‘Mr Wakefield’s Speaking Trumpets’

Abolishing Slavery and Colonising Systematically

Professor Jane Lydon

Wesfarmers Chair of Australian History (M204), The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia.

Jane.lydon@uwa.edu.au

Words: 13,265

‘Mr Wakefield’s Speaking Trumpets’

Abolishing Slavery and Colonising Systematically

Abstract

This essay examines the significance of Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s theory of ‘systematic colonisation’ within the transition from slavery to settler colonisation to reveal the sequential relationship of these two imperial systems. In the context of industrialisation and social unrest, the anti-slavery movement performed an important purpose for Britain’s ruling classes by simultaneously accruing moral authority and sanctioning oppressive new forms of disciplined labour, including the treatment of convicts as slaves. During the ‘ameliorative’ 1820s phase of the anti-slavery movement, experimental colonial schemes combined both abolitionist principles and pro-slavery interests, particularly visible in the form of arguments against free labour and the advocacy of racial, as well as class, labour hierarchies. Wakefield’s theory embodied principles of labour discipline drawn from the plantation, offering a solution to the looming problem of abolition. These principles were invoked in debating the emancipation bill introduced in May 1833, as all sides agreed on the need for freed slaves to work for wages; they were subsequently applied in the Caribbean *after* emancipation by planters attempting to maintain productivity during and beyond the apprenticeship period. After 1833, the abolitionists’ zeal could be turned to other causes, and reformers seeking to end transportation and develop the settler colonies deployed an entwined discourse of anti-slavery and systematic colonisation.

Keywords: slavery; anti-slavery; Australia; Caribbean; E. G. Wakefield; systematic colonisation; colonial reformers; transportation; settler colonisation; labour

‘Mr Wakefield’s Speaking Trumpets’. Abolishing Slavery and Colonizing Systematically

In August 1833 British Parliament abolished slavery in the British Caribbean, Mauritius and the Cape when it passed the ‘Act for the abolition of slavery throughout the British Colonies, for promoting the industry of manumitted slaves, and for compensating the persons hitherto entitled to the services of such slaves.’ [1] The celebration of abolition has obscured many legacies of slavery, including its relationship to the new settler colonies of Australasia. As Catherine Hall has argued, there are important links between the histories of Caribbean slavery and those of the colonies of Australia, Canada and South Africa.[2] Rather than seeing abolition as an historical rupture, it is important to recognise the substantial continuities between slavery, apprenticeship, and the post-emancipation period. In this essay I explore links between the end of Caribbean slavery and the dramatic expansion of the new Anglophone settler colonies sometimes termed the ‘Settler Revolution’, which from 1815 propelled white English-speaking emigrants around the globe.[3] Bringing the histories of British anti-slavery and Australian colonisation together changes our view of both. By expanding our analysis of the anti-slavery campaign to include the concurrent and entwined process of establishing the new settler colonies, it is evident that they worked in tandem to stabilise the domestic social order, and underwrite the conquest and administration of a growing empire.

The campaign to end slavery intersected in many ways with Britain’s colonisation of Australia, initially focused on the transportation of convicts, but from the 1820s becoming a destination for investment and imperial growth. As a source of political legitimacy the

abolitionist campaign helped define specific forms of freedom for diverse imperial subjects in counterpoint to African slavery, sanctioning new forms of disciplined labour and justifying invasion and subjugation. In particular, as I show here, key concerns were shared by abolition discourse and the theory known as 'systematic colonisation', between the late 1820s and the post-emancipation period of the 1830s-1840s. As one system was dismantled and the other began, the plantation offered a key precedent for experiments in labour discipline, while abolition shaped new forms of 'free labour'. Historians of imperial 'humanitarianism' have recently traced a genealogy from slavery reform to subsequent schemes for the protection of Indigenous peoples and non-white labour.[4] However, the links between emancipation schemes and the systematic colonisers, with their common concern to maintain a disciplined and subordinate labour supply have not been closely explored.[5]

In this essay I first examine the ameliorative phase of the elite anti-slavery movement during the decade leading up to abolition, when officials worked to 'reform' the Caribbean system of slavery. Experiments in settler colonialism expressed both abolitionist principles and pro-slavery interests, particularly visible in the form of arguments against free labour and the advocacy of racial, as well as class, labour hierarchies. I then consider how early proponents of settler colonialism such as Edward Gibbon Wakefield offered proposals for creating a disciplined colonial labour force which betray ambivalence about the superiority of free labour over slavery. At a time when social unrest threatened the stability of the British social order, abolition formed part of a suite of reforms intended to maintain elite authority. Alongside the anti-slavery movement, mechanism of tightening discipline were applied to the working classes, and specifically convicts transported to the colonies, serving as a means to quell dissent and maintain the social order. I examine how Wakefield's prescriptions for a disciplined colonial workforce became important to the debates surrounding the momentous

1833 Abolition act, and were applied in the Caribbean after emancipation, as planters struggled to maintain their labour force.

After 1833, the abolitionists' reformist zeal could be turned to other causes, and the moral capital and tactics of the anti-slavery cause became powerful tools for those seeking to end transportation, and develop the settler colonies. I review the entwined critiques of transportation, framed in anti-slavery terms, and the inviting new discourses of penal reform and systematic colonisation. I argue that by recovering this shared imperial commitment to Wakefieldian principles of colonisation, we may understand the structural relationship between the demise of Caribbean slavery and the emergence of the 'settler revolution', and specifically, how new forms of labour required by global industrial capitalism grew from, and in contradistinction to the enslaved labour force of the British sugar colonies.

Anti-slavery, amelioration and industrial capitalism during the 1820s

The 1820s constituted a key decade in the British anti-slavery movement, characterised by a 'gradualist' parliamentary response to abolition, as advocates on both sides of the debate agreed that slaves needed to be 'civilised' and Christianised, before they were fully emancipated. In January 1823 the anti-slavery movement was revitalised, as a widespread popular movement emerged, fuelled especially by women's campaigns as well as by the active resistance of enslaved peoples themselves.[6] In May, Foreign Secretary and Tory leader in the House of Commons, George Canning, introduced a series of resolutions calling for the 'amelioration' of the condition of the slave population, and a policy of slavery reform was subsequently pursued by the Colonial Office.[7] The 1820s was a decade of great economic hardship and political uncertainty in Britain, as the nation grappled with problems of slave emancipation, domestic poverty and unemployment, Catholic rights, and reform of the House

of Commons. A rise in crime and unrest among Britain's working-classes led to a sharp escalation in the numbers of transported convicts, and their treatment became increasingly harsh. Popular agitation and radicalism targeted the corrupt and exclusive political system, represented between 1812 and 1827 by Lord Liverpool's Tory government.[8] This period saw the adoption of the precepts of free-market capitalism, emphasising the distinction between slave and 'free' labour, yet overlooking the harsh conditions under which labourers lived and worked in Britain.

An influential interpretation of the anti-slavery movement has demonstrated its important domestic purpose for Britain's ruling classes in maintaining their religious and hereditary privilege. Since Eric Williams' landmark 1947 *Capitalism and Slavery* argued on economic grounds that slavery was key to generating the Industrial Revolution, more recent economic analyses have broadened their scope to consider the role of foreign trade in England's industrialisation and its development in the context of global economic systems. Historians continue to argue over the relative significance of factors such as external trade, the diffusion of new technology, and the interaction of domestic and external forces in stimulating growth and change, but emphasise the significance of slave wealth in stimulating new institutions and industries.[9] In a similar way, the political dynamics of this period exemplify David Brion Davis's argument that Britain's conversion to anti-slavery ideology was related to the Industrial Revolution's need to legitimise wage labour, and the bitter struggle over domestic reform. Davis traced the contradiction between elite parliamentarians' concern for Caribbean slaves, and their oppressive maintenance of the domestic British social order, arguing that anti-slavery arguments defined slavery as a 'unique moral aberration' that sanctioned the prevailing social and economic order, helping to 'reshape attitudes toward work, liberty, exploitation, and proper discipline'. Ultimately, '[i]f British abolitionists could

express horror over the iron chains of the slave trade, their acts of selectivity and definition helped to strengthen the invisible chains being forged at home'.[10] Davis's analysis focused on Britain and the Caribbean, arguing that '[b]ecause the slave system was both distinctive and remote, it could become a subject for experimental fantasies that assimilated traditional values to new economic needs'.[11] If we expand Davis's frame of analysis to consider global processes of emigration and settler colonialism, it is clear that 'experimental fantasies' could equally be realised in the new settler colonies. Further, the anti-slavery movement was also centrally about the struggle for control between metropolis and colony.[12] The first decades of the nineteenth century constituted an era of imperial juridical and legal reordering, and the anti-slavery movement both drew from, and facilitated, this process. Lisa Ford emphasises the important role played by abolitionist advocates in refining legal technologies of metropolitan authority not only in the service of abolition, emancipation, and amelioration; but also of colonial penal reform, Aboriginal protection, and the imperial legal order.[13]

Contemporary critics also pointed out how the campaign against Caribbean slavery worked to divert attention and sympathy from domestic class struggle, as Wilberforce, James Stephen and their evangelical circle (the 'saints'), made a sharp distinction between the evils of the world of colonial slavery and domestic inequality. From the earliest years of the anti-slavery movement radicals and the pro-slavery lobby had claimed that slaves were better treated than English industrial workers, but these arguments took on particular power during these years.[14] A key element of this dynamic was the contrast drawn by abolitionists between the potential redemption of slaves and the moral degradation of convicts, long a feature of domestic reform.[15]

Labour discipline in the Caribbean and the new Settler Colonies

After 1823 slavery amelioration policy was implemented by the Colonial Office, alongside diverse policies for British territories around the globe.[16] Robert Wilmot Horton, parliamentary Under-Secretary for war and the colonies between 1821 and 1827 oversaw a range of debates and proposals regarding the linked challenges of compelling tropical labour and compensating slave-owners in the West Indies, as well as devising emigration schemes to address the problem of over-population and growing unemployment at home. [17] Interest both in disposal of Britain's excess population and capitalist investment prompted numerous schemes for colonisation over these years – and starkly posed the question of colonial labour. Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* had first popularised the notion of free labour, and the view that there were two methods of motivating the worker, summarised as 'wages or the whip'. Anti-slavery campaigners argued for the relationship between 'free labour, higher productivity and colonial prosperity'; they argued that free labour would expand markets by allowing the worker to become a consumer – while wage labour would motivate productivity.[18] However, many questioned Smith's axiom, contesting its practical implications and proposing a range of intermediate positions between slavery and freedom.

