Jane Lydon jane.lydon@uwa.edu.au

Slavery’s Swan (River) Song: The decline of British slavery and the making of a colonial working class

> In moments of weakness, how I had sighed, and even shed tears of compassion and anger, at the damnable cruelties which I saw inflicted upon Blacks at the Cape of Good Hope! And yet, in spite of my reason and every better feeling of my nature, I brought myself to find excuses for the Spaniards, Americans, and Dutch; aye, even to think that a few thousand Negroes would be a great acquisition to New South Wales! So they would; and they would conduce to the wealth, and—deny it who will—even to the civilization of these colonial landowners. What made Lord --- a rich, well-educated, and agreeable gentleman?—The sweat, and blood, and tears of his and his father's slaves in Jamaica!
>
> Edward Gibbon Wakefield, *Letter from Sydney*, 1829, p.42.

Abstract

This essay explores links between the end of British slavery and the start of systematic colonization through debates about the establishment of the Swan River colony on the west coast of Australia in 1829. Historians of Australian colonization have overlooked the important context of slavery for metropolitan debates during the 1820s and 1830s; conversely, histories of British slavery have neglected the ways in which the institution’s demise was linked to the new Australasian settlements. In the decade leading up to the triumph of abolition, the colonies provided an alternative for the investment of capital, goods and people, as instantiated by the life-journeys of figures moving from the plantations of the West Indies to Western Australia. As British policy-makers and investors pondered how to colonise, the question of a colonial labour force became pressing. The ascendant anti-slavery movement insisted upon the distinction between ‘black’ slavery and free ‘white’ labour. However, in schemes for Swan River, and notably in Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s famous 1829 *Letter from Sydney*, prior to the formulation of his systematic colonization scheme, links to slavery are particularly visible in the form of arguments against free labour and the advocacy of racial, as well as class, labour hierarchies. The failure of *laissez faire* at Swan River made it an example of how *not* to colonise, helping Wakefield to

argue for the ‘concentration’ – that is, disciplining - of white labour. Concurrent with the making of the English working class, the Swan River moment was formative in the making of a colonial working class, and entrenching the principle of regulated but free white labour as constitutive of the settler colony.

British slavery and its colonial legacies

In August 1833 British Parliament finally 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’. However, in place of slavery the negotiated settlement established a system of apprenticeship and granted £20 million in compensation, to be paid by British taxpayers to the former slave-owners.[1] The end of slavery – including years of conflict presaging abolition as occurred in Demerara - re-directed capital, people and ambitions towards the colonies. As Catherine Hall has argued, we must think the histories of slavery (of the Caribbean) alongside those of the colonies of Australia, Canada and South Africa.[2] The ‘Legacies of British Slavery’ (LBS) project has offered a profound revision to the history of nineteenth-century Britain, demonstrating that slavery was central to domestic and imperial histories until at least the mid-nineteenth century, as the wealth it generated and the movement of human and financial capital from the Caribbean slave economy to the East Indies, Canada and Australasia constituted a significant historical force. Many slave-owners remained wealthy and politically influential, and successfully facilitated new forms of unfree labour such as indenture, while some former slave-owners were prominent in forging post-emancipation racial hierarchies.[3] Historians have begun to trace this movement of people, investment and aspirations towards these new markets and opportunities, revealing links between the sugar industry in the West Indies and Queensland, gold-rush Victoria, and the ways that imperial careers instantiate links between slavery and settler colonialism.[4]

Abolition and the poor

As many have argued, the success of abolition was not due solely to the moral persuasion of the humanitarians, but was eventually achieved when ending slavery became economically and politically advantageous. In January 1823 the anti-slavery movement was revitalized when William Wilberforce, Henry Brougham and other veteran abolitionists established the ‘Society for Mitigating and Gradually Abolishing the State of Slavery throughout the British Dominions’.[5] A radical anti-slavery current developed that scorned the ‘gradualist’ parliamentary response, beginning publication of the *Anti-Slavery* reporter in 1825. Under pressure from London, colonial Caribbean jurisdictions passed several reforms in 1825, but these reforms were resisted by local legislature and many planters refused to comply with their provisions, prompting many to leave – and exemplifying a wider process of re-orientation in the Caribbean, as many slave colonies were destabilized from within.[6] At the same time, as Eric Williams first claimed, and as recent analysis has affirmed, the slave colonies’ economic value to the empire diminished, and only protection ensured the viability of West Indian sugar. West Indies economic interests were trumped by the new forces of industrial capitalism, confirming an overall picture of decline by the 1820s.[7]

This was a decade of particular 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. While labour had commanded high wages during the Napoleonic wars, after 1815 grain prices plummeted and labour was in oversupply, leading to a crisis of rural depopulation, increasingly harsh poor laws, and growing worker protest.[8] In the context of these challenges, most historians agree that Britain’s conversion to antislavery ideology was related to the Industrial Revolution’s need to legitimize wage labour, and the bitter struggle over domestic reform.[9]

In Britain, these debates were structured by an enduring tension between ‘two systems of oppression’ - slave rights and white worker rights – that was as old as the anti-slavery movement itself. During the 1780s, for example, West Indian planters had claimed that their slaves were better treated than English industrial workers, a contrast that remained a standard tactic of the pro-slavery lobby. Conversely, English radicals argued that English social conditions were very close to slavery.[10] The anti-slavery movement therefore had the seemingly paradoxical effect of supporting an aristocratic monarchy that sanctioned wage slavery to facilitate industrialization and maintain the domestic social order.

In addition, from at least the 1780s debates surrounding the troubling category of convict transportation had been central to the racialized bifurcation of black slavery and white punishment. The contested status of convicts at the inception of transportation to Australia had crystallized the importance of the association between race and ‘unfreedom’, as many were worried that white convicts looked too much like slaves.[11] The creation of racialised labour hierarchies at this time were to remain central to long-term, global flows of forced labour.[12]

The 1820s constituted a key moment in these debates as the British anti-slavery movement legitimated the precepts of free-market capitalism, emphasizing the distinction between slave and ‘free’ labour – yet overlooking the harsh conditions under which labourers lived and worked in Europe. Before 1830, for Wilberforce, James Stephen and their evangelical circle (the ‘Saints’), it was essential to maintain a sharp distinction between the evils of the colonial slave world and the ‘ostensibly free institutions that had been imperiled both by French tyranny and English “Jacobins”’.[13] Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* had first popularised the notion of free labour, as well as the view that there were two methods of motivating the worker, summarised as ‘wages or the whip’.[14] Anti-slavery campaigners drew an equation 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.[15] However in place of the harsh physical constraints of slavery many advocated the economic, legal and moral disciplining of workers.

In this decade of growing abolitionist sentiment and declining slave profits, the championing of free labour, and a domestic over-population crisis, the need to find new opportunities for both capitalist investment and disposal of Britain’s excess population prompted numerous schemes for colonization – and starkly posed the question of colonial labour. The Colonial Office at this time undertook a ‘vast imperial stocktaking’, overhauling its administrative system in the wake of the Napoleonic wars notably through the mechanism of parliamentary Commissions of Inquiry.[16] Between 1818 and 1826, sixteen commissions of enquiry were appointed, six sent to non-European colonies, with the effect of enhancing imperial networks of communication and advocacy.[17]

As I explore here, precedents employing coercive labour were found wanting, and abolitionist sentiment insisted upon the re-inscription of the distinction between ‘black’ slavery and free ‘white’ labour. In parallel with the ‘making of the English working class’, this decade saw the making of a colonial working class, and the establishment of free white labour as a constituent feature of the settler colony.

