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INTRODUCTION

The New York Public Library is not an obvious place in which to delve into the Australian past, but it has given me some real Eureka moments, yielding rich sources that have illuminated and given new meaning to many aspects of our history and its wider ramifications. For perspectives from other places require that our national story be placed in a larger context and encourage us, perhaps, to adopt a global frame of analysis. Only then might we see the distinctiveness and significance of Australian history and the need to better explain it.

Seeing Australian experience through the eyes of others we can better appreciate our place in the wider world and our location in the longue durée of modern history. As Cuban historian, Louis A. Perez Jr. wrote in a critique of Thomas Bender’s collection Rethinking American History in a Global Age, one can gain valuable insight into the national condition from outside the context of one’s nation.\(^1\) The histories and historiographies of others can throw new light on our past, highlight connections and re-shape our national narratives.

In researching the international history of Australian democracy, I’ve worked in a number of American (and other) archives and libraries including the Library of Congress, the Houghton, Widener and Schlesinger Libraries at Harvard, the Yale archives, the Bancroft Library at University of California, Berkeley, the Kheel Center at Cornell University and the New York Public Library. I have vivid memories of what I read in those places – perhaps because I was alone and worked without distraction – and through this research and reflection came to see Australian history differently and, I think, more clearly.

\(^1\) Matthew Guterl and Christine Skwiot, “Atlantic and Pacific Crossings: Race, Empire and ‘The Labor Problem’ in the Late Nineteenth Century,” Radical History Review 91 (Winter 2005): 44. My thanks to Sascha Auerbach for alerting me to this article in the course of teaching our RHD Intensive, ‘The British Empire and the Chinese Puzzle’, at the University of Melbourne, 23rd – 27th September 2013.
Researching Australian history from abroad encourages a world-history approach that for me highlighted with dramatic clarity Australia’s (and New Zealand’s) reputations as sites of advanced democratic experiments. ‘New Zealand and Australia are the most interesting legislative experiment stations in the world’, wrote Victor S Clark, who had visited these countries on behalf of the US Department of Labor in 1904, ‘and they experiment so actively because their political institutions are extremely democratic’.² To be sure, the idea of Australia as ‘a land of experiments’ and ‘social laboratory’ had been favourite tropes of an older national historiography, but my research in US sources offered new understanding, pointing to the significance of the imperial encounters – between British and Chinese empires – and New World identifications between Australia and the United States – that framed these democratic experiments, one of the most notable of which, and the one that gave meaning to the rest, was the White Australia policy.³

## Along the Colour Line

In the Houghton Library at Harvard, when researching the papers of the US Immigration Restriction League (IRL), I remember my surprise at finding the gentlemen of the Boston elite, who comprised the IRL membership closely studying a copy of Australia’s Immigration Restriction Act (Act No.17 of 1901), received in 1902, following a request to new Prime Minister Edmund Barton’s office in Melbourne.⁴ The Act was of particular interest to the IRL, because it contained an education or writing test, requiring would-be immigrants to ‘write out at dictation a passage of fifty words in a European language’ as determined by a Customs Officer.

Office bearers in the IRL, including leading intellectuals E.A. Ross, David Starr Jordan, John R. Commons and A. Lawrence Lowell favoured a literacy test to achieve immigration restriction, that would enable the United States to limit the numbers of ‘undesirable races’, not just Asians, but also
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⁴ T.R. Bavin, Secretary to Prime Minister Edmund Barton to Prescott Hall, 12 February 1902, Immigration Restriction League papers, Houghton Library, MS Am 2245 (70).
southern and central Europeans. Such a test had already been introduced to restrict voting rights in Mississippi and other southern states, where the tests worked to disenfranchise African-American voters, but Australia was the first country to adopt an education test at the national level as a means to restrict immigration on an (unstated) racial basis.5 Frustrated by the previous veto by President Grover Cleveland of legislation passed by Congress in 1896, members of the IRL were excited by the Australian development that encouraged them to hope for a similar outcome in the US.