In New South Wales, transportation had long served the purpose of quelling dissent, and in the tumultuous period between 1815 and 1821 the population of New South Wales more than doubled, from around 13,000 to nearly 30,000.[19] In September 1818 Liverpool's ministry appointed John Bigge, recently returned from four years as Chief Justice of Trinidad, to enhance the function of the settlements in New Holland primarily as 'a receptacle for offenders'.[20] In Trinidad Bigge had overseen an ameliorative program of categorisation, apprenticeship, and only gradual emancipation of the enslaved; in New South Wales, his attention was turned to the governance of white workers, and he applied several elements of the reforming Caribbean slave system to the Australian colonies.[21] The

increasingly harsh treatment of convicts was frequently likened to Caribbean slavery, as the Tory government sought to enhance the system's terror. Broadly, as Hamish Maxwell-Stewart notes, a key impact of Bigge's report was to prevent the 'convict's route to independence', as emancipists (pardoned convicts) were forced to become wage-earners and a disciplined labour force.[22]

Seeing the potential for investment, a range of proposals were advanced to establish new settler colonies, and investment schemes implemented, such as the Australian Agricultural Company formed in 1824, by a group of prominent and wealthy share-holders - including many anti-slavery leaders such as Wilberforce, William Smith, and Stephen Lushington. [23] These schemes owed much to the plantation, structured by principles of discipline and surveillance, and incorporating racially segregated and classed work-forces. The proposal developed under Colonial Office oversight in August 1828 for a settlement on the west coast of 'New Holland', for example, established Swan River as the first British colony founded exclusively for private settlement based upon a land-grant system, sponsored by private investors, colonists, and syndicates, but under government control.[24] Such schemes envisaged the colonial reproduction of the British social order based on land grants for the wealthy, with labour to be supplied by the white working class.

Systematic colonisation

In 1828 the problem of colonisation was taken up by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, while imprisoned in Newgate gaol. Wakefield's anonymous *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia* was first printed in June 1829 and then reprinted in December as an appendix to *A Letter from Sydney, the Principal Town of Australasia*.[25] From the start, Wakefield's thinking engaged closely with contemporary debates regarding slavery, colonisation, and

their shared reliance upon cheap and disciplined labour. Wakefield's debt to slavery emerges from his direct disagreement with Smith's principal arguments concerning both colonisation and free labour; his extensive use of historical and contemporary examples of slave colonies to demonstrate the necessity of forced labour for colonial success; his explicit translation of slavery's key principles into colonial terms; his justification of the institution on not only economic but also moral grounds; and his proposal for and implementation of colonial racialised labour hierarchies that mimicked the Caribbean plantation regime. In each of his four foundational texts published between mid-1829 and 1833, Wakefield's narrative logic is the same, moving from slavery exemplars of his principles of dear land and cheap, 'concentrated' labour, to his scheme for reproducing this relationship in the colonies. Systematic colonisation is a solution to the problem of abolition.[26]

In *Sketch,* Wakefield attacked Adam Smith's argument that colonies thrive where they take possession of vacant or thinly populated land, pointing out that Smith had overlooked the role of slave labour in making his calculations.[27] *Sketch* presented the key elements of his scheme, which essentially aimed to restrict land-ownership to the wealthy, and to force the poor to labour for them. His object lesson was provided by the tobacco-growers of Virginia and Maryland, where slave labour provided the settler with wealth, the means for civic engagement, public eminence and 'if his abilities are great, universal fame'.[28] Recreating these conditions in the Australian settlements, he predicted, would make labour cheap and docile. The challenge was to 'devise any means by which to establish, in a new country, such a proportion between people and land as would render labour plentiful, and not extravagantly dear'.[29] His solution was to restrict access to land, by selling it what he termed the 'sufficient price', so that labourers would be prevented from becoming landowners too soon and would instead be forced to work for cheap wages.[30] Wakefield's key innovation –

directly refuting Smith's famous argument for free labour – was his system for 'concentrating' (or 'combining') labour.[31] From the start, Wakefield's vision of 'concentrated' labour was modelled upon the plantation, responding to the need to replace what was becoming an unacceptable institution, with a form of labour that would nonetheless retain slavery's 'efficient' discipline.

Several contemporary opponents pointed out Wakefield's debt to slavery – for example when the *Westminster Review* denounced Wakefield's reproduction of the 'slave colonies'; nor were his views unusual during these years.[32] Indeed, Seymour Drescher argues that the 'silence' or doubts of political economists such as Thomas Malthus and Wakefield regarding free labour indicates the fragile basis of economic arguments for emancipation at this time. The May 1833 Slave Emancipation Bill was a 'mighty experiment', or the validation of an untested hypothesis, and Drescher concluded that 'science' was suborned to humanitarian sentiment in choosing a humanitarian future over a certainly prosperous one.[33] More recently, Anita Rupprecht has expanded Drescher's framework to explore a range of intermediate positions between 'wages and the whip'; Rupprecht argues that in the messy process of emancipation many abolitionists aimed to retain the plantation complex under a 'reformed' labour regime that blurred the boundary between slavery and freedom.[34] This variability reminds us that imperial labour forms, including enslavement and apprenticeship, are best conceptualised within a global continuum of human exploitation.[35] It points toward the way that slavery constituted the antimony of freedom in defining new forms of labour.

The British context for abolition in 1833

The Anti-Slavery Society was re-founded in May 1830, and a rise of abolitionist activity was linked to the deepening crisis of the Tory regime – termed 'Old Corruption' by its critics.

Abolition served an important purpose for the reformers, in uniting diverse interests, and giving them a sense of transcendent moral purpose without the threat of revolution that shadowed domestic reform.[36] From its inception the anti-slavery movement had accrued moral capital for its adherents, defining opposition to slavery as proof of collective virtue.[37] At a time when many feared revolution, anti-slavery permitted the British government to maximise its legitimacy and popular support. Against a background of great social turmoil, what Linda Colley terms the three great campaigns of this era – Catholic emancipation, political reform, and anti-slavery – operated in tandem to provide proof of 'the superior quality of British freedom'.[38]

Under Charles Grey, the second Earl Grey, a new ministry initiated a decade of reform, starting with the repeal of the Test Act, and enactment of the Catholic Relief Act 1829, which removed the most significant restrictions on Roman Catholics. [39] A key element of the 'Whig Revival' was its broadening of the political nation beyond metropolitan elites, [40] Public unrest had shifted decisively toward reform over the late 1820s, and built up especially strong pressure during 1829 and 1830. Agrarian changes such as enclosure transformed the rural poor into a landless proletarian relying on wage labour or the poor law.[41] Their desperate situation was exacerbated by the economic conditions of 1828-1830, which increased rural unemployment, so that enormous demonstrations in London and Birmingham greeted Grey when he came into office. Between 1830-32 the rural poor across southern and eastern England revolted, signing their petitions and threats as 'Captain Swing', as they burned down ricks and barns, broke threshing machines, and demanded higher wages. [42] The Swing movement was effective in precipitating the ascension of the Whig government, and posing political reform as a conservative solution to social change. The patrician Grey and his ministry were forced to make concessions to preserve the government.[43] From early 1831 to

the ‘Days of May’ in 1832, pressure from the working-class radical movement drove the Reform Bill crises, as successive bills were rejected by the House of Lords - a time, suggested E.P. Thompson, in which revolution was very possible. The great challenge was to preserve established government structures yet also reform parliamentary representation and its oppressive control by the oligarchy of powerful families.[44]

Antagonism sharpened between radicals and the aristocratic Whig abolitionists, whose government treated working-class unrest as harshly as had Liverpool’s. The Swing disturbances were followed by massive retribution in the form of hangings, imprisonment and transportation. During the 1830s radicals such William Cobbett and Bronterre O’Brien explicitly argued for the greater claims of the British working-classes over distant slaves, and led the attack on the anti-slavery campaign.[45] Such contrasts constituted a key tactic of the radical critique of the anti-slavery movement, popularising the view that it competed with the fight against domestic repression. It is true that some prominent radicals supported both causes, such as Joseph Sturge, who defended the rights of both emancipated slaves and British labourers, and the West Indian-born ‘ultra’-radicals Robert Wedderburn and William Cuffay.[46] However, broad antagonism between anti-slavery and radicalism only gradually dissipated after abolition was achieved, and especially after 1840.