Imagining Swan River: an experiment in free labour

Through the proposals advanced for Swan River we see the ways in which 'free labour' emerged as a central principle in debates about both emancipation and emigration/ colonization. 'Swan River', now the city of Perth, is sited on the traditional country of the Whadjuk Nyoongar people. [Map] It was the third colony to be established in Australia, but the first non-convict and agricultural settlement, as defined by its land regulations and the composition of the original settlers, who aimed to practise mixed farming.[18] Historians have debated whether the decision to establish a colony on this site was primarily to avert the threat of a French claim, or was due to the 'creative role' of its first proponents, naval Captain James Stirling, and private speculator Thomas Peel. The French were indeed considered a serious threat.[19] In addition, Stirling, with an eye to profit, certainly played an active part in pushing to survey the region in March 1827, providing a glowing report that reversed previous, negative, views of the region, and negotiating with the Colonial Office regarding the scheme.[20] However while these factors were indeed significant, the establishment of Swan River also reveals much about British domestic concerns.

Within the Colonial Office, official policy regarding both colonization, and emancipation in the West Indies, was overseen by Robert Wilmot Horton, parliamentary undersecretary for war and the colonies between 1821-1827. Wilmot Horton had a direct influence in developing and implementing policies that today would be the responsibility of parliamentarians.[21] These government officials actively courted public opinion: for example Second Secretary to the Admiralty John Barrow published widely in periodicals of the day, while Wilmot Horton wrote some 30 pamphlets, gave lectures, and wrote to the press. He was responsible for official publications such as the three Reports of the Select Committees on Emigration of 1826 and 1827, and when an emigration Bill was passed in February 1831 he was credited with its design. [22] Faced with the problem of over-population, Wilmot Horton agreed with Thomas Malthus, that the poor laws 'created the poor which they maintain' and destroyed the 'spirit of independence'.[23] In this way he could be said to have been the first systematic colonizer, although he is often remembered most readily through the caricature by his contemporary Charles Buller – that his plan of emigration consisted simply of 'shovelling out paupers' - and his successor Edward Gibbon Wakefield's attacks led to Wilmot Horton's contribution subsequently being overlooked by historians.[24]

Wilmot Horton's work quickly came to revolve around the issue of compensation for the planters, and therefore involved him in questions regarding the relative efficiency of slave and free labour. Deeply respectful of property rights, Wilmot Horton was sympathetic to the planters' position, and he successfully argued that because the nation as a whole had benefited from slavery, it should equally share the cost of ending it through compensation. [25] Wilmot Horton - and his Colonial Office advisor between 1824-8, Major Thomas Moody - effectively overturned a standard assumption of *laissez faire* political economy: acknowledging that slaves would not willingly work in the sugar industry, they argued that compensation should be calculated on the basis of the loss to the planter, not simply the slave's market value.

While Wilmot Horton's policies on emancipation and emigration are not usually considered together, it is clear that his ideas concerning free labour - and especially workers' motivation - were central to both, as he sought to apply reforms that had been attempted in the Caribbean over previous decades to the regulation of colonization.[26] Alternative schemes for relieving Britain's rising population of 'paupers' were advanced by a number of figures during the 1820s, but Wilmot Horton was the major advocate of systematic colonization, proposing that planned emigration to the colonies be funded by loans secured against the parish poor rates.

He came into office at a time when voluntary emigration had recently been established, and notably the subsidised emigration scheme, now termed the 1820 Settlers, that sent around 4000 British settlers to the Zuurfeld region in the Cape Colony. This scheme was prompted by the Select Committee on the Poor Laws of 1817-19 recommendation, that 'every facility that is reasonable' should be given for emigration to British colonies.[27] As Laidlaw has shown, when it was proposed in 1819 the African Institution, formed to monitor the implementation of the 1807 Abolition Act, secured Secretary of State Lord Bathurst's promise that all land grants in the new colony would be conditional on 'the cultivation of free land by free labour'.[28]

Later, in 1823 and 1825, Wilmot Horton organized two waves of emigration from Ireland to Canada, but concerns about cost prompted Wilmot to attract private capital to the colonies instead, giving encouragement to several joint stock companies, in particular the Canada Land Company. Canada provided an important example in debates surrounding the 1826 and 1827 Select Committees on Emigration that sat under Wilmot's chairmanship.[29] Colonel Francis Cockburn had been involved in these Canadian schemes and was a keen proponent of government-assisted emigration. His elder brother George Cockburn was a Junior Naval Lord, and as an old family friend was probably responsible for commissioning the young Captain James Stirling to relieve the settlement of Fort Dundas, Melville Island in northern Australia in 1826.[30]

Swan River schemes: Thomas Moody's convicts, parish paupers and 'half-castes'

Stirling was to make the first proposal for colonizing Swan-river.[31] His father-in-law, James Mangles, owned a shipping company that had been extensively involved in transporting convicts to New South Wales, and was a shareholder in the East India Company; before departing Stirling was able to consult Mangles's Australian library, which may have stimulated his thinking about the region's commercial prospects.[32] The failure of the family business early in 1826 probably spurred Stirling's desire for profit. Arriving in Sydney in December, General Ralph Darling, the Governor of New South Wales, agreed that during the northern monsoon season, Stirling should explore the Swan River. On 14 December, before he left, Stirling presented Darling with a proposal for settlement, arguing for its commanding position for trade and defence, and, '[a]s it is situated in the same parallel as New South Wales' it could be expected to 'admit of labour by Europeans', and to produce trade commodities.[33] Written before he had ever laid eyes on the place, and perhaps even before leaving England, this can be regarded as the first Swan River scheme, focused upon strategic defence and trade.

