorative inscription to acknowledge her life there. An “unvisited” tomb indeed.
THE WILL OF WILLIAM JONES

I William Jones of the Town of Northampton in the County of Northampton Hog Jobber being of sound and disposing mind memory and understanding, praised be God for the same, Do make and ordain this my last will and Testament in manner and form following that is to say I give and devise unto my Son Robert Jones his heirs and assigns for ever All that my Close or inclosed ground with the appurtenances situate and being near Castle Hills within the liberties of the said Town of Northampton now in my own occupation and which I purchased of John Clarke. I give and devise unto my Daughter Caroline Jones her heirs and assigns for ever All that my messuage or tenement with the appurtenances situate standing and being in Bearward Street in the said Town of Northampton now or late in the tenure or occupation of my Son William Jones. I give and bequeath unto my dear wife Sarah Jones the sum of five hundred pounds of lawful money of Great Britain to be paid to her immediately after my decease. I give and bequeath unto my son James Jones and my Daughter Elizabeth Pettit the Sum of £100 pounds a piece of lawful money of Great Britain to be paid at the end of six Calendar months next after my decease. I give and forgive unto my Sons William Jones and George Jones and my daughter Mary Smith all monies by me advanced to or for them respectively. I give and devise unto my said wife and her assigns during her life all that my appurtenances to the same belonging situate and being in the Mayorhold in the said Town of Northampton now in my own possession and occupation and from and after the decease of my said wife and subject wheresaid estate for life therein I give and devise the said last mentioned premises unto and equally between my five children by my said wife, namely Charlotte, Thomas, Mary Ann, Sarah and Harriet their heirs and assigns for ever as tenants in Common and not as joint tenants and in case any or either of my said five Children give and devise the share or shares of him her or them so dying unto the Survivors or Survivor of them his her and their heirs and assigns for ever with like benefit of survivorship. As to all the real residue and remainder of my goods chattels effects ready money securities for money and personal estate whatsoever and wheresoever after and subject to the payment of my debts the aforesaid legacies and my funeral expenses I give and bequeath the same and every part thereof unto my said wife and my brother Plowman Jones upon Trust to put and place the same out at interest on such security or securities permit my said wife to receive the interest and annual produce thereof for her life for the better support and maintenance of herself and her said Children and from and after the decease of my said wife upon trust to pay and divide all the said residue and remainder of my said personal estate unto and equally between my said five last mentioned children share and share alike and I make constitute and appoint my said wife and my said Brother Plowman Jones Executrix and Executor of this my last Will and Testament and also Guardians to such of my said Children as shall be under the age of twenty-one years at the time of my decease during their respective minority. Provided always and my mind and will is that it shall and may be lawful to and for my said wife and my said Brother (if they shall think proper) or the survivor of them to pay and advance any sum or sums of money for the putting and placing and apprentice or otherwise advancing any or either of my said five children in the world as they shall think fit so as the sum to be advance for any one child do not exceed such particular childs share of the said residue of my personal estate and lastly I do hereby revoke and make void all former and all other wills by me at any time herefore made. In witness whereof I have to this my last will and testament contained in this and the previous sheet of paper set my hand and that to wish my hand to the preceding sheet and my hand and seal to the second or last sheet the 4th day of April in the year of our Lord Christ 1814.

The mark of William Jones

Witnessed: Rob Abbey  Geo Abbey  Wm. Penfold (sic)

The 1824 Pigot’s directory lists under ‘Attorneys’ Robt. Abbey & Son of Gold Street. The 1830 Pigot’s directory under ‘Attorneys’ lists George Abbey of Gold Street. George Abbey was by that time also Coroner for the County, and Secretary to the Northamptonshire Law Society. This information refutes Hoban’s statement that “Mr. Penfold and the two abbes were taken into his room to witness the will [of William Jones]” (Hoban, 1984, 5). The signature of the third witness is difficult to decipher. It could be William Penfold, but it is not at all clear. The third witness could well have been a clerk of Robert and George Abbey asked to witness the mark of William Jones.
Sarah and Harwell their heirs and assigns for ever as aforesaid and in case any of either of my said five children to die without issue under the age of twenty one years then the same share or shares of their heir or heirs so dying unto the survivors or survivor of them and their heirs and assigns with like benefit of survivorship to all unremainder of my goods chattels effects ready money securities in whole whatsoever and whatsoever appurtenances and subject to the payment of the said legacies and my funeral expenses I give and bequeath the said personal effects unto my said wife and my brothers Plomer Jones upon and after the same and at such time as such securities or securities do them shall think proper and pay to or perform my said lawful expenses and annuities and produce there of during her life for the better support of herself and her said children and from and after the decease of her the said Sarah to pay and divide all the said residue and remainder of personal estate unto and equally between my said five bastard children and share alike and I do constitute and appoint my said wife and my said Plomer Jones executor and executor of this my last will and testament and also guardians to each of my said children as shall be of twenty one years at the time of my decease during their respective minority always and my will is that I shall appoint to and for my said wife and my said Plomer Jones executor of this my last will and testament.