Transportation to the colonies was a corollary of the fundamental tension between the claims of slaves and the poor, reinforcing official authority by supposedly deterring crime, and removing dissidents. Defenders of transportation emphasised the ways in which convicts *were* like slaves in order to demonstrate the regime’s effectiveness, and counter arguments that conditions in Australia were more benign than those experienced by the poor of Britain and Ireland. Lieutenant-Governor George Arthur, for example, greeted new convicts arriving

in Van Diemen's Land in 1832, reported British Quaker James Backhouse, and 'alluded to the degraded state into which they had brought themselves by their crimes; this he justly compared to a state of slavery'.[47]

The Slavery Abolition Act 1833

Theories of labour discipline were central within both 'reforming' slavery and new colonial labour regimes. Their interrelationship emerged clearly within the momentous parliamentary debate regarding the proposed emancipation bill, introduced in May 1833. Debate was now focused on *how* to abolish slavery, and an apprenticeship program was proposed that was intended to replace slave labour with wage labour. Both abolitionists and slave-owners agreed on the need for freed slaves to work for wages – not just to ensure continuing productivity, but as a means of becoming civilised. Abolitionists such as Buxton and Henry Whiteley sought to develop new institutions and sanctions focused on work discipline that would apply equally to British factory, Caribbean plantation and the new settler colonies. In giving evidence to the 1832 House of Lords committee Buxton had asserted that 'it may be extremely necessary for the state to introduce laws for protecting persons from living in idleness to the detriment of the state', and he went on to insist that all freed slaves should be required to enter an estate labour contract; occupation of subsistence gardens would be provisional upon working on the estate. He compared this regime of discipline with that of the workers in his own brewery, exemplifying the parallels between elite abolitionists' responses to slavery and to domestic labour – as noted above, such as the tightening provisions for poor relief enacted the same year that slaves became apprentices. [48] Even the Colonial Office's James Stephen, author of the 1833 Act, advocated 'the dread of starving' as a replacement for 'the dread of being flogged'.[49] As David Eltis suggests, where the hard-working British worker was considered better off than the slave if only because he answered

only to God and himself, the logical corollary was that if the slave was to become free he must work as hard as an Englishman. [50] Grounded in a bourgeois and newly-industrialising world view, abolitionist thought was congruent with the developing coercive policies that supported wage labour. [51]

In debates about the emancipation bill of May 1833, the principles of Wakefield's theory of systematic colonisation were an important touchstone. His schemes provided an answer to the abolition of both slavery and transportation by offering to resolve social disorder and provide considerable economic benefits via imperial expansion into 'undeveloped' land, the employment of surplus population, and development of a market for surplus capital. Combining land commoditisation with the appropriation of labour, Wakefield extrapolated his argument that slavery formed the basis for colonial prosperity, to conclude that systematic colonisation was the only practical means of *abolishing* slavery. The interrelationship of debates about slavery, transportation and settler colonisation conducted by a younger generation of abolitionists and Colonial Reformers maps the transition from slavery, and its corollary, transportation, to a new model of settler colonisation and coercive waged labour.

Wakefield's ideas circulated at a time that a growing number of young radicals were becoming concerned with the new anglophone settler colonies – this group came to be called the Colonial Reformers, and during the 1830s and 1840s comprised a major element of parliamentary Radicalism. In 1830, the National Colonisation Society was formed in London around Wakefield's theory, comprising Robert Gouger, Charles Buller, John Stuart Mill, Robert Rintoul, William Hutt, Colonel Torrens and Charles Tennant. It broke up the same year, but Wakefield's influence continued to grow. One important figure who promoted the

ideas of the Colonial Reformers at this time was Henry George Grey, Viscount Howick from 1807-1845. When the Whigs came to power in 1830, his father, the second Earl Grey, became Prime Minister, and Howick was made Under-secretary of State for War and the Colonies. In this role he became deeply concerned with colonial matters, and at first shared some of Wakefield's views, overseeing the Ripon land regulations of 1831, which brought an end to free grants in the colonies and provided for sales by auction at a minimum price of 5s. an acre.[52] Like many of his Radical colleagues, he was a strong supporter of the anti-slavery movement; as an immediatist, he resigned in 1834 when an apprenticeship period was attached to emancipation. Grey's West India policy centred on the principle that 'the welfare of all classes of the inhabitants of these Colonies depend upon their being enabled to continue to advantage the cultivation of sugar.'[53] Shortly before the abolition bill was proposed, and in echo of Wakefield, Howick had suggested in a memo of December 1832 that

> The great problem to be solved in drawing up any plan for the emancipation of the slaves in our colonies, is to devise some mode of inducing them when relieved from the fear of the driver and his whip, to undergo the regular and continuous labour which is indispensable in carrying on the production of sugar.

Howick pointed to the examples of the western states of America, Canada, the Cape of Good Hope, and the Australian colonies to argue that if land was too easily secured, it 'effectually prevents the prosecution by voluntary labour of any enterprise requiring the cooperation of many hands'. It was therefore impossible that slaves would 'be induced even by high wages to continue to submit to a drudgery which they detest', if they could obtain land sufficient for subsistence. He concluded that 'it would be greatly for the real happiness of the Negroes themselves, if the facility of acquiring land could be so far restrained as to prevent them, on the abolition of slavery, from abandoning their habits of regular industry', and so proposed a

‘considerable tax upon land’ as the mechanism that would enable the planter to continue his business after emancipation.[54] By raising the price of land high enough to prevent freed slaves from buying their own small plots on which to support themselves, the class and labour structure of slavery would be maintained.

In debating the abolition bill in May 1833 Howick and others applied Wakefieldian principles in arguing for immediate emancipation, and against apprenticeship, which was seen as analogous to indenture. Surely thinking of Swan River, and in echo of Wakefield’s attacks, he referred to the Australian colonies as an object lesson, where ‘the high price of labour’ tempted indentured labourers from their master, ‘since the threat of dismissal was no threat to them, but on the contrary to be released from their bargain was a direct advantage’. For Howick, the superiority of free labour was an article of faith, and he hoped that freed slaves would realise that it would be better for them to labour, ‘than to indulge in their natural inclination for repose’.[55]

Among those arguing against immediate abolition were Robert Peel and economist Colonel Robert Torrens, who saw apprenticeship as a means of ensuring the maintenance of the planters’ labour supply, and supposedly teaching the slaves how to be free. Peel and Torrens argued for the gradualist position, in part on the basis that the soil in parts of the West Indies was too rich to make slaves work if freed.[56] Torrens had long supported emigration as a solution to redundant population, joining Wakefield as a member of the new Colonisation Society in 1830, and helping found the South Australian Land Company in 1831.[57] In the closing days of debate, Torrens drew upon colonial experience and Wakefieldian rhetoric to oppose immediate emancipation, arguing that

> a sufficient supply of labour could not be obtained for hire; and that the independent cultivation of land, which could be procured for little or nothing, was preferred to working for wages. Upon what principle, and for what motive, then, could it be supposed, that emancipated slaves in Jamaica, Trinidad, Berbice, and Demerara, would work for wages? When we knew from ample experience that, under similar circumstances, a civilised and Christian people fall back to the semi-barbarism of squatters and woodsmen, was it rational to suppose that the negro would advance to civilization?

Instead, 'a sufficient period of probation should precede complete freedom from the master's control.'[58] Many agreed, ensuring that a six-year 'apprenticeship' following abolition became part of the new act. The applicability of Wakefield's scheme for systematic colonisation to apprenticeship reveals their shared underlying rationale – and the origins in slavery of Wakefield's notion of 'concentration' and the reliance of British imperialism upon forming 'civilised and Christian communities' built on disciplined labour.

Wakefield in the Caribbean after 1833

Wakefield's key principles for systematic colonisation were subsequently applied to Caribbean colonies *after* emancipation by West Indies planters and the Colonial Office and responding to the impact of emancipation after 1833, attempting to ensure productivity during and beyond the end of the apprenticeship period on 1 August 1838. All sides of the debate about abolition were invested in preserving racial and economic hierarchies within the plantation system, and believed that apprentices needed to be taught how to become free.[59] Drummond Professor of Political Economy at Oxford University, Herman Merivale, emphasised the relevance of Wakefield's theory not to Australian colonies but also to the West Indies, and expressed the common view that '[t]he great danger of emancipation... has

been lest the half-civilised freedman should sink into the indolence and apathy so natural to their climate and condition; content themselves with an easily acquired subsistence, and relapse by degrees into the savage state.' He warned of the way that 'steady systematic labour fell into decay' in the free black state of Haiti - the 'only country where chairs are placed for the sentinel on duty'- and linking race to climate, he ruled out white labourers for tropical conditions.[60]

As the planters had feared, first women, then, by the mid-1840s, many male workers, left the plantations, and as output declined in British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica, the overall British West Indies sugar output nearly halved from 1834 to 1844.[61] In response, planters developed a range of legislative schemes and legal policies intended as instruments of control: these addressed master and servant relationships, combinations among labourers, ejection from provision grounds, trespassing, vagrancy, policing, immigration, land sales and taxation of food. The humanitarian Colonial Office, and especially James Stephen, permanent Under Secretary, attempted to restrain the planters - initially even promoting gentler labour laws in the sugar islands than those in force in Britain, but were quickly forced to retreat from this position.[62]

While it is of course difficult to summarise diverse British Caribbean contexts, a few examples point toward the application of Wakefieldian principles to 'new' colonies such as Trinidad and British Guiana by those seeking to ensure the supply of a disciplined agricultural labour force.[63] On Trinidad, for example, where in 1834 a vast amount of land remained uncultivated, Wakefield's theories were applied in seeking to keep workers on the plantations, and prevent them from becoming small subsistence farmers. Prosperous Trinidad planter William Burnley wrote to the Colonial Secretary in January 1834 asking for

regulations to prevent ‘the dispersion of the labouring classes over the ungranted lands of the colony’, and that land would not be sold except ‘under such regulations of price and quantity as the now generally understood principles of colonisation recognise as necessary to ensure concentration of cultivation, profitable employment of capital, and the civilization of the labouring classes’.[64] Burnley gave evidence to the 1836 Select Committee inquiring into the disposal of land in British colonies, and emigration and settlement of those lands, alongside the star witness, Wakefield. He urged the adoption of systematic colonisation, in the form of a high land price and large minimum acreage, because unless the availability of Trinidad’s fertile land was restricted, freed blacks would not work, aspiring only to build ‘a small garden, and a small and miserable house’. This would not produce a surplus and a lowered state of civilisation amongst the black population, making the colony a burden to Britain. Burnley envisaged a Wakefieldian regime comprising negro labourers and white capitalists that would maintain racial hierarchies. He proposed to introduce the other element of Wakefield’s scheme - subsidised immigration, sourcing workers of African blood from the Azores, Canaries and Cape Verde, and best of all, free blacks from the United States then being sent to Liberia. He suggested that they would consider Trinidad ‘a sure asylum where free negro labourers could be comfortably located, and furnished with profitable employment’ and that many would therefore wish to emigrate.[65]

In January 1836, Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Glenelg (Charles Grant) sent a circular dispatch to the West Indies colonial governors, ordering them to ‘fix such a price upon all crown lands as may place them out of the reach of persons without capital’, advising that,

> The minimum price of land, therefore, should be high enough to leave a considerable portion of the population unable to buy it until they have saved some capital out of the

> wages of their industry; and at the same time low enough to encourage such savings by making the possession of land a reasonable object of ambition to all.[66]

Gradually, however, it became accepted that these principles were unsuitable for the Caribbean colonies.