On his return to Sydney from his survey in April 1827, his report on the region's agricultural potential was even more positive, declaring that 'it appears to hold out every attraction that a Country in a State of Nature can possess'.[34] Likewise, colonial Botanist Charles Fraser's breathless account 'hesitate[d] not in pronouncing it superior to any I ever saw in New South Wales, east of the Blue Mountains, not only in its local character, but in the many existing advantages which it holds out to settlers'.[35] Darling added a further 9,600 acres to the 1,500 he had already granted, and supported Stirling's request for the post of governor from Lord Bathurst. But when Stirling returned to London in October 1827 with his proposal the Colonial Office was cool. A greater challenge for administrators during these months was enforcing the abolition of the slave trade, while closer to home, the financial collapse of 1825-6 had increased the number of unemployed.[36] Nonetheless, Wilmot Horton recognized the potential for colonies to provide relief, and spent most of his energies throughout 1827 in exploring alternative forms of assisted emigration.[37]

At this key moment, when a decision regarding Swan River hung in the balance, experience drawn from West Indies slavery played a significant role, demonstrating the entwined nature of thinking regarding slave emancipation and emigration. Major Moody was a close advisor of Wilmot Horton on slavery, particularly in relation to the apprenticeship system applied to former slaves in the West Indies, but also assisting in his examination of the pauper question and assisted migration. Moody had served in the Royal Engineers in the West Indies between 1806-1820, where he acquired extensive slave plantations and estates including in Barbados, Guiana, Demerara, Berbice, and Tortola; later in 1834 he was awarded compensation, as was his wife's family.[38] In 1821 William Wilberforce proposed a parliamentary Commission to investigate the condition of slaves in the West Indies, and Moody served as a Commissioner. Moody's 1825 report argued that financial independence would only be achieved through developing agriculture for export and this must be performed by former slaves because Europeans were ill-equipped for hard physical work in tropical climates. Moody's second report addressed labour motivation, and he advocated giving local government such powers over liberated slaves as was needed to make them productive, concluding that enslavement, or 'some degree of coercion' was fundamentally necessary. While these views made him the target of the Anti-slavery society, Moody's reports appealed to officials seeking to make the former slave colonies profitable.[39] In April 1824, with colonial secretary Lord Bathurst's support, Wilmot Horton appointed him to the Colonial Office as home secretary to the overseas commissions of enquiry where he remained until the middle of 1828.[40]

Presented with Stirling's scheme in mid-1828, Wilmot Horton encouraged them to develop a proposal for a settlement at Swan River.[41] They wrote on 21 August to ask Colonial Under-Secretary Robert Hay 'whether we may be permitted to form an Association, with a view to obtain a proprietary Charter, upon principles similar to those formerly adopted in the settlement of Pennsylvania and Georgia'.[42] Moody had been engaged in translating the writings of (later) Governor-General Johannes van den Bosch whose Dutch system of pauper colonization seemed particularly suited to new penal colonies in Australia, where assisted migration and transportation could be combined.[43] With Stirling's assistance, Moody proposed separate settlements for white convicts, white paupers, and non-white agricultural labourers, writing,

> I would form ... three classes of Settlements viz. 1st Those for convicts on the Dutch system - 2nd those for the profit of the Association, conducted by them for parish paupers &. persons of that class ... indented for a term of years, with considerable privileges on the satisfactory termination of their indentures; and 3rdly those for the encouragement of half castes from India, Chinese &. others, who may be induced to settle in the hotter climates of the territory, to raise cotton, &c[44]

While never implemented at Swan River these principles were indeed realised in Java in the early years of Dutch colonial control (1830-70) in what is now remembered as the notoriously harsh Cultuurstelsel or Cultivation System. The Cultuurstelsel forced the peasant population in large parts of Java to grow various crops supplied to the colonial government for export, van den Bosch arguing that '[t]he native races of the tropics had a natural tendency to sloth and indolence [so that t]here was no alternative to the use of force'.[45] Van den Bosch's colonial theories stemmed from an initial concern with metropolitan poverty, and his establishment of three domestic agricultural 'colonies' in the eastern Netherlands where residents were trained under strict supervision and discipline.[46] He opposed the notion of the superiority of free labour as a 'liberal illusion', arguing for the need for coercion of criminalized paupers and Javanese alike.[47] Moody's proposal for Swan River applied van den Bosch's principles of discipline and surveillance, coercive labour, and strict racial segregation, providing for the separation of convicts, paupers and coloured races in separate settlements.

In October the French threat as well as the collapse of the northern settlements loomed again, so Stirling was told to go ahead if he could do so without cost to the government. Stirling dropped Moody and began to advertise for investors, setting off as governor in February 1829.[48] But Moody's arguments for coercive colonial labour point to the salience of slavery and emancipation in developing ideas about colonization at this period. Notable is the omission of Indigenous people as a potential source of labour in this or any other scheme - despite their important role in Swan

River following invasion. Perhaps this was due to the combination of contemporary abolitionist concern to avoid any appearance of slavery, and precedents set by the 1820 Zuurfield colony, together with disparaging assessments of Indigenous capacity based on earlier encounters.

Stirling and Thomas Peel: 'a limited slavery'

Swan River was a new attempt to introduce an assisted migration scheme, sponsored by private investors, colonists, and syndicates. It was the first British colony in Australia founded exclusively for private settlement based upon a land grant system, although under government control. Under the conditions stipulated by the Colonial Office, settlers were granted land in proportion to the value of assets and labour that they brought to the colony, and were required to 'improve' their grants in order to secure full title. Many British newspapers promoted the Swan River's fertile soil, ample water supply and year-round mild climate – and especially its status as the first free colony, untainted by convicts. In February 1829, for example, *The Times* was 'glad to observe' that the 'alacrity which prevails among individuals of this class, in preparing to depart for the settlement, has no precedent in any former opportunity for emigration. Many highly respectable, and indeed, distinguished individuals, whose names we have learnt, are eagerly engaged in forming parties on a large scale to emigrate there.'[49]

Meanwhile, hearing of Swan River's rich potential, Thomas Peel and a syndicate of financiers proposed to the Government to underwrite the development of the settlement if granted prime land. The land eventually granted to him, 250,000 acres of land to the south, extended from Cockburn Sound to the Murray River.[50] The settlers Peel took with him were drawn from the working-classes, intended to provide the colony's labour under indenture. Another major (absentee) investor was Lieutenant-Colonel Peter A. Lautour, who obtained grants of 113,000 acres, dispatching eighty-five servants, considerable stock and goods per *Calista* and *Marquis of Anglesea*, which arrived in August 1829. Lautour's partner was his brother-in-law, banker Edward Marjoribanks of the Coutts banking family - and an LBS claimant. Some objected to this system as a form of 'limited slavery' in its exploitation of white workers: for example in December 1829 the East India Company Captain John Burton Gooch published a pamphlet offering *Important information to the agriculturist, mechanic, and labourer, who intends to emigrate to* *the new settlement of the Swan River*, which cautioned labourers against the system because

> the poor fellows must pay for their passage out to the Settlement; and, after a servitude of three, five, or seven years, as specified in the agreement or bond, they shall be rewarded with a grant of land. Now let us examine the modesty, as well as the equity of this proposal to the poor agriculturist, mechanic, and labourer; and I think I shall not find much difficulty in exposing this kidnapping and nefarious system. … I should wish to know what is the object of these gentlemen, who have already succeeded in deluding a number of these thoughtless beings into the trammels of a limited slavery, if it is not to turn their labour to a source of advantage to themselves, and deprive the labourer, by the obligation of the bond, of a fair remuneration for his exertions.[51]

The colonists who travelled to Swan River therefore comprised two distinct social classes– those paying their passage with their own funds and usually of the middle or upper-middle classes, and a group from the wide spectrum of agricultural, industrial trade and labouring classes.[52] Among this first group of settlers in 1829 were several families emigrating from the West Indies, instantiating the shift from Britain's declining 1820s slave economy towards investment in the new settler colonies, and exemplifying the previously overlooked role of slave wealth in the establishment of the Swan River colony.[53] One intriguing group appears to have migrated from Demerara, including Charles Dawson Ridley and James Walcott and their families, arriving in Western Australia in 1829.[54] This group had left the Caribbean in the early 1820s, perhaps prompted by the economic and political changes epitomized by the Demerara Rebellion of 1823 – although they retained some financial interest in the slave colonies, as indicated by their listing in 1834 as beneficiaries of compensation.