This Australian innovation attracted widespread attention in the US and was widely discussed in newspapers and academic essays. It was explained at length by Professor Frank Parsons in an article in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in 1904. There he quoted Australian Attorney General Alfred Deakin, explaining that the legislation was necessary to achieve ‘equal opportunities’ and ‘social justice’ for ‘white men and white women’, in a formulation that drew on an international discourse on Asian labour as ‘underpaid labour’. ‘It means’, said Deakin,

the maintenance of conditions of life fit for white men and white women; it means equal laws and opportunities for all; it means protection against the underpaid labor of other lands; it means social justice so far as we can establish it, including just trading and the payment of fair wages.6

The following years, in 1905, and again in 1906, the American Federation of Labor, whose members also saw Asian labour as a threat to white men’s standard of living, joined the IRL in re-affirming its commitment to the achievement of immigration restriction through an ‘educational test’.7

A few years later, I visited the Schlesinger Library at Radcliffe College, down the road from the Houghton Library, to research the papers of the National American Women’s Suffrage Association. I remember feeling bemused, but also fascinated, when I read of veteran feminist Carrie Chapman Catt’s indignation about the fact, that in extending full political rights to women in 1902, the British colonial ‘dependency’ of Australia had extended furthest

7 Ibid.
the principle of self-government, even though Britain itself had gone to war to defeat the American desire for self-government. Catt located the Australian democratic advance not as an achievement of ‘equal rights’, but as an ‘inconsistency’ in the long history of colonial claims to self-government:

The American people were the first to formulate those fundamental principles of self-government upon which has been based the movement towards universal suffrage during the last century. However, by a curious inconsistency, we must turn for the broadest application of those immortal principles to a dependency of the government which denied by force of arms the truth expressed in the American maxim ‘Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed’. 8

As the United States itself became an imperial power and acquired ‘foreign possessions’, some men in its new territories were also enfranchised, but no women. ‘We demand’, said Catt, ‘that the ballot shall be extended to the women of our foreign possessions on the same terms as to men’. 9

In the Bancroft Library at Berkeley, I again came across American indignation that in its immigration restriction legislation, dating from 1855, the British colony of Victoria seemed to possess a greater degree of sovereignty than did republican Californians, who could not pass their own legislation to restrict immigration, but had to wait on decisions made in Washington. As Adam McKeown has argued in Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders, the control of borders became increasingly central in the 19th century to understandings of national sovereignty. 10

Looking at Australian and American experience comparatively and transnationally, I came to better understand the racial coding of the pride in self-government and the tendency of colonial liberals such as Alfred Deakin and American suffragists such as Carrie Chapman Catt to attribute such importance to being members of ‘self-governing’ communities. ‘We demand’, said Catt, ‘that the women of the United States shall no longer suffer the degradation of being held not so competent to exercise the suffrage as a Filipino, a Hawaiian, or a Port Rican man’. 11 Clearly by the end of the 19th century self-government was con-
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9 Minutes of the Suffrage Convention, ibid., 20.
11 Ibid.
ceptualised as a race-based right.\(^\text{12}\) To be thought less capable than a coloured man or native, less qualified for the work of government, was a peculiar degradation. This was the world historical context in which the Commonwealth of Australia came into being in 1901, when it was moved to define its national identity in explicitly racial terms and to enfranchise white women in 1902.

It was a world in which ‘whiteness’ had suddenly taken on unprecedented significance as W.E.B. Du Bois, historian and activist, writing in New York, saw clearly. In 1900 at the founding meeting of the Pan-African Congress in London, Du Bois had declared memorably that ‘the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line’.\(^\text{13}\) When browsing through original hard copies of the New York weekly journal, the Independent, in the New York Public Library, I came across Du Bois’ little known, but remarkable essay on ‘The Souls of White Folk’, first published in 1910, but not re-printed in a separate collection of his writings until 1920, when it appeared in revised (post-war) form.\(^\text{14}\)

In the essay for the Independent, in 1910 he identified a ‘new religion of whiteness’, that ‘wave upon wave’ was ‘dashing …on the shores of our time’.\(^\text{15}\) His earlier essay ‘The Souls of Black Folk’ was much better known to students of American history and was regularly referenced in US historiography, but it was ‘The Souls of White Folk’ that named ‘whiteness’ as the problem, and identified this new source of pride as the basis of personal and global power, long before the advent of ‘whiteness studies’ in the US in the 1990s declared that ‘whiteness’ was an unmarked category.\(^\text{16}\) That was not the case historically.