Wakefield's powerful and vocal supporters succeeded in making systematic colonisation central to subsequent colonial policy and practice– for example in founding the colony of South Australia.[67] However, the radical independence sought by Wakefieldians between 1831-33 incurred official disapproval at a time when central control was a colonial priority. [68] Concern for Indigenous rights was to constitute a source of continuing antagonism between the Wakefieldians and the Colonial Office throughout the 1840s. In late 1833 the South Australian Association was formed, proposing a crown colony, and the South Australian Act was passed in 1834.[69] Again, Torrens was prominent, being appointed chairman of the colonisation commission to manage land sales and emigration in May 1835.[70] The timing of the establishment of this colony links it closely to abolition and its compensation provisions, offering an economic alternative to slave wealth. Alan Lester and Nikita Vanderbyl have demonstrated some of the ways that the compensation money which started to flow to slave owners and their agents in 1834 was transferred to this new field of investment. London-based merchant and banker, George Fife Angas, for example, played an important role in providing capital required to colonise South Australia, derived from compensation for his slave-interests in Honduras.[71]

The abolition of transportation

After 1833, the abolitionists' reformist zeal could be turned to other causes, and the moral capital and tactics of the anti-slavery cause became powerful tools for reformers seeking to end transportation, protect and discipline Indigenous peoples, and develop the settler colonies. The interrelationship of these debates, conducted by a younger generation of abolitionists and Colonial Reformers, maps the transition from slavery, and its corollary, transportation, to a new model of settler colonisation and disciplined waged labour. After 1833, slavery was proscribed by British law and social consensus; abolition had re-affirmed Britain's commitment to liberty, re-defined freedom, and become an 'emblem of national virtue'.[72] Opposing convict abjection, influential voices for penal reform combined anti-slavery arguments with direct advocacy for Wakefield's schemes. One influential voice for penal reform was the Archbishop of Dublin, Richard Whately, who questioned whether religion could be used to reform convicts under the existing system. In 1834 Whately published his substantial *Remarks on Transportation*, which argued that the system had corrupted both the convict and his master in the same manner as slavery, and appended the South Australian Association's prospectus - the first Wakefieldian free labour scheme. He quoted Wakefield, who had used his three-year term in Newgate for abduction as a kind of ethnographic fieldwork, contrasting the 'thoughtful, anxious, and sad' demeanour of most prisoners with those sentenced to transportation, who were 'more careless, gay, and noisy, than all the rest' to argue that transportation was no longer a deterrent to crime.[73] Coupling his critique with Wakefield's proposal, Whately expressed the entwined discourses of penal reform and systematic colonisation, and their shared central emphasis on the creation of a disciplinary labour regime.

Another landmark in the critique of transportation was the inquiry led by young baronet and MP William Molesworth between 1837-1838.[74] Molesworth was among

Wakefield's most loyal supporters, highly networked into Colonial Reformer and 'philosophical radical' movements, the latter inspired by James Mill and Bentham's utilitarian philosophy, and in turn connected to a larger number concerned with colonial reform. One of their opponents referred to Molesworth as 'one of Mr. Wakefield's speaking-trumpets', and the inquiry indeed amplified and furthered Wakefield's schemes, providing an important plank in the transition from slavery to settler colonialism.[75] Molesworth's investigation has long been recognised, by contemporaries as well as historians, as heavily stage-managed: its committee included known antagonists to assignment and transportation, and the inquiry produced a sensationalised picture of transportation as a slave system, defined by private assignment, physical abjection and torture, and sexual deviance.[76] Both phases of the anti-transportation movement – the 1830s campaign and the larger movement against convictism that began in the 1840s – drew upon the power of anti-slavery discourse and the themes embodied by the Molesworth inquiry. What is less often considered is that the inquiry also constituted a forum for Wakefield's theories, and its recommendations explicitly promoted his proposal for systematic colonisation. Wakefield was an important intellectual influence upon Molesworth, introducing him to the connection between slavery, the redundant poor, colonisation, and transportation; Wakefield attended the initial meetings of Molesworth's Committee and – with Whately - remained 'in open and perpetual communication with its chairman—advising Molesworth, suggesting questions and amassing evidence'.[77]

Eight members of the transportation committee had connections with systematic colonisation organisations: for example, Molesworth, Buller, Ward, Hawes, Bulwer, Lemon and Hutt had been members of the 1834 South Australian Association, though by 1837 only Hutt was still actively involved with that body; Molesworth's family fortune enabled him to

be a trustee responsible for the safety of considerable funds on its behalf. Buller and Hutt had belonged to the short-lived National Colonisation Society formed in London in 1830 around Wakefield's ideas. Baring was chairman and Molesworth a member of the 1837 New Zealand Association (although Baring attended only five of the 38 meetings of the Molesworth Committee).[78] These influential networks indeed widely 'trumpeted' Wakefield's theories, and less directly, 'Wakefieldian cadences' pattern a range of public arguments at this time – such as Molesworth's free trade speeches arguing for repeal of the Corn Laws, and Merivale's extended reflection in his *Lectures on Colonisation and Colonies* 1839 and 1841, who was to be appointed assistant Under-Secretary for the Colonies in 1847.[79] Molesworth's highly-orchestrated report expresses the reformers' opposition to slavery, and their twin desires to reform transportation's moral basis via utilitarian theories of penal reform, in the larger context of systematic colonisation.[80]

The Molesworth inquiry took full advantage of the anti-slavery fervour that had seized the country to frame transportation as a slave system. The system of assigning convicts to a master for private labour was a major focus, shown to foster a culture of oppression and abuse. As David Roberts points out, by the early 1830s assignment was characterised by 'poorly defined, highly discretionary and largely unchecked' disciplinary powers, and the 'incompetent and self-interested administration of discipline and justice'.[81] A key marker of slavery was the practice of flogging, which, after abolition, appeared excessive and prompted anxieties regarding its numbing and degrading effects.[82] Molesworth deployed the sensational details of a handful of cases in order to depict the colonies as the site of cruelty and depravity.[83] In place of this brutalising regime, the principles of the penitentiary with its emphasis on non-physical punishment and moral reform were gaining favour, prompting several inquiries into prison discipline and a number of new penal projects during the

1830s.[84] The Molesworth committee seized upon penal reformer and naval officer Alexander Maconochie's *Report on the State of Prison Discipline in Van Diemen's Land*, in which he condemned the assignment system as an uncertain punishment, slavery-like in its emphasis on physical coercion, and the source of moral degradation.[85] The inquiry fully agreed, and Molesworth concluded that, '[t]ransportation is much more than exile; it is slavery as well'.[86]

Yet Molesworth's report went beyond its transportation remit to advocate directly for Wakefield's schemes. The report argued that the colony's extraordinary prosperity had been due to the labour of convicts, assigned 'as slaves' and 'forced to work in combination', but now the labour requirements far exceeded the convict supply. From his earliest writing on colonisation, *Letter to Sydney*, Wakefield had proposed to use non-white labour from China or India. Now, however, the lessons of Caribbean slave society would be applied to the new colonies, which would be kept white: a scheme to import 'Hindoos' had been 'most justly objected to by the Government as one of the innumerable descriptions of slavery'. If these workers remained in the country, they would produce 'a separate, probably a slave caste' to curse Australia further. This was indeed the moment that official policy adopted what later came to be termed the 'White Australia Policy'.[87] Molesworth congratulated the government on its active encouragement of free labour, funded by the sale of waste lands – but was concerned that 'while the minimum price for obtaining land is so low as 5s. an acre, a labourer can too quickly acquire land by the saving of his high wages, and too readily gratify the desire, inherent in all men, of independence.' If transportation was discontinued, the committee considered it 'absolutely necessary' to raise the minimum price to 1*l.* an acre and eventually considerably higher still, to prevent 'the tendency of population to undue dispersion over an almost unlimited territory'. In this way, the committee pointed out that transportation might be discontinued without interfering with NSW's supply of labour.[88]

Wakefieldian agitation reached a peak when a parliamentary Select Committee on Waste Lands advocated the adoption of systematic colonisation and the establishment of a board to implement its principles. In February 1837 T. F. Elliot was appointed United Kingdom Agent General for Emigration. Antagonism grew between the Wakefieldians and the humanitarian Colonial Office, due in part to the feared impact of colonisation on Indigenous people. Molesworth delivered a powerful attack on the Colonial Office in March 1838, in which he castigated Glenelg for the economic problems besetting New South Wales, for ignoring the mechanism of promoting 'free emigration by means of the sale of waste lands', and allowing private interest to mis-manage emigration.[89] Colonial Reformers such as Henry Ward and Molesworth remained eloquent parliamentary supporters of systematic colonisation, for example during the 1839 House of Commons inquiry into Waste Lands of the Colonies.[90] Arguing for its application to both the West Indies as well as Australia or Canada, Ward suggested that while each colony's circumstances were different, each should determine 'the '"sufficient" price to secure to every capitalist a supply of hired labour, while it holds out to the labourer the prospect of such wages, as will enable him to become in turn a capitalist himself.' He moved for the 'occupation, and cultivation, of waste lands in the British colonies, by means of emigration' and the extension of the South Australian scheme to all other suitable colonies.[91] The government followed the Molesworth report's recommendations regarding transportation, and in May 1840 an Order-in-Council was issued, removing New South Wales from the list of places to which convicts could be sent.

The shifts in public policy during this decade, away from slavery and transportation and toward free white emigration, are graphically demonstrated by the numbers of convicts transported to Australia: after Bigge, this flow steadily rose during the 1820s and early 1830s,

peaking in 1833, with almost 7000 people arriving in that one year.[92] As I have argued, it is no accident that the numbers transported went into permanent decline in the same year that slavery was abolished within the British Empire. Its dramatic drop was a result of the powerful critique of transportation, drawing on anti-slavery arguments, combined with new discourses of penal reform and systematic colonisation.