In Australia, these men were granted land which they 'improved' (farmed) and subsequently participated in colonial industrial and agricultural development, exploration, and governance. Ridley, for example, was awarded 1,750 acres of the best available land when the first grants were made on the 29th September 1830, at the junction of the Helena and the Swan Rivers, upstream of the new town of Guildford.[55] From his arrival Ridley was actively engaged in the colony's agricultural development, becoming the Secretary of the Agricultural Society, and promoting a range of schemes including the colonial Apprenticeship of 'Orphan and Destitute Children' in 1833, an export trade in jarrah timber in 1843, sandalwood in 1844, and (making close reference to his West Indies experience) a sugar industry in 1845. He formed part of an explorers' expedition to the south-east led by Lieutenant J. S. Roe in 1848.[56] Another figure, Adam Wallace Elmslie, whose West Indies family business had failed, accompanied Thomas Peel to the Swan River colony in 1829 as his agent.[57] Further beneficiaries of abolition in the LBS had close links to the Swan River colonists rather than emigrating themselves, or else migrated later, prompting other questions regarding their subsequent activities, including how they may have applied ideas and practices derived from slavery – or anti-slavery - in the new colony.

The Stirling and Peel schemes were the first to envisage 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. Swan River offered an opportunity for investors, including those withdrawing or diversifying from the Caribbean slave economy. Crucially, the new colony would be free, untainted by either slavery or convictism. Again, notably absent from these original Swan River schemes is a role for Aboriginal people in the colonial economy, despite their subsequent actual importance.

Wakefield and Swan River: How *not* to colonise

In 1828-9 as Stirling arrived in Swan River, the problem of colonization was taken up by Edward Gibbon Wakefield.[58] While imprisoned for abduction in Newgate gaol between 1827-1830 Wakefield became interested in debates about population, emigration, and labour. His anonymous *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia* was printed in June 1829, and then reprinted as an appendix to *A Letter from Sydney, the Principal Town of Australasia*, published in December (with the name of Robert Gouger as editor).[59] *A Letter from Sydney* purports to describe the condition of New South Wales from the perspective of a settler and presents Wakefield's proposal for an emigration system that would provide an efficient supply of land and labour.

As Tony Ballantyne has pointed out, *Letter from Sydney* owed much to his grandmother Priscilla Wakefield's ideas, and especially *Excursions in North America* (1806) in which she lamented the ways in which the colonists had 'dispersed' and polite society had disappeared in the New World societies.[60] In the same way, *Letter* argued that if settlement were concentrated, and waste lands of the crown were sold at a 'sufficient price', the speed at which colonial wage-earners could acquire land would be restricted. If the price for crown land were made high enough to discourage working-class buyers, the availability of labour and a 'civilised' society would attract capital, encourage emigration, assure prosperity, and justify responsible government. British society and civilization – for Wakefield, centred upon capitalism and the class system - could thus be recreated within the colonies. However, while his grandmother Priscilla was known for her antislavery tales for children, Edward's stance was more ambivalent.

A notable aspect of Wakefield's 1829 *Letter from Sydney* is the prominence of the institution of slavery as a reference point within his account. Given that at the time Wakefield wrote slavery was still in full swing across the British empire, with, as he noted, 'the number of slaves owned by Christians … increasing every day', this is not surprising. More remarkable is his explicit argument against free labour – and for racialized labour hierarchies - as an important element in colonial progress. While acknowledging contemporary anti-slavery views, he reworked key elements of the institution of slavery and these remained notable aspects of his theory, as evident in his continuing opposition to free labour, his arguments for non-white indentured labour in the Australasian colonies, and his contempt for Australian Aboriginal people. While he became more circumspect as the abolitionist movement reached its triumphant climax in 1833, these aspects of his scheme are at this stage clearly visible.

In *Letter*, Wakefield bowed to contemporary anti- slavery sentiment, for example in making his case for preventing the working classes from buying land, where he dismissed the suggestion that indented servants should be 'bound for life' because the English nation did not 'approve of white slavery.' [61] He noted the distinction between black slave and white convict, for example when over-worked indentured convict servant John finally rebels when mocked as a 'negur slave'.[62] Yet his jocular tone sometimes works to elide these categories, such as when he repeatedly terms transportation 'penal slavery' or simply 'slavery', or poses the dilemma of extracting labour from his mischievous, lazy, and rebellious assigned convict servants in lamenting that,

> I might have had them flogged, or, in colonial language, had 'their backs scarified,' whereby I should have punished them without losing their labour. This

> is the ordinary, because the most economical, mode of correcting our slaves; but, thanks to Fortune, I was not compelled to adopt it, being rich enough to indulge some foolish sentiments of tenderness and respect for all my fellow-creatures, not to mention tenderness and respect for myself. A necessary consequence, however, of this my abstract humanity and selfish pride, was, that I became the slave of my slaves. Can you imagine a more hateful existence?[63]

It is perhaps this playful, frequently ironic tone that in 1968 prompted Muriel Florence Lloyd Prichard, the editor of Wakefield's collected works, to conclude that Wakefield supported anti-slavery – an assessment subsequently accepted by many historians.[64] Indeed, abolition quickly became an effective justification of Wakefield's alternative concept of coercive ('concentrated' or 'combined') labour. However, as Wakefield formulated his theories in 1829, slavery provided an important and not completely abhorrent model for his theories regarding 'concentrated' labour. In a tactic commonly deployed by the pro-slavery lobby, Wakefield compared the harsh conditions of slaves with those of convicts to argue against 'dear' (waged or free) labour and the economic and ultimately social importance of transportation for the colonies. While convictism was 'a moral injury in one respect [it was of] great pecuniary benefit, and in that point of view a moral benefit, because wealth is the parent of civilization'.[65] Race was the key difference here- but precisely because Australian convicts had 'more rights and more reason than the black slaves of Virginia', the system produced 'more "insubordination," consequently, on the one hand, and on the other, more fear', with brutalising effects on the master.[66] Convict labour would be made redundant through Wakefield's colonizing mechanisms, including the imposition of a 'sufficient' price for land, and selection of young married emigrants - although convicts could still be employed in segregated communities.[67]

But Wakefield does more than problematise the distinction between plantation slavery and transportation to urge the value of coercive labour: he went further to argue explicitly for the value of importing African slaves. Notwithstanding any moral scruples, he began to 'hanker' for it as a means to mitigate the dispersed population, suggesting that 'a few thousand Negroes would be a great acquisition to New South Wales!' Not only would they make the colony more profitable, but would enhance the culture and even 'the *civilization* of these colonial landowners.' He asked, 'What made Lord --- a rich, well-educated, and agreeable gentleman?—The sweat, and blood, and tears of his and his father's slaves in Jamaica!' In a particularly forceful passage he went on to demand,