Just as exciting as finding Du Bois’ essay that contextualised the White Australia policy was discovering an earlier report in the same paper, presumably read by Du Bois, that described the ecstatic welcome accorded the Great White Fleet of sixteen American battleships, in Sydney and Melbourne, in


\(^{15}\) Ibid., 339.

1908, a report that emphasised the solidarity of white men greeting each other across the Pacific. The response of the Australians’, wrote Sydney-based journalist W.R. Charlton in his article on the welcome to the Great Fleet, would almost suggest a tacit alliance between the Republic and the Commonwealth... Australia is quite certain that the time will come when historians and novelists will invest with the richest romance the year that the United States of North America and the striping Commonwealth joined hands within hearing of the booming rollers of the Pacific.

The alliance thus forged across the Pacific between the Republic and the Commonwealth was based in racial and political affinity: the Americans were ‘kinsmen, blood of our blood, bone of our bone, and one with us in our ideals of the brotherhood of man’. This did not mean disloyalty to Britain, Charlton hastened to assure his readers. Rather, white solidarity across the Pacific was thought to gain new significance in a dramatically changing world that seemed to leading towards a historic struggle between the East and the West.

In 1908 the Independent also carried stories about the rise of China and Japan as countries worthy of respect and admiration: ‘The time for revising our nineteenth century ideas of the East has come’, noted one writer. ‘The real facts are beginning to loom up before us. And new and glad voices are bearing witness to the wonderful moral and spiritual life in the nations of the East’. Only recently the Episcopalian Bishop of Boston had declared that the Chinese, with their ideals of scholarship, peace and righteousness, would surely find their mission in impressing these admirable ideals upon the world. Another commentator suggested, on the other hand, that with the conclusion of a ‘gentleman’s agreement’ between Japan and United States, it was Japan that was now well placed to mediate between East and West. ‘Race questions’ as the editor of the social science section of the paper noted, were becoming more ‘conspicuous’. They would take a central place in the new monthly journal Du Bois helped edit from 1910, Crisis: A Record of the Darker Races: ‘It takes its name from the fact that [we] believe that this is a crit-
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18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., 813-15.
20 Independent, 9 July, 83.
21 Ibid., 253.
22 Ibid., 560.
ical time in the history of the advancement of men’. 23 Every issue featured local and international news reports in a section called ‘Along the colour line’.

In ‘The Souls of White Folk’ Du Bois observed that ‘the world, in a sudden emotional conversion, has discovered that it is white, and by that token, wonderful’. He saw the strident assertion of whiteness as a defensive response to the mobility and mobilizations of colonial and coloured peoples: ‘Do we sense somnolent writhings in back Africa, or angry groans in India, or triumphant “Banzais” in Japan?: “To your tents, O Israel!” these nations are not white’. 24 It was the mobility of Chinese and the military ascendancy of Japan that prompted Australian political leaders to declare White Australia as the nation’s founding doctrine. ‘We have decided’, said first Prime Minister Edmund Barton, ‘to make a legislative declaration of our racial identity’. 25

This was a national statement, but it was at the same time a declaration to the world. What Du Bois’ essay made clear is that the Australian policy was part of a global movement with its dynamics in changing world forces, identified, for example, in 1908, in a perceptive essay by ‘Viator’ in the Fortnightly Review called ‘Asia Contra Mundum’ (Asia against the world’). 26 Adopting the same perspective the first issue of Crisis warned of the ‘great conflict of the future when, as they believe, the white races will fight for their existence against the coloured races coming up out of the East’. 27 White Australia had indeed been justified by political leaders as necessary for national preservation. As Alfred Deakin explained to Parliament in 1901: ‘We here find ourselves touching the profoundest instinct of individual or nation – the instinct of self-preservation – for it is nothing less than the national manhood, the national character and the national future that are at stake’. 28

Research in the New York Public Library and other American archives and libraries was crucial to formulating the transnational argument advanced in Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality. A transnational approach to history offered a methodology...