Table 1. 'Annual Number of Convicts Transported from Britain and Ireland, 1615–1870'.[93]

By the late 1840s Wakefield had lost his supporters and his schemes were failing. Despite the appeal for the doctrinaire intellectual, the messy realities of colonisation led both policy-makers and settlers further away from Wakefield's principles of fixed price, population dispersal, and combined labour. Nonetheless, the Settler Revolution was well underway.

Conclusion

During the anti-slavery movement's final, ameliorative, phase, both the distant slave system, and the new settler colonies became sites for what Davis termed 'experimental fantasies' in labour discipline.[94] The 1820s debates about emancipation and emigration centred upon this issue, and as slavery was 'reformed', new labour forms were developed, giving rise to settler colonial theory and practice. While 'free labour' was championed by anti-slavery campaigners, it was an uncertain, if mighty experiment: Wakefield offered his scheme as a solution to the entwined challenges of emancipation and imperial expansion. When abolition was debated in 1833, both abolitionists and slave-owners agreed on the need for freed slaves to work for wages, and Wakefieldian principles of systematic colonisation played a significant role in developing new institutions and sanctions focused on work discipline that

would apply equally to Caribbean plantations and the new settler colonies, and establishing a new imperial division of labour.

The rise of anti-slavery sentiment in Britain coincided with urgent domestic challenges, and from 1830 in particular, the new Whig regime was forced to address growing public demand for reform. Abolition served an important purpose for the movement's elite leaders, in uniting diverse interests and providing a sense of transcendent moral resolve, without the threat of revolution that shadowed domestic transformation. The challenges of industrial capitalism prompted the ruling classes to develop a hierarchy of reform created through the comparisons and contrasts drawn between slaves, the working-classes, and convicts. Abolitionists such as Wilberforce emphasised the plight of slaves while remaining complicit with class oppression; for British property-owners, abolition served the purpose of maintaining their position at the head of a stable social order, and accruing moral legitimacy for imperial rule. Transportation to the colonies formed part of the fundamental tension between the claims of slaves and the poor, reinforcing official authority by supposedly deterring crime and removing dissidents – and defenders of the regime emphasised its equivalence to Caribbean slavery and the abjection of white convict 'slaves'. In this sense transportation worked in tandem with abolition to maintain the British social order; the abjection of the degraded convict ultimately facilitated the claims of the enslaved African. Once emancipation in the Caribbean was achieved, it became necessary to abolish convict slavery too, making way for free white emigration and opening up new investment opportunities. In this way, the dramatic expansion we call the Settler Revolution had, conversely, made abolition possible, serving the twin purposes of relieving domestic social unrest and bolstering elite authority, and simultaneously offering alternatives to slavery.

Recovering this shared imperial context for Wakefieldian principles of colonisation reminds us that the Caribbean sugar plantations, like the newer Australasian settlements, were settler colonies too: it was only after emancipation, and largely as a result of the debates about slavery, that official emigration policy began to distinguish between so-called 'settler colonies' and other colonial territories on the basis of race and climate. The wide applicability of Wakefield's principles points toward the imperial imperative to ensure low wages, and a supply of disciplined agricultural labour, despite abolition. Maintaining the class order was also crucial: as Karl Marx pointed out, in mocking Wakefield's theory, colonisation revealed the underlying truth of 'free labour' –'the secret discovered in the new world by the Political Economy of the old world' was that 'the capitalist mode of production and accumulation, and therefore capitalist private property, have for their fundamental condition … the expropriation of the labourer'.[95] Systematic colonisation revealed that capitalism's seemingly free labour market was actually premised on compelling wage labour, and ensuring a docile work-force. The shared concerns of abolitionists and systematic colonisers reveals the ways in which settler colonisation provided an economic and cultural replacement for the slave system, and how the new forms of labour required by global industrial capitalism were derived from, yet carefully differentiated against the enslaved labour force of the sugar colonies. Through interrelated debates about abolition, the governance of working-class Britons, transportation, and systematic colonisation, the transition from slavery toward disciplinary regimes of free labour both in the Caribbean and the penal colonies was argued, challenged, and eventually implemented to create the racialised system of global labour flows still shaping the modern world.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Ann Curthoys and Jeremy Martens for their encouragement and advice in preparing this paper. I also thank Cate Pattison for her help with copy-editing. This research derives from several linked projects conducted over many years, in the course of which many colleagues have generously contributed to my thinking. Here, most relevant are Fiona Paisley, Philippa Levine, Liz Conor and Hamish Maxwell-Stewart.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council under its Discovery program (grant number DP200100094].

ORCID

Jane Lydon https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3083-4084

References

Allen, Richard B. ‘Slaves, convicts, abolitionism and the global origins of the post-emancipation indentured labor system.’ *Slavery & Abolition* 35, no. 2 (2014): 328-348.

Anderson, Clare. ‘After emancipation: Empires and imperial formations.’ In *Emancipation and the remaking of the British imperial world*. Manchester University Press, 2015.

‘Angas, George Fife (1789–1879).’ *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. Canberra: National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, 1966. http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/angas-george-fife-1707/text1855

Anon [Edward Gibbon Wakefield], *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia*, London, 1829.

Antoine, Rose-Marie Belle. *Commonwealth Caribbean Law and Legal Systems*. Routledge 2008.

Backhouse, James. *Letter book 1831–4*. Friends House Library, London, Ms. Vol. 1 S48.

Bashford, Alison and Joyce E. Chaplin. *The New Worlds of Thomas Robert Malthus: Rereading the Principle of Population*, Princeton, 2016.

Barry, John V. ‘Maconochie, Alexander (1787–1860),’ *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, (Canberra: National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, 1967) http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/maconochie-alexander-2417/text3207

Belich, James. *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Blackburn, Robin. *The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery 1776–1848.* London: Verso, 1988.

Blouet, Brian W. ‘Land Policies in Trinidad, 1838-50’, *Journal of Caribbean History* VII, (1976).

Brown, Christopher Leslie. *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2006.

Burnley, William Hardin. *Observations on the Present Condition of the Island of Trinidad and the actual state of the experiment of Negro Emancipation*. London, 1842.

Cameron, J.M.R. ‘The Foundation of Western Australia Reconsidered.’ *Studies in Western Australian History* 3, (1978): 1–17.

Cazzola, Matilde. ‘Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the political economy of emancipation.’ *Intellectual History Review* (2020): 1-19.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. Yale University Press, 2005.

Conder, Josiah. *Wages or the whip: An essay on the comparative cost and productiveness of free and slave labour*. London: Hatchard and son, 1833.

Craton, Michael. *Testing the Chains: Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Crawfurd, John. ‘New South Australian Colony’, *Westminster Review* 21, 1834: 446–8, 473–5.

Curthoys, Ann. ‘Liberalism and exclusionism: A prehistory of the white Australia policy.’ In *Legacies of White Australia: Race, culture and nation,* edited by Laksiri Jayasuriya, David Walker, and Jan Gothard, Jan, 8-32. Crawley, WA: University of Western Australia Press, 2003.

Curthoys Ann and Jessie Mitchell. *Taking Liberty: Indigenous Rights and Settler Self-Government in Colonial Australia, 1830-1890*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution 1770–1823.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Dobie, Edith. ‘Molesworth's Indictment of the Colonial Office, March 6, 1838.’ *Pacific Historical Review*, 13, no. 4 (1944): 376–389.

Draper, Nicholas. *The Price of Emancipation: Slave-ownership, Compensation and British Society at the End of Slavery.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Drescher, Seymour. *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977.

Drescher, Seymour. ‘Cart Whip and Billy Roller: Or Antislavery and Reform Symbolism in Industrializing Britain.’, *Journal of Social History* 15: 1, autumn (1981): 3–24.

Drescher, Seymour. *Capitalism and Antislavery, British Mobilisation in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Seymour Drescher. *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation*, Oxford, 2002.

Edmonds, Penelope. ‘Travelling ‘Under Concern’: Quakers James Backhouse and George Washington Walker Tour the Antipodean Colonies, 1832–41,’ *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40, No. 5 (December 2012): 769–788.

Eltis, David. ‘Abolitionist perceptions of society after slavery.’ In *Slavery and British Society 1776–1846*, pp. 195-213. Palgrave, London, 1982.

Eltis, David. *Economic growth and the ending of the transatlantic slave trade*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Eltis, David, and Stanley L. Engerman. ‘The importance of slavery and the slave trade to industrializing Britain.’ *Journal of Economic History* (2000): 123-144.

Ertman, Thomas, ‘The Great Reform Act of 1832 and British Democratization,’ *Comparative Political Studies*, 43, no. 8/9 (2010): 1006-10

Fladeland, Betty Lorraine. *Abolitionists and working class problems in the age of industrialization*. Springer, 1984.

Fladeland, Betty. ‘‘Our Cause being One and the same’: Abolitionists and Chartism.’ In *Slavery and British Society 1776–1846*, pp. 69-99. Palgrave, London, 1982.

Ford, Lisa. ‘Anti-slavery and the reconstitution of empire.’ *Australian Historical Studies* 45, no. 1 (2014): 71-86.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*. London, Allen Lane, 1977.

Gilchrist, Catie. ‘This Relic of the Cities of the Plain': Penal Flogging, Convict Morality and the Colonial Imagination,’ *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 9 (2007): 1-28

Green, William A. *British Slave Emancipation: The Sugar Colonies and the Great Experiment 1830–1865*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Grey, Earl. *The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*. London, 1853.

Hall, Catherine. ‘The Slave-Owner and the Settler.’ In *Indigenous Networks: Indigenous Mobility and Exchange*, edited by Jane Carey and Jane Lydon, 29-49. London: Routledge, 2014.

Hall, Catherine, Nicholas Draper, Keith McClelland, Katie Donington and Rachel Lang. *Legacies of British Slave-ownership.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Hall, Douglas. ‘The flight from the estates reconsidered: the British West Indies 1838-42.’ *The Journal of Caribbean History* 10 (1978): 7.

Hannah, Mark. ‘Aboriginal Workers in the Australian Agricultural Company, 1824-1857.’ *Labour History: a Journal of Labour and Social History* 82, (2002): 17-33.