> What, then, are we to do, to obtain that desirable proportion between the demand and supply of labour, without which, I say, no country can flourish? Answer me that question satisfactorily, and I will tell you that Botany Bay is an earthly paradise. This, indeed, would be a glorious discovery. Call it an invention, or what you will, it must, whenever established in a country cursed with slavery, cause the natural, slow, easy death of that hideous monster. Fancy the slavery of America and South Africa in a slow consumption, and free labour growing up, healthy, strong, and cheerful, to supply its place! But I am dreaming—We have a right to presume that slavery will flourish in America and South Africa, until there shall be no more land to be obtained for next to nothing; and that the inhabitants of Australasia must, for hundreds of years to come, secretly long for a trade in human flesh. Tell me the time when the disproportion between the demand and supply of labour in America, South Africa, and Australasia will cease, and I will tell you when slavery will cease in America and South Africa, and when the Australasians will become a rich, instructed, refined, and highly civilized people. Meanwhile, I deliberately state it as my opinion, that a permission to obtain slaves from Africa would be most beneficial to these settlements, with a view only to wealth and civilization; and that if Australasia should become independent to-morrow, these people would find some means of establishing slavery in spite of all the saints. [68]

Perhaps this was merely intended as a provocation, designed to make his larger point through hyperbole. Nonetheless, considered within the larger trajectory of his work, it is striking that Wakefield never again gave slavery the explicit and important place that he did in *Letter*.

Wakefield rejected Smith's argument for the superiority of free labour, and specifically his emphasis on wages as motivation, instead arguing for the 'combination of labour' - best construed as readily-accessible and disciplined labour, whether performed by plantation slaves or the factory-workers of industrial Manchester. In particular, he directly attacked Smith's argument for 'cheap land and dear labour' in his 'Inquiry into the Causes of the Property of New Colonies', arguing that in America, slavery was a response of the civilised against 'the barbarizing tendency of dispersion' and was the capitalists' rational response to the frontier. [69] Wakefield remained sceptical of free labour, as evident in his 1835 introduction to Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations,* issued a few months after the Slavery Abolition Act 1833 was passed. While Wakefield expressed himself cautiously, Seymour Drescher noted that Wakefield was probably wary of alienating pro-abolition audiences 'in the full flush of national pride'.[70]

Wakefield's scheme was also fundamentally shaped by his views on race, which underlay his arguments for importing non-white labour. In a 'postscript' to his *Letter*, Wakefield proposed that non-white indentured labour might be employed in the Australasian colonies, by providing 'a free bridge between the settlements and those numerous over-peopled countries, by which they are, as it were, surrounded' – those of the Pacific Islands, India and especially, China. The Chinese, he argued, might 'not only supply the want of labourers now felt in the British Australasian settlements, but they might, in the course of a century, perhaps, convert the whole of this enormous wilderness into a fruitful garden'. He quoted authorities such as Sir George Staunton, who described how 'they apply to every industrious occupation, and obtain whatever care and labour can accomplish. They become, in town, retailers, clerks, and agents: in the country, they are farmers, and the principal *cultivators of the sugar cane*' (Wakefield's emphasis, no doubt in allusion to the possibility of developing that well-known tropical industry in southern latitudes). He asked,

> And is it not still more surprising that these British settlers, who would gladly purchase slaves at one hundred pounds per head, should not have procured labourers from Canton? The labouring classes there, I am credibly informed, frequently make offers to the masters of English ships to bind themselves to labour, without wages, during three days in the week, for a term of years, in return for a free passage to any British settlement.[71]

In this way Wakefield argued for a racial as well as class labour hierarchy in the Australasian settlements, in a vision that echoed his predecessors'.[72]

As many have pointed out, settler colonialism is premised upon the denial of indigenous culture and claims to land. Wakefield's early writing pays relatively little attention to indigenous peoples, however in Wakefield's 1835 edition of Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Wakefield revealed a deeply racialized view of human difference in defining Australian Aboriginal people as subhuman, challenging Smith's distinction between human and animal in arguing for trade as a fundamental human instinct. Wakefield stated that '[t]he savages of New Holland never help each other, even in the most simple operations; and their condition is hardly superior, in some respects it is inferior, to that of the wild animals which they now and then catch.'[73] No doubt this racialized disparagement explains his disregard of Aboriginal labour, despite its actual importance in Western Australia.[74] By 1837 when he published his *Colonization of New Zealand*, however, humanitarian concern focused upon the treatment of Indigenous people across the empire, and he devoted a chapter to the question of 'civilising' Maori - by then a necessary concession to humanitarian sentiment which insisted on addressing the damage inflicted by colonization.[75] During the 1820s, for Wakefield and his contemporaries, the creation of a class of free white colonial labour was defined explicitly as an alternative to slavery. [76] Four years before abolition triumphed, Wakefield offered his colonization scheme as a solution to the entwined challenges of emancipation and imperial expansion, in establishing an imperial division of labour.

Conclusion: Unhappy Mr Peel!

The first reports of the new Swan River colony arrived back in England in late January 1830, describing poor conditions and the land as unfit for agriculture. It was claimed (incorrectly) that the settlers were in a state of 'near starvation' and that the colony had been abandoned. As a result, many people cancelled their migration plans or went to other colonies instead – such as South Australia. One question prompted by these circumstances regards the relationship between abolition in 1834 and investment in South Australia, established in 1835: we might perhaps expect the most direct links between beneficiaries of compensation recorded in the LBS and this fresh field for investment. In Western Australia, further proposals for investment and labour supply continued to be made, including the settlement of Australind, established in 1840 by the Western Australian Company, of which Wakefield was a director.[77] Australind also canvassed the use of free labour from 'Hindostan' and the Malay archipelago, and was intended to provide a hub linking directly to India.[78] All of these schemes, imagined or realised, grappled with the problem of generating a source of colonial labour that avoided the appearance of slavery.

Wakefield's theory was influential within and beyond the British empire, fashioning a new political language to define empire, and linking emigration from Britain and colonial development through 'the mechanism of a regulated colonial land market'.[79] But as I have shown, Wakefield was not as original as is often claimed: many aspects of Wilmot Horton's thought, for example, were shared by Wakefield, despite their disagreement regarding free emigration of the poor. In 1834 Wakefield elaborated his theory using Swan River as a (counter) example, in the anonymously published *England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations*.[80] Among his numerous disparaging remarks, he wrote that

> The last colony founded by Englishmen, has severely felt the want of slavery …In this colony, there never has been a class of laborers. Those who went out as laborers, no sooner reached the colony than they were tempted, by the superabundance of good land, to become land-owners. One of the founders of the colony, Mr. Peel, who, it is said, took out a capital of 50,000l, and 300 persons of the laboring class,— men, women, and children,—has been left without a servant to make his bed, or to fetch him water from the river.

The Western Australian colonists themselves saw his critique as driven by competition with his own scheme, and the *Perth Gazette* declared indignantly in May 1835 that he was 'interested in influencing the public mind at home against us' and hoped that 'their palpable absurdity will carry with them their own refutation'.[81] But Wakefield's influence grew, while his attacks on Wilmot Horton, Peel, and Swan River hit their marks.