23 Editorial, Crisis: A Record of the Darker Races 1, no.1 (November 1910).
26 Ibid., 188-9.
27 Crisis: A Record of the Darker Races 1, no. 1 (November 1910).
28 Lake and Reynolds, Drawing the Global Colour Line, 139-40.
and conceptual framework, whose potential Ann Curthoys and I elaborated in the introduction to the collection, Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective based on papers presented at a special symposium in Canberra, in 2004, organised after I had returned from Harvard and Ann from Georgetown University in Washington. Thinking about Australian history overseas had shaped new perspectives on the transnational dimensions of our national past.

**The Minimum Wage as the Answer to Underpaid Labour**

A transnational perspective has also been important to my more recent research on the significance of Victoria’s world historic invention of a legal minimum wage in 1896 and the later definition by H.B. Higgins, who had been a member of the Victorian Legislative Assembly in 1896, of the minimum wage as a living wage based on humanist principles. It was in the United States that commentators – ranging from Professor M.B. Hammond, to editor of Life and Labour, Alice Henry, to Judge Learned Hand – saw the world historic significance of a legal minimum wage defined as a living wage in its decisive break with earlier 19th century labour systems, that relied on slavery, convicts, ‘cooler labour’, indentured and other kinds of ‘underpaid labour’ as Deakin had phrased it. In other words, they pointed to the larger significance of the legal minimum wage defined as a living wage as a key moment in the global history of human rights.

When researching the transnational exchanges that underpinned American Progressivism in the early 20th century and in particular the impact of Australasian innovations in the regulation of hours and wages, I became aware of the key role of H.B. Higgins’ visit to the US, in June 1914, in publicising the significance of Australia’s path-breaking minimum wage and in galvanising local campaigns for an American minimum wage, not achieved until the closing years of the New Deal in 1938.

Higgins had taken a year’s leave from his arduous duties as President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration to travel overseas. His intended destination was the United Kingdom, but he went first to the United States, specifically in response to an invitation from Progressive labour reformer Robert Valentine, who introduced him to key figures involved in civil society organisations and legislative and judicial campaigns for state regulation of minimum wages and maximum hours.29
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In Boston, Washington and New York, Higgins met Justices Louis Brandeis, Felix Frankfurter and Learned Hand, the Progressive manufacturer Stanley King as well as members of the feminist National Consumers’ League, Florence Kelly and Josephine Goldmark, and Irene and John Andrews of the American Association for Labor Legislation. Higgins had already met Professor M.B. Hammond from Ohio State University, when Hammond had himself taken a year’s sabbatical leave in 1911 to visit Australia and New Zealand to investigate their pioneering systems of industrial arbitration and wage fixation.

In resulting articles, Hammond had praised Higgins as a pioneering theorist of social democracy. Importantly, Hammond emphasised the humanist values that underpinned Higgins’ judgments (‘a growing sense of the value of human life’):

He has certainly expressed, at greater length and with greater clearness than has anyone else, the ideals which have animated the Australian people and the Australian lawmakers in placing on the statute books the body of social legislation which has drawn the eyes of all the world to Australasia, and which marks the most notable experiment yet made in social democracy. 30

In the United States, in June 1914, Higgins was sought out for interviews on how the Australian wage fixing systems worked and asked his expert advice. He was also invited to write an article for the Harvard Law Review on the innovative practice of compulsory arbitration, that he called, significantly, ‘A New Province for Law and Order: Industrial Peace through the Minimum Wage and Arbitration’ addressing his American audience’s greater preoccupation with how to achieve a legal minimum wage.

Josephine Goldmark reprinted ‘A New Province for Law and Order’ as booklet no. 14 in the National Consumers’ League Minimum Wage Series. An interview with Higgins by Mary Chamberlain of the American Association for Labor Legislation was published in the New York journal, Survey and in 1915 Florence Kelly published a special edition of Survey called The Case of the Minimum Wage, to which Hammond contributed a long article on ‘The Australian Experience with Wages Boards’ in which he discussed Higgins’ work on the minimum wage and the Arbitration Court. In the same year, Learned Hand reviewed ‘A New Province for Law and Order’ in an article on ‘The Hope of the Minimum Wage’ in the New Republic, in which he discussed Higgins’ contribution to establishing a minimum wage in Australia through

his work on the Arbitration Court. He emphasised the importance of the idea of a living wage for thinking about the meaning of ‘full citizenship’.