Harling, Philip. *The waning of ‘Old Corruption’: The politics of economical reform in Britain, 1779-1846*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hay, William Anthony. ‘‘If There Is a Mob, There Is Also a People’: Middle Class Politics and The Whig Revival, 1810–1830’, *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe 1750–1850: Selected Papers* (2000): 396–402

Hay, William Anthony. *The Whig Revival, 1808-1830*. Springer, 2004.

Hendrix, Richard. ‘Popular Humor and’ The Black Dwarf’.’ *The Journal of British Studies* 16, no. 1 (Autumn,1976): 108-128.

Higman, B.W. ‘The West India ‘interest’ in Parliament, 1807–1833.’ *Historical Studies* 13, no. 49. (1967): 1-19.

Hilton, Boyd. *A Mad, Bad and Dangerous People? England 1783-1846.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and George Rudé. *Captain Swing*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985.

Hollis, Patricia. 'Anti–Slavery and British Working-class Radicalism in the Years of Reform', in *Anti-Slavery, Religion and Reform: Essays in memory of Roger Anstey*, ed. Christine Bolt and Seymour Drescher, Folkestone, 1980: 294–315.

Holt, Thomas C. 'The essence of the contract: The articulation of race, gender, and political economy in british emancipation policy, 1838-1866.' *Beyond Slavery: Explorations of Race, Labor, and Citizenship in Postemancipation Societies*. Frederick Cooper, Thomas C. Holt, and Rebecca Scott, eds. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000: 33-59.

Holt, Thomas C. *The Problem of Freedom. Race, Labour, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832– 1938*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Hoyles, Martin, *William Cuffay: the life and times of a Chartist leader*. Hertford UK: Hansib Publications Limited, 2013.

Ignatieff, Michael. *A just measure of pain: the penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*. London: Macmillan, 1978.

Ince, Onur Ulas. *Colonial Capitalism and the Dilemmas of Liberalism*, 113–157. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Inikori, Joseph E. *Africans and the Industrial Revolution in England: A Study in International Trade and Economic Development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Kale, Madhavi. *Fragments of Empire: Capital, Slavery, and Indian Indentured Labor in the British Caribbean*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

King, Peter. *Crime, Justice and Discretion in England 1740–1820*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Kittrell, Edward R. 'Wakefield's Scheme of Systematic Colonisation and Classical Economics.' *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 32, no. 1 (1973): 87–111.

Laidlaw, Zoë. *Colonial Connections. 1815-1845: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government*. Manchester University Press, 2005.

Laidlaw, Zoë. 'Imperial complicity: Indigenous dispossession in British history and history writing.' In *Emancipation and the remaking of the British imperial world*, edited by Catherine Hall, Nicholas Draper, Keith Mcclelland. Manchester University Press, 2015.

Lester, Alan and Fae Dussart. *Colonization and the Origins of Humanitarian Governance: Protecting Aborigines across the Nineteenth-Century British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Lester, Alan, K. Boehme and P. Mitchell, *Ruling the World: Freedom, Civilisation and Liberalism in the Nineteenth-Century British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming 2020.

Lester Alan and Nikita Vanderbyl, 'The Restructuring of the British Empire and the Colonisation of Australia, 1832-1838.' *History Workshop Journal* (August 2020).

Lydon, Jane. *No Slavery in a Free Land? Antislavery and Australia*. Routledge, forthcoming 2021.

Lydon, Lydon. 'Secret Longing for a Trade in Human Flesh: the Decline of British Slavery and the Making of the Settler Colonies.' *History Workshop Journal*, August 2020.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* Cosimo, 2007 [1867].

Maxwell-Stewart, Hamish. 'Convict Transportation from Britain and Ireland 1615–1870.' *History Compass* 8, 11 (2010): 1,221–42.

McCalman, Iain. 'Anti-Slavery and Ultra Radicalism in Early Nineteenth Century England: The Case of Robert Wedderburn.' *Slavery and Abolition* 7, no. 2 (Sept 1986): 99-117.

McCulloch, S.C. 'Sir George Gipps and Captain Alexander Maconochie: The Attempted Penal Reforms at Norfolk Island, 1840-44,' *Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand* 7, no. 28 (May 1957): 387-405.

McLachlan, Noel. 'Edward Eagar (1787–1866): a colonial spokesman in Sydney and London.' (1963): 431-456.

Maxwell-Stewart, Hamish. ‘Convict Workers, Penal Labour and Sarah Island: Life at Macquarie Harbour, 1822-1834,’ in *Representing Convicts: New Perspectives on Forced Labour Migration*, I. Duffield and J. Bradley eds. London: Leicester University Press, 1997.

Maxwell-Stewart, Hamish. *Closing Hell's Gates: The death of a convict station*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2008.

Maxwell-Stewart, Hamish. ‘Convict Transportation from Britain and Ireland 1615–1870,’ *History Compass* 8/11 (2010): 1221–1242.

Maxwell-Stewart, Hamish. ‘Convict Labour and Extraction, and Transportation from Britain and Ireland, 1615–1870.’ in *Global Convict Labour*, edited by Christian De Vito and Alex Lichtenstein, 168–96. Leiden, 2015.

Meenai, S.A. ‘Robert Torrens-1780-1864,’ *Economica*, 23, no. 89 (Feb. 1956): 49-61

Merivale, Herman. *Lectures in Colonisation and Colonies, Delivered before the University of Oxford, 1839, 1840, 1841*. London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1842.

Meyering, Isobelle Barrett. ‘Abolitionism, Settler Violence and the Case Against Flogging: A Reassessment of Sir William Molesworth’s Contribution to the Transportation Debate.’ *History Australia* 7, no. 1 (2010): 06-1.

Midgley, Clare. *Women Against Slavery: the British Campaigns, 1780–1870.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Mills, Richard. *The Colonisation of Australia (1829-42): The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building*. Sydney University Press, 1974 [1915].

Morgan, Kenneth. *Slavery, Atlantic Trade and the British Economy, 1600-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Morgan, Kenneth. 'Labour Relations during and after Apprenticeship: Amity Hall, Jamaica, 1834–1840.' *Slavery & Abolition* 33, no. 3 (2012): 457-478.

Neal, David. *The Rule of Law in a Penal Colony: Law and Power in Early New South Wales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Nettelbeck, Amanda. *Indigenous Rights and Colonial Subjecthood: Protection and Reform in the nineteenth-century British empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Nettelbeck, Amanda and Samuel Furphy, eds. *Aboriginal Protection and its Intermediaries in Britain's Antipodean Colonies*. London: Routledge, 2019.

O'Brien, Bronterre. *The Rise, Progress, and Phases of Human Slavery*. London: W. Reeves, 1885.

O'Connor, Tamsin. 'A Zone of Silence: Queensland's Convicts and the

Historiography of Moreton Bay.' In *Representing Convicts: New Perspectives on Forced Labour Migration,* edited by I. Duffield and J. Bradley, 124-41. London: Leicester University Press, 1997.

Pappé, Helmut O. 'Wakefield and Marx'. *Economic History Review* 4: 1, 1951, pp. 88–97

Parry, Jonathan, *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*. Yale University Press, 1996.

Paton, Diana. *No Bond but the Law: Punishment, Race, and Gender in Jamaican State Formation, 1780–1870*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

Pemberton, Penelope. 'The London Connection: The Formation and Early Years of the Australian Agricultural Company', PhD diss., Australian National University, 1991.

Peté, Stephen, and Annie Devenish. 'Flogging, fear and food: punishment and race in Colonial Natal.' *Journal of Southern African Studies* 31, no. 1 (2005): 3-21.

Pickering, Paul. 'A Wider Field in a New Country,' in *Elections: Full, Free and Fair*, edited by Marian Sawer. Federation Press, 2001.

Pike, Douglas. *Paradise of Dissent, South Australia 1829-1857*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1967.

Reid, Kirsty. ‘Gender, crime and empire: convicts, settlers and the state in early colonial Australia.’ (2017).

Report from the Select Committee on the Extinction of Slavery Throughout the British Dominions: With the Minutes of Evidence. British Parliament, House of Commons. (London: J.Haddon, 1832).

Ritchie, John. ’Towards ending an unclean thing: The Molesworth committee and the abolition of transportation to New South Wales, 1837–40.’ *Historical Studies*, 17, no. 67 (1976), 144-164.

Roberts, David. ‘Masters, magistrates and the management of complaint: The 1833 convict revolt at Castle Forbes and the failure of local governance,’ *Journal of Australian Colonial History.* 19 (2017): 57-94.

Rudé, George. *Protest and punishment: the story of the social and political protesters transported to Australia, 1788-1868.* Oxford: Oxford, 1978.

Rupprecht, Anita. ‘From Slavery to Indenture: Scripts for Slavery’s Endings.’ In *Emancipation and the Remaking of the British Imperial World*, edited by Catherine Hall, Nicholas Draper, Keith McClelland. Manchester University Press, 2015.

Rupprecht, Anita. ‘From slavery to indenture: Scripts for slavery’s endings.’ In *Emancipation and the Remaking of the British Imperial World*, edited by Catherine Hall, Nicholas Draper, Keith McClelland. Manchester University Press, 2015.

Ryan, Lyndall. ‘The Australian Agricultural Company, the Van Diemen’s Land Company: Labour Relations with Aboriginal Landowners, 1824–1835.’ In *Intimacies of Violence in the Settler Colony: Economies of Dispossession around the Pacific Rim*, edited by Amanda Nettelbeck and Penelope Edmonds, 25–43. Basingstoke and New York: Springer, 2018.

Semmel, Bernard. ‘The Philosophic Radicals and Colonialism.’ *The Journal of Economic History*, 21 no. 4 (1961): 513–525.

Semmel, Bernard. *The rise of free trade imperialism: Classical political economy the empire of free trade and imperialism 1750-1850*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Shaw, Alan George Lewers. *Convicts and the Colonies: A Study of Penal Transportation from Great Britain and Ireland to Australia and other parts of the British Empire*. Melbourne University, 1977.