Much later, in 1867, Karl Marx mocked Wakefield's theory: 'Mr. Peel, he moans, took with him from England to Swan River, West Australia, means of subsistence and of production to the amount of £50,000. [but] Once arrived at his destination, 'Mr. Peel was left without a servant to make his bed or fetch him water from the river.' Unhappy Mr. Peel who provided for everything except the export of English modes of production to Swan River!'[82] Marx credited Wakefield with 'discovering' the 'truth as to the conditions of capitalist production in the mother country'- that is that 'that capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons', and he attacked Wakefield's capitalist vision, which aimed at healing 'the anti-capitalistic cancer of the colonies'. A number of scholars have thus noted the importance of Wakefield's analysis of Swan River in the development of Marxist theory as an example of how *not* to colonise – and the subversive potential of the colonial political and social order.[83]

The new Australian colony of Swan River was established in the midst of intensifying debates regarding slavery in the Caribbean, and its imagined futures express the complex and contested relationship between debates concerning emancipation, English over-population, paupers, emigration and colonization. At the same time that the making of the English working class was underway in Britain, a colonial labour force was also being devised for her new colonies. In political argument at this time 'free labour' was championed by anti-slavery campaigners, but opposed by those such as Moody and Wakefield, whose plans to introduce non-white labour to the new Australasian colonies still bore the imprint of slavery. In Wakefield's 1829 *Letter from Sydney,* prior to the elaboration of his well-known systematic colonization scheme, explicit links to slavery – such as his support for forced labour - had not yet been censored or disguised. Subsequently, Wakefield seized upon the unregulated basis for labour at Swan River as a perfect example of how *not* to colonise, buttressing his argument for the more circumspectly-phrased 'combination' of white labour. In reality Wakefield's scheme sanctioned increasing exploitation of and control over white working men in the colonies so as to maintain the British class system – as symbolized by his mocking picture of Thomas Peel as a gentleman who actually had to make his own bed. Yet his scheme was not so different from those of his contemporaries – as Captain Gooch pointed out in warning working men considering emigration to Swan River in 1829 against indenture to Peel as 'the trammels of a limited slavery'.

These debates also underscore the growing control of white labour in the colonies, whether convict or 'free'. As I have noted, the limits of white convict labour had always been contested due to its seeming similarity to slavery. Alan Atkinson, for example, identified the uneasy status of convicts as felons who could be argued to have been 'condemned to transportation alone, and not to bondage'.[84] During the 1820s their treatment indeed became increasingly harsh, and the convict regime came to be synonymous with confinement and hard labour.[85] In January 1836 Charles Darwin observed of convict labourers at Walerawang near the Blue Mountains in New South Wales that

> Although the farm was well stocked with every requisite, there was an apparent absence of comfort; and not even a single woman resided here. The sunset of a fine

> day will generally cast an air of happy contentment on any scene; but here, at this retired farmhouse, the brightest tints on the surrounding woods could not make me forget that forty hardened, profligate men, were ceasing from their daily labours, like the slaves from Africa, yet without their just claim for compassion.[86]

Darwin's comments expressed the typical abolitionist view, and the enduring opposition between slave rights and white worker rights, here extended to the colonies, where convicts represented the very lowest tier of white labour.
The humanitarian insistence on the distinction between the innocent black African, object of abolitionist compassion, and the sinful white convict, was crucial to creating, establishing and maintaining racial hierarchies that supported distinct racialized labour systems across Britain's 'Second Empire'.

Much research remains to be done regarding the diverse groups who participated in the British slave-economy, and their involvement in new colonization in Australia or Canada. Recovering the important transitional context for Swan River's establishment changes our view of colonization more broadly, helping us to see these places and histories within a shared historical framework, and prompting many questions about how they subsequently shaped Australia.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

I am very grateful to Ann Curthoys, Jeremy Martens, Zoë Laidlaw, Kirsten McKenzie, and Alan Lester for commenting on this paper.

[1] Raymond Smith, *The Negro Family in British Guiana,* London, 1956; Richard B. Sheridan, 'The Condition of slaves on the sugar plantations of Sir John Gladstone in the colony of Demerara 1812 to 1849', *New West Indian Guide* 76:3/4, 2002, pp. 243–269.

[2] Catherine Hall, 'The Slave-Owner and the Settler' in *Indigenous Networks: Indigenous Mobility and Exchange*, ed. Jane Carey and Jane Lydon, London, 2014. See also Catherine Hall, Nicholas Draper, Keith McClelland, Katie Donington and Rachel Lang, *Legacies of British Slave-ownership,* Cambridge, 2014.

---

[3] Catherine Hall, 'Writing History, Making "Race": Slave-Owners and their Stories', *Australian Historical Studies* 47, 2016, pp. 365-380; *Legacies of British Slave-ownership* project, https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/project/

[4] Emma Christopher, 'Dreams of a new plantation society: Legacies of British Slavery in Queensland, Australia', *Legacies of British Slavery Blog*, 25 July 2018 https://lbsatucl.wordpress.com/2018/07/25/dreams-of-a-new-plantation-society-legacies-of-british-slavery-in-queensland-australia/ ; Ann Curthoys, 'From Montserrat to Settler-Colonial Australia: the intersecting histories of Caribbean slave-owning families, transported British radicals, and Indigenous peoples', (unpublished paper, 2018); Georgie Arnott, "Legacies of British Slavery in Australia', (unpublished paper, 2017); Tracey Banivanua Mar, Nikita Vanderbyl and Alan Lester, ' The End of Caribbean Slave Ownership and the Beginning of Settler Colonialism in Australasia: The Montefiore Brothers and Celia Scott' (unpublished paper, 2018).

[5] Emilia Viotta da Costa, *Crowns of Glory, Tears of Blood: The Demerara Slave Rebellion of 1823*, New York, 1994.

[6] V. Harlow & F. Madden, eds., *British Colonial Developments 1774-1834*: *Select Documents*, Oxford, 1953, pp.560-4. The amelioration already underway in some West Indian colonies is assessed in J.R. Ward, *British West Indian Slavery, 1750-1834: The Process of Amelioration*, Oxford, 1988.

[7] Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, Chapel Hill, 1944; Nicholas Draper, '"Possessing slaves": ownership, compensation and metropolitan British society at the time of Emancipation', PhD thesis, London, 2008, pp.143-7; Robin Blackburn, *The Overthrow of Colonial Slavery, 1776-1848*, London, 1988, pp. 433-5; P. F. Dixon,

---

'The Politics of Emancipation: the Movement for the Abolition of Slavery in the British West Indies, 1807-1833', PhD Thesis, University of Oxford, 1970, p.340.

[8] Patrick Wallis, 'Labour Markets and Training', *The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Britain*, Volume 1, ed. Roderick Floud, Jane Humphries, Paul Johnson, Cambridge, 2003, pp. 178-207.

[9] See for example Blackburn, *Overthrow*, p. 465.