One of Higgins’ interlocutors in Boston was Elizabeth Glendower Evans, a member of the National Consumers’ League, friend of Justice Brandeis and proud founding member of the first US Wages Board, established in Massachusetts in 1912. Like most American progressives, Evans was familiar with Australian innovations in establishing a minimum wage, associated wages boards and maximum hours legislation. Speaking to a meeting in Philadelphia, in 1913, Evans told her audience:

In Australia more than fifteen years ago, in an effort to correct this evil [of low wages], wages boards were organized by the State in certain sweated trades. Both employers and employees were represented upon these boards, which were authorized to fix a wage below which is should be illegal to hire labour....The Australian experiment was later adopted in England, and last spring a similar law was enacted in Massachusetts....

Wages boards as a method of fixing a minimum wage are not advocated as a panacea. They will not bring in the kingdom of heaven...But where they have been tried it has been found that they do tend to correct certain flagrant abuses. They tend to bring the standard of the worst employer up to the standard of the best...31

Evans and other members of the National Consumers’ League (NCL) had learnt about this Australian experiment in Geneva at a conference of international consumers’ leagues in Switzerland in 1908.

I learned this in another visit to the New York Public Library, when I was looking for the records of the NCL. There I read a report by Florence Kelley about her conversion to the cause of the minimum wage, when she heard an English delegate speak about ‘minimum wage boards’ as an answer to sweated labour and the ‘human wreckage that that sweated wages cause’. Massachusetts had followed the example of Australia and Britain, which had introduced trade boards in 1910. ‘But why is it’, asked Kelley, ‘that we alone restrict this legislation to women?’32 Why indeed?

31 Philadelphia Enquirer, 1 May 1913.
Victoria had led the way in introducing a legal minimum wage in 1896 that applied to adult men as well as women. Yet the existing historiography on the introduction of the minimum wage and trade boards in Victoria and Britain had emphasised the activities of Anti-Sweating societies aimed at reforming the working conditions of women and children. Why did Victorian legislation insist on a minimum wage for men?

In the New York Public Library, this year, I came across a collection of bound pamphlets called Capital and Labor that encouraged me to locate Victorian developments in a larger frame of reference, in the context of 19th century labour history, immigration history and specifically the history of indentured, ‘cooler’ or ‘underpaid’ labour. In an article on ‘The Campaign Against Sweating’ leading Progressive Walter Lippmann made the case for a minimum wage that was above ‘the slave-owners’ standard’. ‘We are against sweating’, wrote Lippmann, ‘That means we are against cheap labour and for the economy of high wages’.33 For Lippmann, underpaid labour included child labour, ‘cooler labour’ and some immigrant labour, that in the case of New York meant European labour from central, eastern and southern Europe. ‘If the European is compelled to work at not less than an American standard, he will be less useful to the employers of cheap labor, and less effort will be made to bring him over’ wrote Lippmann.34

The connection between labour standards and global migration was also made by other Progressive American writers. Paul U. Kellogg, New York social reformer and Associate Editor of The Survey noted:

Now, in Australia, they have adopted minimum wage legislation. These laws provide that in any depressed trade a board representing the employer, the employee and the public can set a standard of pay below which nobody can be hired. Ideas of freedom of contract, and the effects of interstate competition which might push to the wall any industry or State which tried to raise wage standards by law, have stood in the way of such a plan in the United States.35

But in the United States there was strong resistance, on the part of both capital and organised labour, led by Sam Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, to state intervention that would make a minimum
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34 Ibid.
35 Reprinted in Dallas Morning News, 22 January 1911.
wage compulsory for women, let alone for men. State intervention on behalf of adult male workers would, according to Gompers, emasculate men.\textsuperscript{36} This view was not a view shared by labour and liberal forces in Australia, where ‘State Socialism’ seemed to prevail as regularly reported in United States newspapers. In Australia, as historian, journalist and politician Charles Pearson noted in his magnum opus National Life and Character: A Forecast, ‘state socialism’ succeeded because it was popular: ‘the State builds railways, founds and maintains schools, tries to regulate the wages and hours of labour, protects native industry, settles the population on the land, and is beginning to organise systems of state insurance’.\textsuperscript{37} As Liberal leader, Alfred Deakin had explained state intervention was considered necessary for ‘the maintenance of conditions of life fit for white men and white women; it means equal laws and opportunities for all; it means protection against the underpaid labor of other lands; it means social justice so far as we can establish it’. The basic pre-condition for achieving these goals in the new Commonwealth, according to Deakin and his fellow liberals, was immigration restriction or White Australia. However, in the 1890s, Chinese migrants from earlier decades and their Australian-born families had settled in Melbourne and were clearly there to stay. How to regulate the threat posed by their ‘underpaid labour’ and their propensity to work excessive hours, including through the night and on Sundays?