The above being the Will of William Jones.

Witness.

Sarah Jones

Plomer Jones

Sarah Jones

Sarah Jones
TEXT BOUND INTO
THE SPINE
Descendants of William Jones and his first wife Elizabeth Pettitt

Pettitt, Elizabeth
Born: 27 June 1742 in Wootton
Died: 11 November 1767 in Duston

Jones, William
Born: 30 March 1744 in Wootton
Married: 20 October 1762 in Wootton
Died: 4 April 1814 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Jones, James
Born: 8 May 1762 in Wootton
in Duston

Sarah
in Probably Duston

Jones, Mary
Born: 17 August 1764 in Wootton
Died: 11 November 1764 in Wootton

Jones, Mary
Born: 8 September 1765 in Wootton
in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Joseph
Born: 1829 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Elizabeth
Born: 11 November 1767 in Duston

Jones, Anna
Born: 1793

Smith, Joseph
Born: 1802 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Louisa
in London

Smith, Michael
Born: 1829 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Joseph
Born: 1832 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Edmund
Born: 1840 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Charlotte
Born: 1842 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Emma
Born: 1844 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Elizabeth
Born: 1846 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Smith, Charles
Born: 1848 in St. Sepulchre's, Northampton

Generally speaking the date given as "born" is the baptismal date. Where birth is an " denotes "bapt" date.
Descendants of William Jones and his third wife Mary Saunders

Saunders, Mary
- born: 30 March 1744 in Westm
- married: 17 October 1744 in Denmark
- died: 5 April 1814 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, William
- born: 21 January 1754
- married: 17 October 1773 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
- died: 12 May 1813

Jones, Ann
- born: 27 August 1783 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
- married: 22 December 1803 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
- died: 23 September 1860

Jones, George
- born: 21 June 1787 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

?Stacey, Maria
- married: 1 April 1815

Jones, George
- born: 10 November 1810 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, James
- born: 6 June 1813 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Ann
- born: 26 September 1813 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Joseph
- born: 11 April 1813 in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Generally speaking the date given as "born" is the baptismal date. If there is an "actions" table, "death" date.

Direct Descendants of William Jones and his fourth wife Sarah Allum

Allum, Sarah
Born: 1771
Died: 4 April 1864
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, William
Born: 24 March 1744
Died: 4 February 1827
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Keiley, George
Born: 1775
Married: 7 October 1809
in Fun All's Church, Northampton
Died: 11 April 1837
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Charlotte
Born: 19 December 1809
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 5 April 1886
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Wright, John
Married: 17 September 1827
in All Soul's Church, Northampton
Died: 17 November 1896
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Thomas
Born: 26 October 1795
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 28 March 1865
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Mary Ann
Born: 21 August 1795
Died: 1877
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Auld, Henry
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 9 December 1891
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Sarah
Born: 19 September 1824
Died: 4 March 1885
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Robert
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 9 December 1891
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Malone, Mary
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 20 March 1877
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Patrick
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 20 March 1877
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Goode, John
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 20 March 1877
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Jones, Caroline
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 20 March 1877
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Chishold, Archibald
Married: 20 March 1823
in St. Sepulcher's, Northampton
Died: 20 March 1877
Buried: St. Sepulcher's, Northampton

Generally speaking, the date given as 'born' is the baptismal date. Where there is an 'x' before the 'born' date, other descendants of Charlotte's children are known. Details which would make the tree difficult to incorporate within the text.
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