[10] Historians have hotly debated the 'degree to which abolitionism stimulated and reinforced domestic reform or provided "moral capital" for the ruling classes, unintentionally diverting attention from domestic issues like "wage slavery".' David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*, Oxford, 2006, p. 304; Seymour Drescher, 'Cart Whip and Billy Roller: Or Antislavery and Reform Symbolism in Industrializing Britain', *Journal of Social History* 15:1, Autumn 1981, p. 3; See also Patricia Hollis, 'Anti-Slavery and British Working-class Radicalism in the Years of Reform', in Christine Bolt and Seymour Drescher, ed., *Anti-Slavery, Religion and Reform: Essays in memory of Roger Anstey*, Folkestone, 1980, pp. 294-315.

[11] Emma Christopher, '"The Slave Trade is Merciful Compared to [This]": Slave Traders, Convict Transportation, and the Abolitionists', in *Many Middle Passages: Forced Migration and the Making of the Modern World*, ed. Emma Christopher, Cassandra Pybus and Marcus Rediker, Berkeley, 2007, pp. 109-128; Alan Atkinson, *The Europeans in Australia. Volume 1: The Beginning*, Sydney, 2016, pp. 58-59.

[12] Emma Christopher and Hamish Maxwell-Stewart, 'Convict transportation in global context, c.1700-88', in *The Cambridge History of Australia: Indigenous and Colonial Australia*, ed. Alison Bashford and Stuart Macintyre, Cambridge, 2016, pp. 68-90.

---

[13] Davis, *The Problem of Slavery*, p. 307-8, 311-12. Davis argues that this tension was overcome after 1830 when alliances between the two emerged.

[14] David Turley, *The Culture of English Antislavery, 1780-1860*, 1991, pp.18-46.

[15] E.g., David Brion Davis, *The problem of slavery in the age of revolution, 1770-1823*, Ithaca, NY, 1975; Seymour Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation*, Oxford, 2002, p. 54.

[16] Kirsten McKenzie, *Imperial Underworld: An Escaped Convict and the Transformation of the British Colonial Order*, Cambridge, 2016, p. 5; Zoë Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections 1815-1845: Patronage, The Information Revolution and Colonial Government*, Manchester, 2005.

[17] Zoë Laidlaw, 'Investigating Empire: Humanitarians, Reform and the Commission of Eastern Inquiry', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40:5, 2012, pp. 749-768.

[18] J. M. R. Cameron, 'The Foundation of Western Australia Reconsidered', *Studies in Western Australian History*, 3, 1978, pp. 1-17.

[19] Leslie R. Marchant, *France Australe: A study of French explorations and attempts to found a penal colony and strategic base in south western Australia 1503-1826*, Perth, 1982.

[20] J. M. R. Cameron, 'Prelude to colonization: James Stirling's examination of Swan River, March 1827', *Australian Geographer*, 12:4, 1973, pp. 309-327.

[21] Richard Charles Mills, *The Colonization of Australia (1829-42)*, Sydney, 1974 [1915], pp. 9-10.

[22] Stephen Peter Lamont, 'Robert Wilmot Horton and liberal Toryism', PhD thesis, University of Nottingham, 2015, p.12.

---

[23] R.N. Ghosh, ‘Malthus on Emigration and Colonization: Letters to Wilmot Horton’, *Economica*, 30:117, 1963, p. 45.

[24] Hansard, 3rd ser., vol 68, c.522, 6 April 1843; Douclas Pike, ‘Wilmot Horton and the national colonization society’, *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, 7:26, 1956, pp. 205-210.

[25] Wilmot’s pamphlet *The West India Question Practically Considered*, attracted a scathing response by the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*: ASR no 11 (30 Apr 1826), pp.168-70; ASR no 72 (1 Dec 1830), p. 508.

[26] See also Caroline Quarrier Spence, 2014. ‘Ameliorating Empire: Slavery and Protection in the British Colonies, 1783-1865’, Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

[27] Parliamentary Sessional Papers 1819 (529), p.9.

[28] Further, when the Commission of Eastern Enquiry was appointed in mid-1822, the abolitionists cited this precedent in securing WH’s agreement to place slavery on its agenda, and in urging the end of slavery. Zoë Laidlaw, ‘Investigating Empire: Humanitarians, Reform and the Commission of Eastern Inquiry’, *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 40:5, 2012, pp.749-768.

[29] Lamont, ‘Robert Wilmot Horton’, pp. 80-81.

[30] Pamela Statham-Drew, *James Stirling: Admiral and Founding Governor of Western Australia*, Perth, 2003, pp. 50-51.

[31] John Barrow, Admiralty, to Wilmot Horton, Colonial Office, 30 April, 1825, CO201/164 f46. 1817-1823.

[32] Australian historians have overlooked his family’s links to slavery, including business and family ties with the Virginian tobacco-growing Buchanans, later diversifying to the West Indies (LBS awardees). James’s brother Walter Stirling

---

represented the family business, and was a beneficiary of slave compensation in 1834: LBS https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/1407

[33] *Historical Records of Australia,* I, Vol xii, 777-80. Cameron traces some of these views to earlier proposals such as Swiss Jean Pierre Purry's 1745 *The Method for Determining the Best Climate on Earth*. See Cameron, 'The Foundation', p. 4.

[34] Cameron, 'The Foundation'.

[35] Reprinted in John Burton Gooch, *Important information to the agriculturist, mechanic, and labourer, who intends to emigrate to the new settlement of the Swan River*, London, 1829.

[36] Brown, Robert T. "Fernando Po and the Anti-Sierra Leonean Campaign: 1826-1834." *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 6:2, 1973, pp. 249–264.

[37] James Cameron, 'Thomas Moody, James Stirling and Swan River', *Early Days: Journal of the Royal Western Australian Historical Society* 11:3, 1997, pp. 320-337.

[38] LBS: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/6650 His wife's father, Richard Clement, owned estates in Barbados from 1799, and compensation of a little less than £10,000 was awarded to Moody's eldest son Hampden Clement.

[39] 'Reports by Commissioners of Inquiry into State of Africans apprenticed in West Indies. I Papers relating to Captured Negroes', Parliamentary Papers, 1825, (114) XXV.193, 68., and no. 3, 'Major Thomas Moody's Separate Report'; 'Reports by Commissioners of Inquiry into State of Africans apprenticed in West Indies: Part II. Of Major Moody's Report on Captured Negroes', PP, 1826, (81) XXVII.1.; for critique see *The Antislavery Monthly Reporter* 15, 1827, pp. 216–19; 18, 1827, pp. 262–4; 19, 1827, pp. 271–7; 24, 1827, pp. 386–7; *Morning Chronicle,* 7, 15 and 20 September 1826; Anita Rupprecht, '"When he gets among his countrymen, they tell

---

him that he is free": Slave Trade Abolition, Indentured Africans and a Royal Commission', *Slavery & Abolition* 33:3, September 2012, pp. 435–455.

[40] Moody was sent to Van Diemen's Land in 1831 as a commissioner to investigate the Black War. D. M. Young *The Colonial Office in the Early Nineteenth Century*, London, Longmans, 1961, pp. 71-74.

[41] James Cameron, 'Thomas Moody, James Stirling and Swan River', *Early Days: Journal of the Royal Western Australian Historical Society* 11:3, 1997, pp. 320-337.