Sheridan, Richard B. ‘The West India Sugar Crisis and British Slave Emancipation, 1830-1833.’ *The Journal of Economic History* 21, no. 4 (1961): 539-51.

Slavery Abolition Act 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 73). <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Will4/3-4/73/contents>

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations: By Adam Smith,...* Vol. 4. JJ Tourneisen; and JL Legrand, 1791.

Spence, Caroline Quarrier. ‘Ameliorating Empire: Slavery and Protection in the British Colonies, 1783–1865.’ PhD diss., Harvard University, 2014.

Steven, Margaret. ‘Public credit and private confidence.’ *The age of Macquarie* (1992): 48-59.

Taylor, Miles. ‘Imperium et libertas? Rethinking the Radical Critique of imperialism during the nineteenth century.’ *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 19, no. 1, 1991: 1-23.

Temple, Philip. *A Sort of Conscience: the Wakefields*. Auckland University Press, 2003.

Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1991.

Thornton, Alan Mark. *The Philosophical Radicals, their influence on emigration and the evolution of responsible government for the colonies*. California, Pomina College, 1975.

Turley, David. *The Culture of English Antislavery, 1780-1860*. Routledge, 2004.

Turner, Michael. *British Politics in an Age of Reform.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Turner, Michael. *The Age of Unease*: *Government and Reform in Britain, 1782-1832*. Stroud: The History Press, 2000.

Turner, Michael. *Radicalism and reputation: the career of Bronterre O'Brien*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2017.

United Kingdom. *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*. 'Waste Lands of The Colonies'. 3rd series, vol 48 (1839); Vol 54 (1840).

United Kingdom. Britain House of Commons Debates. Ministerial Proposition for the Emancipation of Slaves, 14 May 1833. vol 17.

United Kingdom. Britain House of Commons Debates. Ministerial Plan for the Abolition of Slavery, 25 July 1833. Vol 19.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon. *Letter from Sydney, the Principal Town Of Australasia, Together With The Outline Of A System Of Colonisation*. ed. Robert Gouger, London: Cross, 1829.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon. *Facts Relating to the Punishment of Death in the Metropolis*. London, 1831.

Wakefield, Priscilla. *Reflections on the Present Condition of the Female Sex; with Suggestions for its Improvement*. London, 1798.

Walvin, James. 'The Public Campaign in England Against Slavery 1787-1834,' in *The Abolition of the Atlantic Slave Trade*, edited by D. Eltis and James Walvin, 63-79. Madison, 1981.

Ward, John M. ‘Grey, Henry George (1802–1894),’ *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (Canberra: National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, 1996) http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/grey-henry-george-2126/text2693

Whately, Richard. *Thoughts on Secondary Punishments: In a Letter to Earl Grey*. Vol. 6, no. 1. B. Fellows, 1832.

Whately, Richard. *Remarks on Transportation: And on a Recent Deference of the System; in a Second Letter to Earl Grey*. Vol. 6, no. 2. B. Fellowes, 1834.

Wiener, Martin *Reconstructing the Criminal: culture, law and policy in England, 1830-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Williams, E. *Capitalism and Slavery*. London: André Deutsch, 1964.

Williams, E. *From Columbus to Castro: The History of the Caribbean, 1492-1969*. New York: Vintage, 1984 [1970].

Wilmot, Swithin. ‘Not 'Full Free': The Ex-Slaves and the Apprenticeship System in Jamaica, 1834-1838.’ *Jamaica Journal* 17, no. 3 (1984): 2-10.

Table(s) with caption(s) (on individual pages).

Table 1. ‘Annual Number of Convicts Transported from Britain and Ireland, 1615–1870’. From Hamish Maxwell-Stewart. ‘Convict Transportation from Britain and Ireland 1615–1870,’ *History Compass* 8/11 (2010): 1221–1242.

[1] Slavery Abolition Act 1833. This act made the ownership of slaves illegal across the empire with the exception of the East India Company territories Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and Saint Helena (until 1843). When it came into force on 1 August 1834 only slaves below the age of six were freed, while the rest were redesignated as 'apprentices' until 1 August 1838. Compensation of £20 million was paid to slave-owners on the basis of a loan, not to be fully re-paid until 2015.

[2] Hall, 'The Slave-Owner and the Settler'. See also Hall et al., *Legacies of British Slave-ownership*.

[3] Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, 147.

[4] See for example Lester and Dussart, *Colonisation and Humanitarian Governance*; Nettelbeck, *Indigenous Rights and Colonial Subjecthood*; Nettelbeck and Furphy, *Aboriginal Protection*.

[5] There are important exceptions: for a recent analysis of the shared interests of abolitionists and Wakefieldians see Cazzola, 'Edward Gibbon Wakefield'. Scholars of slavery and capitalism have noted engagement with systematic colonisation, e.g. Semmel, *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism*; Ince, *Colonial Capitalism*, 136–7.

[6] Midgley, *Women Against Slavery*; Craton, *Testing the Chains*; Blackburn, *Overthrow of Colonial Slavery*.

[7] Spence, 'Ameliorating Empire'.

[8] King, *Crime, Justice and Discretion*; Turner, *British Politics*.

[9] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*; Morgan, *Slavery, Atlantic Trade and the British Economy*; Eltis and Engerman, 'The Importance of Slavery'; Inikori, *Africans and the Industrial Revolution*, 479; Hall et al., *Legacies of British Slave-ownership*, 11.

[10] Davis, *Problem of Slavery*, 253–4, 455.

[11] Ibid., 466.

[12] Higman, 'The West India 'interest'', 1-19

[13] Ford, 'Anti-Slavery and the Reconstitution of Empire,' 71-86; Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections.*

[14] Davis, *The Problem of Slavery*, 307–8, 311–12; Drescher, 'Cart Whip and Billy Roller'; Hollis, 'Anti–Slavery and British Working-class Radicalism,' 294–315.

[15] See Lydon *No Slavery in a Free Land?* for an extended discussion of these dynamics.

[16] Lester et al., *Ruling the World*.

[17] See Lydon, 'A Secret Longing'. Wilmot Horton's contribution to theories of colonisation was denied by the ambitious Wakefield. Belich also suggests that an important predecessor for Wakefield's ideas was provided by American examples, Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, 147.

[18] Smith, *Inquiry into the Nature*; Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment*; Turley, *The Culture of English Antislavery*, 18–46.

[19] Steven, 'Public Credit and Private Confidence'; Maxwell-Stewart, 'Convict Transportation from Britain and Ireland 1615–1870,' 1,221–42.

[20] Earl Bathurst to Commissioner John Thomas Bigge, 5 Jan. 1819; Earl Bathurst to Commissioner John Thomas Bigge, 6 Jan. 1819, *Historical Records of Australia* (HRA), Sydney, 1914–1925, Series 1, vol. X, pp. 3–4, p. 7.

[21] See Lydon, 'A Secret Longing'; and Lydon, *No Slavery in a Free Land?*

[22] Maxwell-Stewart, 'Convict Labour and Extraction,' 183.

[23] Pemberton, 'The London Connection'; Ryan, 'The Australian Agricultural Company,' 25–43; Hanna, 'Aboriginal Workers,' 17–33.

[24] Cameron, 'Foundation of Western Australia Reconsidered.' 1–17.

[25] Temple, *A Sort of Conscience*; Wakefield, *Letter from Sydney.*

[26] For expanded analysis of Wakefield's early texts, see Lydon, 'A Secret Longing'.

[27] Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, chap. VII 'On Colonies'; Anon [Edward Gibbon Wakefield], *Sketch of a Proposal*; Wakefield's critique paralleled Priscilla's criticism of Smith because of his omission of women's unpaid labour. Wakefield, *Reflections on the Present*.

[28] Wakefield, *Sketch*, 14–21.

[29] Wakefield, *Letter from Sydney*, 41.

[30] Ibid., 168-169. Later summarised in *The Art of Colonisation*, 331-349.

[31] Wakefield, *Letter from Sydney*,146.

[32] [Crawfurd], 'New South Australian Colony,' 446–8, 473–5. For further examples see Semmel, *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism*, 115–8.

[33] Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment*, 56–8, 123–4; Drescher, *Econocide*. Malthus's striking 'avoidance' of the topic throughout his work has been linked to his close involvement in managing his family's Jamaican interests over these years: Bashford and Chaplin, *The New Worlds*, 171–200.

[34] Rupprecht, 'From Slavery to Indenture'.

[35] Anderson, 'After Emancipation: Empires and Imperial Formations'.

[36] Blackburn, *The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery*, 436-437, 439-440, 465.

[37] Brown, *Moral Capital.*

[38] Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation*, 361.

[39] Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, 808-9; Turner, *Age of Unease*, 221; Harling, *Waning of Old Corruption*; Parry, *Rise and Fall*; Hilton, *Mad, Bad and Dangerous*.

[40] Hay, *The Whig Revival*; Hay, 'If There Is a Mob,' 396–402; Turner, *British Politics*.

[41] As Hobsbawm and Rudé note, 'it is difficult to find words for the degradation which the coming of industrial society brought to the English country labourer.' Hobsbawm and Rudé, *Captain Swing*, 32; Rudé, *Protest and punishment*.

[42] Hobsbawm and Rudé, *Captain Swing*, 246.

[43] This is evident in the connection between the riots, at their peak in the last week of November, and the fall of the Duke of Wellington's government: Hobsbawm and Rudé, *Captain Swing*, 68*;* Rudé, *Protest and punishment;* Turner, *Age of Unease*, 222.

[44] Turner, *Age of Unease*, 218; Ertman 'The Great Reform Act of 1832'; Hilton, *Mad, Bad and Dangerous*.

[45] Hollis, 'Anti-Slavery and British Working-class Radicalism,' 294-315, 296; Turner, *Radicalism and reputation*; O'Brien *Rise, Progress, and Phases of Human Slavery*.