\textbf{The Globalized Labour Market}

The globalized labour market of the 19th century, referred to by Walter Lippmann in his article advocating a compulsory minimum wage in the United States, and by social reformer, Paul Kellogg, editor of Survey, was the crucible of the introduction of a legislated minimum wage in Victoria. In the encounter of the subjects of the British and Chinese empires in the urban labour market of the Australian colonies in the late 19th century, two systems of political economy confronted each other.

In 1907, the Commissioner sent by the British government to investigate wages boards in Australasia in 1907, Ernest Aves, said he was doubtful

\textsuperscript{36} Alice Kessler Harris, \textit{In Pursuit of Equity Women, Men and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20th Century America} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 66-74.

if they were applicable in the very different conditions of industrial Britain. ‘Australia’, Aves wrote in his Report, was located in a different world:

though far from Europe is comparatively near to India, China, Java and Japan, and in this lies another fact greatly affecting the outlook – political, economic and social. Within some three to five thousand miles of its small British population there dwell some 750 millions of the human race, spread over an area hardly greater than its own. ³⁸

Australians intended to adhere to ‘the principle of the legal minimum wage’, he explained, because the ‘standard of the race is felt to be at stake’. It was a perceptive remark, but little noticed by historians who have focussed on anti-sweating agitation aimed at reforming the labour conditions of women and children.

But Australians lived in a different world. ‘It was by no means extraordinary or extravagant for us in this colony’, H.B. Higgins, Member for Geelong, explained to the Victorian Parliament in 1895, ‘to pass exceptional legislation for the protection of our workmen’. Higgins was one of the coalition of labour and liberal forces who, in a radical amendment to the original Bill, extended the principle of the minimum wage to adult men. ‘Our people were European in origins’, he explained

and we did not want to have our workers degraded to the position of the people who lived in China. In China the people worked more hours and got less pay than the people here, and it was our policy to try to raise the standard of living and not to lower it.³⁹

The idea of the standard of living came to define the new civilization being built in the Australasian colonies.⁴⁰ Higgins extended the concept of the standard of living with his path-breaking definition of the minimum wage as a living wage, calculated on the basis of evidence to meet the capacious needs of workers living as ‘human beings’ in the ‘civilized community’ of the new Commonwealth of Australia.

In the United States, Alice Henry, transnational activist and Aus-

³⁹ H.B. Higgins, Legislative Assembly, 12 November 1895, VPD, 3129.
lian-American labour reformer, editor of the journal of National Women’s Trade Union League, Life and Labor, caught the significance, excitement and ambition of the new concept of a living wage when she wrote in 1913 in the middle of the US debate, that some people’s idea of a minimum wage was ‘based upon the slave-owner’s idea, enough to keep the worker alive and fit for work’. But it meant so much more than this, she insisted. It meant ‘Food, wholesome and appetising, clothes comfortable and graceful, and education broad and adequate, not forgetting the primal need for recreation’. Indeed, the idea of a living wage was revolutionary:

It means more than humanity has ever asked for before. It is a noble, a dignified demand, something at least worthy of humanity. For it means more than life, it means the right at last for all to be human...  

This Australian invention can only be explained in the context of the dynamics of the global labour market as it exploded in the 19th century, and in the Victorian case, in the urban encounters between the subjects of the British and Chinese empires in the workforce in Melbourne. To fully understand the larger historical context of this distinctive Australian development, researchers need to go beyond Australia, and a great place to begin their research is in the serenity of the New York Public Library. Then, after pouring over old books and journals, they might take a well-earned break in the leafy shade of verdant Bryant Park.