[42] Moody to Hay, 6 August 1828, CO 3231155, 187; Hay to Moody, 7 August 1828, CO 324/93, 9. Stirling and Moody to Hay, 21 August 1828, *Historical Records of Australia*, III, vi, pp.586-7.

[43] Jan Breman, *On Mobilizing Labour for the Global Coffee Market: Profits from an Unfree Work Regime in Colonial Java*, Amsterdam, 2015.

[44] Moody to Wilmot Horton, 22 August 1828, Catton Collection. Derbyshire Record Office, Fond D3155, Wilmot-Horton of Osmaston and Catton Papers, 'C' series letter.

[45] Breman, *On Mobilizing Labour*, pp.197-99.

[46] Albert Schrauwers, 'The "Benevolent" Colonies of Johannes Van Den Bosch: Continuities in the Administration of Poverty in the Netherlands and Indonesia.', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43:2, 2001, pp. 298–328.

[47] Schrauwers, 'The "Benevolent" Colonies', p. 310.

[48] Stirling to Hay, 30 July 1828, *Historical Records of Australia*, III, vi, 58S-6; Hay to Moody, 2 November 1828, CO 324/91, 201-2. Letter by Captain Stirling and Major Moody to Under Secretary Hay. 21st August, 1828, in Official Papers relating to the Settlement at Swan River, West Australia, December 1826 – January 1830, in *HRA* Series III, Volume VI, pp. 551–640. Perhaps the abandonment of Moody's plan,

---

coinciding with his departure from the Colonial Office in mid-1828, reflect the ascendancy of the saints at this time.

[49] *The Times*, Monday, 2 Feb, 1829, p. 2.

[50] Alexandra Hasluck, *Thomas Peel of Swan River*, Oxford, 1965.

[51] Gooch, John Burton, *Important information to the agriculturist, mechanic, and labourer, who intends to emigrate to the new settlement of the Swan River*, London, 1829.

[52] Timothy Mazzarol, 'Tradition, Environment and the Indentured Labourer in Early Western Australia', *Studies in Western Australian History*, 3, 1978, pp. 30-37; James M. R. Cameron and Edwin K. G. Jaggard, eds, *Western Australian Readings*, Swan River Papers, Folio 5, Perth, 1977, unpaginated.

[53] There are 14 individuals (37 records) named as beneficiaries with links to WA in the LBS database, representing around 8% of the total named Australian individuals (and around 10% of the entries) for 'Australia' (160 individuals / 366 records). Of the LBS beneficiaries linked to WA, 35% (5/14) came on the first fleet(s).

[54] These are listed in the LBS: Ridley's entry notes that he was an 'Attorney of Demerara, later in Western Australia. Part of what appears to have been a group from Demerara moving to Western Australia c. 1830, including his partner James Walcott (q.v.).' In 1817 in Demerara James Walcott registered 65 enslaved people as proprietor, T71/397 G3 2289; his (?) brother John Walcott was awarded £7,256 18S 8D in 1836 at St Christopher, British Guiana: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/2146652229

[55] J.S. Battye, *Western Australia: a history from its discovery to the inauguration of the Commonwealth*, Oxford, 1924.

---

[56] These preliminary biographical links are the focus of continuing research. Jane Lydon, ‘From Demerara to Swan River’, Unpublished paper, Perth, 2018.

[57] CO201/229, p.522.

[58] Philip Temple, *A Sort of Conscience: The Wakefields*, Auckland, 2003.

[59] Edward Gibbon Wakefield, *Letter From Sydney, The Principal Town Of Australasia*, *Together With The Outline Of A System Of Colonization,* Robert Gouger ed., London, 1829. The text of the original articles from the *Morning Chronicle* between 21 August to 6 October 1829 appears to be identical to the published book version.

[60] Tony Ballantyne, ‘The theory and practice of empire building: Edward Gibbon Wakefield and “systematic colonization’, in *The Routledge history of western empires,* ed. Robert Aldrich and Kirsten McKenzie, London, 2014, pp. 92–3.

[61] Wakefield, *Letter*, p.22.

[62] Wakefield, *Letter*, 26. He acknowledges that convicts have more rights, p. 57.

[63] Wakefield, *Letter*, p.10.

[64] M.F. Lloyd Prichard, *The Collected Works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield,* Glasgow, 1968, p. 166.

[65] Wakefield, *Letter*, pp. 70-78.

[66] Wakefield, *Letter*, p. 98.

[67] Wakefield, *Letter*, p.190

[68] Wakefield, *Letter*, p.42.

[69] Wakefield, *Letter*, ‘A New People’, p. 146.

[70] Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment,* p. 161.

[71] Wakefield, *Letter*, p. 201.

---

[72] Wakefield's arguments for non-white labour were indeed reflected in small groups of Indian and Chinese indentured and servant labour: Angela Woollacott, *Settler Society in the Australian Colonies: Self-Government and Imperial Culture,* Oxford, 2015, pp. 38-66.

[73] Edward Gibbon Wakefield, 'Commentary', in Adam Smith, *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, London, 1843, volume I, p. 27.

[74] Penelope Hetherington, *Settlers, Servants and Slaves: Aboriginal and European Children in the Nineteenth-Century in Western Australia*, Perth, 2002.

[75] Ballantyne, 'The theory and practice of empire building', p. 93.

[76] Michael Radzevicius, 'England Elsewhere: Edward Gibbon Wakefield and an Imperial utopian dream', PhD Thesis, The University of Adelaide, 2011.

[77] Such proposals included that of Stirling's father-in-law, James Mangles, who in January 1831 proposed to import convict labour to Swan River, and Lautour, who suggested sending 300 agricultural labourers who had been convicted in the Swing riots.

[78] E.L. Burgess, 'The Settlement at Australind', Western Australian Historical Society: Journal and Proceedings, New Series 11 (October 1939), pp.

[79] Ballantyne, 'The theory and practice of empire building'.

[80] It is tempting to wonder whether Elmslie was the source for Wakefield's famous attack on Peel: 'My authority for this statement is a gentleman, lately in England, who went to the Swan River as Mr Peel's agent.' Edward Gibbon Wakefield, *England and America,* London, 1833, Vol.II, p. 33. Hasluck details Elmslie's barrage of complaints about Peel: Hasluck, *Thomas Peel,* pp.90-92.

[81] *Perth Gazette,* May 1835.

---

[82] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, 1867, p. . https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Das_Kapital_Volume_One/Chapter_33#endnote_2

[83] H. O. Pappe, 'Wakefield and Marx', *The Economic History Review* 4:1, 1951, pp.88-97; Gabriel Piterberg and Lorenzo Veracini, Wakefield, Marx, and the world turned inside out', *Journal of Global History* 10, 2015, pp. 457–478.

[84] Alan Atkinson, 'The Free-born Englishman Transported: Convict Rights as a Measure of Eighteenth-century Empire', *Past and Present* 144, 1994, pp.94-8.

[85] Lisa Ford and David Andrew Roberts, 'New South Wales Penal Settlements and the Transformation of Secondary Punishment in the Nineteenth-Century British Empire', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 15:3, 2014 *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/cch.2014.0038 (unpaginated)

[86] Charles Darwin, *Voyage of the Beagle*, London, 1989, p. 323.