[46] Hollis, 'Anti-Slavery and British Working-class Radicalism' 294-315; Drescher, *Capitalism and Antislavery*, 40, 63, 117, 84-5, 142-9,252-4; Walvin, 'The Public Campaign,' 67-8; Betty Fladeland concedes an intense hostility to the antislavery cause on the part of early Chartists but believes that this was gradually dissipated after 1833 by the mutual concerns of some prominent abolitionists and Chartists; she challenges the radicals' 'stereotype' of elite abolitionists by showing that many anti-slavery figures were concerned with wider reform: Fladeland, *Abolitionists and Working Class Problems*, 98, 104; Fladeland, 'Our Cause Being One and the Same,' 69–99. Abolitionists like Sturge and ultra-radicals like Harney and Cuffay worked for the anti-slavery cause, and the newspaper *The Black Dwarf* (1819-1828) called for both revolutionary emancipation and universal suffrage: Hendrix, 'Popular Humor and 'The Black Dwarf',' 108-128; McCalman, 'Anti-Slavery and Ultra Radicalism,' 99-117; Pickering, 'A Wider Field'; Hoyles, *William Cuffay*.

[47] Backhouse, *Letter book 1831–4*, 79; Edmonds, 'Travelling 'Under Concern,' 769–788.

[48] *Report on the Extinction of Slavery*, 212; Eltis, 'Abolitionist Perceptions,' 195-213.

[49] Quoted in Eltis, *Economic Growth*, 21.

[50] Eltis, 'Abolitonist Perceptions,' 200-201.

[51] Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, 440.

[52] The Earl of Durham had previously led the Radicals, but he died in 1840 and Howick assumed his mantle. Howick became distrustful of Wakefield after the failure of the South Australian venture, and his personal relationship with Wakefield became antagonistic. Semmel, *Rise of Free Trade Imperialism,* 118-124; Ward, 'Grey, Henry George'.

[53] Grey, *The Colonial Policy*, 197.

[54] Howick, Memo, December 1832, cited in Williams, *From Columbus to Castro*, 328-9.

[55] United Kingdom. Britain House of Commons Debates. Ministerial Proposition for the Emancipation of Slaves, 14 May 1833. Howick; see also Stanley. Vol 17, cc1193-262.

[56] United Kingdom. Britain House of Commons Debates. Ministerial Plan for the Abolition of Slavery, 25 July 1833. Peel and Torrens. Vol 19, cc 341-3, 1263-6.

[57] Meenai, 'Robert Torrens-1780-1864,' 49-61.

[58] Torrens, Ministerial Plan for the Abolition Of Slavery, House of Commons, 25 July 1833, vol 19 cc1252-72, 1263-5.

[59] See, for example, Conder, *Wages or the Whip,* 57–79. For apprenticeship in the British Caribbean, see Green, *British Slave Emancipation,* 129–161. For apprenticeship in Jamaica, see also Paton, *No Bond but the Law*; Wilmot, 'Not 'Full Free',' 2–10; Morgan, 'Labour Relations', 457-478.

[60] Merivale, Lecture XI, p. 313-314; Lecture IX, p. 253.

[61] Eltis, 'Abolitionist Perceptions of Society,' 195-213. Eltis, *Economic Growth,* 295-6.

[62] Antoine, *Commonwealth Caribbean Law,* Chapter 2*;* Sheridan 'The West India Sugar Crisis' 539-51, 550; Engerman, 'The Land and Labour Problem,' 297, 304; Holt 'The Essence of the Contract,'; Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, 73.

[63] Eltis, 'Abolitionist Perceptions of Society,' 205; Hall, 'The Flight from the Estates,' 8-34; Blouet, 'Land Policies in Trinidad,' 43-59; Higman, 'The West India 'interest''. Apprenticeship was originally scheduled to conclude for agrarian apprentices on 1 August 1840, but intense public pressure forced its termination on 1 August 1838. The exception was Antigua, where emancipation took place in 1834.

[64] NAA CO 295/105, Burnley to Stanley, 24 January 1834; Burnley, *Observations*; Blouet, 'Land Policies in Trinidad,' 43-59; Kale, *Fragments of Empire*, 44–8.

[65] United Kingdom. Parliamentary Papers. 'Report from the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies', Minutes of Evidence. House of Commons. Burnley, 1836, 152, 161.

[66] Burnley, The dispatch is reproduced in full as appendix B of Burnley, Condition of the Island of Trinidad.

[67] As a mentor of Wakefield's, briefly, Bentham suggested calling the new South Australian colony 'Liberia', because it would not rely upon official funding and therefore would cost the government nothing – he argued for its independence as a test of official good faith, taking aim at 'his Britannic Majesty's advisers', who would otherwise 'extract from it the sweets of *patronage'*. Bentham may also have been referring to the existing 'Liberia' – a free black colony established on the west coast of Africa from 1821, by the American Colonisation Society (ACS). Jeremy Bentham, *Writings on Australia, VII. Colonisation Company Proposal*, ed. T. Causer and P. Schofield, pre-publication version, The Bentham Project, 2018. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10055306/1/7.%20Colonisation%20Company%20Proposal.pdf

[68] Curthoys and Mitchell, *Taking Liberty*; Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections*, 190-191.

[69] Pike, *Paradise of Dissent.*

[70] In May, 1835, he was appointed Chairman of the body of nine Commissioners to establish provinces in South Australia. Meenai, 'Robert Torrens'.

[71] Lester and Vanderbyl, 'The Restructuring of the British Empire'; 'Angas, George Fife (1789–1879)' ; Draper, *The Price of Emancipation,* 242.

[72] Colley, *Britons*, 354.

[73] Whately, *Remarks on Transportation;* Whately, *Thoughts on Secondary Punishments*; Wakefield, *Facts Relating to the Punishment.*

[74] Select Committee on Transportation and William Molesworth, *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Transportation: together with a letter from the Archbishop of Dublin on the same subject,* House of Commons, Great Britain (London: Henry Hooper, 1838); Ritchie, 'Towards ending an unclean thing,' 144-164.

[75] *Sidney's Emigrant Journal*, I, No. 26 (March 29, 1849), 202, cited in Semmel, 'The Philosophic Radicals and Colonialism,' 513–525.

[76] Meyering, 'Abolitionism, Settler Violence,' 06.1-06.18.

[77] N. McLachlan identifies the eyewitness as Edward Eagar: McLachlan, *Edward Eagar*, 431-456.

[78] Mills, *The Colonisation of Australia (1829-42)*, 148 -153. The philosophic radicals included Francis Place, Charles Buller – also to serve on the transportation inquiry – George Grote, Joseph Parkes, John Stuart Mill, and John Arthur Roebuck. The transportation

Committee also comprised Russell, the Home Secretary, Sir George Grey, Under Secretary for War and the Colonies, Viscount Howick, Secretary at War, Sir Robert Peel, Leader of the Opposition, John Temple Leader, Henry Ward, Benjamin Hawes, William Ord, Thomas Fowell Buxton, Sir Thomas Fremantle, Francis Baring, Thomas Lennard, Nicholas Ridley Colborne and Charles Buller. Eight members of the committee had connexions with systematic colonisation organisations: Molesworth, Buller, Ward, Hawes, Bulwer, Lemon and Hutt had been members of the 1834 South Australian Association, though by 1837 only Hutt was still actively involved with that body; Baring was chairman and Molesworth a member of the 1837 New Zealand Association, but Baring attended only five of the 38 meetings of the Molesworth Committee. The original New Zealand Company started in 1825, with little success, then rose as a new company when it merged with Wakefield's New Zealand Association in 1837, and wound up all remaining business with a final report in 1858. 1837 developed NZ scheme -committee including 10 MPs led by Hutt, Baring and Molesworth. Thornton, *The Philosophical Radicals*; Taylor, 'Imperium et libertas?,' 1-23; Kittrell, 'Wakefield's Scheme of Systematic Colonisation,' 87–111; Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections*.

[79] Sidney's Emigrant Journal, 202; Merivale, *Lectures in Colonisation,* 253-76.

[80] Wiener, *Reconstructing the Criminal*; Neal, *Rule of Law,* 196.

[81] Roberts, 'Masters, magistrates and the management of complaint,' 57-94.

[82] O'Connor, 'A Zone of Silence,' 124-41; Maxwell-Stewart, 'Convict Workers, Penal Labour,' 157; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; Ignatieff, *A just measure of pain*; Gilchrist, 'This Relic of the Cities,' 1-28; Peté and Devenish, 'Flogging, Fear and Food,' 3-21.

[83] Reid, *Gender, crime and empire*, 194.

[84] Maxwell-Stewart, *Closing Hell's Gates*; Reid, *Gender, Crime and Empire*, 161–96; Shaw, *Convicts and the Colonies*, 266-94.

[85] Alexander Maconochie and John Franklin, *Report on the State of Prison Discipline in Van Diemen's Land: presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty* (Hobart: William Gore Elliston, 1838); Alexander Maconochie, *Secondary Punishment: The Mark System* (London: John Ollivier, 1848); Wiener, *Reconstructing the Criminal*,132; McCulloch, 'Sir George Gipps,' 387-405; Barry, 'Maconochie, Alexander (1787–1860),'

[86] Molesworth, *Report on Transportation*, 23.

[87] Curthoys, 'Liberalism and Exclusionism,' 8-32; Laidlaw, 'Imperial complicity,'131-148. This racialisation was directly shaped by abolition debates: Lydon, *No Slavery in a Free land?*

[88] Molesworth, *Report on Transportation*, 37-38.

[89] Dobie, 'Molesworth's Indictment,' 376–389.

[90] United Kingdom, 'Waste Lands of the Colonies'. Vol 48, cc841-919.

[91] Ward argued 'To this day there is white slavery in Australia and it produces an infinitely worse moral effect than the black slavery, which it has cost us twenty millions to get rid of in the West Indies.'; United Kingdom, 'Waste Lands of the Colonies'. Vol 48, cc841-919; Vol 54, col. 856.

[92] Maxwell-Stewart, 'Convict Transportation,' 1221–1242.

[93] Maxwell-Stewart, 'Convict Transportation,' 1225.

[94] Davis, *The Problem of Slavery*, 466.

[95] Marx, *Capital*, Chapter 33.; Helmut O. Pappe, 'Wakefield and Marx', *Economic History Review* 4: 1, 1951, pp. 88–97.