

Student Work

6-1-1965

Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the development of his theory of "Systematic Colonization"

Robert J. Shultz

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Shultz, Robert J., "Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the development of his theory of "Systematic Colonization"" (1965). *Student Work*. 443.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/443>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

EDWARD GIBBON WAKEFIELD
AND THE
DEVELOPMENT OF HIS THEORY
OF "SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION"

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of History
and the
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies
University of Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Robert J. Shultz

June 1965

UMI Number: EP73081

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73081

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the College of Graduate Studies of the University of Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

	<u>Stanley Beckell</u>	<u>(History)</u>
	Chairman	Department
Graduate Committee	<u>Paul L. Burk</u>	<u>History</u>
	Name	Department
	<u>Erff Lum</u>	<u>History</u>
	<u>E. J. Steele</u>	<u>Economics</u>
		<u>Rep. Grad. Council</u>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. EDWARD GIBBON WAKEFIELD	5
Biographical Sketch	
Character Sketch	
III. THE THEORY OF "SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION" AND ITS DEVELOPMENT	42
Early Stages	
In <u>A Letter From Sydney</u>	
In <u>England and America</u>	
In <u>Testimony Before the House of Commons</u>	
Select Committee on the Disposal of	
Land in British Colonies	
Later Stages	
In <u>Testimony Before the House of Commons</u>	
Select Committee on South Australia	
In <u>A View of the Art of Colonization</u>	
Summary of the Wakefield Theory of	
"Systematic Colonization"	
IV. THE "WAKEFIELDIANS" OR COLONIAL REFORMERS . .	100
Introduction	
Sir William Molesworth	
Charles Buller	
Robert Torrens	
Lord Durham	
Conclusion	

	Page
V. "SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION" IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND	128
South Australia	
New Zealand	
VI. CONCLUSION	153
APPENDIX A	159
APPENDIX B	161
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	162

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It would be impossible to acknowledge and express my appreciation to everyone who played some role in completing this thesis. They are too numerous and I owe them too much to adequately say what I feel. I would, however, like to express my gratitude to the staff of the Gene Eppley Library at the University of Omaha for their many services. In particular, I extend my deepest and most sincere gratitude to Miss Ella Jane Dougherty, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, for the many invaluable services she rendered to me by securing the needed materials to complete this project.

My appreciation is also extended to the members of the faculty in the Department of History at the University of Omaha. They have all cheerfully given of their time and effort to help me. I owe Dr. A. Stanley Trickett, Chairman, a special and humble debt of gratitude. He guided and directed me in researching and writing this thesis, and without his skill, criticisms, suggestions, and encouragement, I fear this project would not have been completed. To Dr. Trickett, I offer a special heartfelt "thank you."

I would also like to pay a special tribute to my wife, Jan, who typed the manuscript innumerable times. In addition, she has given me constant support and invaluable criticisms. Without her patience and encouragement, this work would still be in the embryo stage.

Aside from the obligations expressed above, I must add one additional comment. Any errors within the scope of this work are my responsibility. I have made the final decision on every statement in this thesis, and I am solely responsible for them.

June, 1965

Robert J. Shultz

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the mid-nineteenth century, the British people experienced a revival of interest in expanding their empire. This renewed interest was, in part, a result of the publication of Edward Gibbon Wakefield's book, A Letter From Sydney, in 1829. This remarkable work vividly described the conditions then existing in New South Wales, Australia, a British penal colony founded on the coast of Australia in 1788. In his work, Wakefield declared that the lack of an adequate labor supply was responsible for most of the misery then prevalent in the Australian settlements. To overcome this deficiency, he propounded a new theory which he called "systematic colonization."

Following this initial expression of his theory in 1829, Wakefield expanded and developed his ideas on colonization in a second work, England and America, published in 1833. His mature views on the subject were set forth in 1849, in A View of the Art of Colonization. It is the purpose of this thesis to trace the development of Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization" from 1829 to 1849, and to show how this theory was applied in South Australia and New Zealand.

Wakefield's theory combined the economic, social, and political aspects of colonization into one unified, comprehensive theory. In his statement of views on colonization, Wakefield presented a powerful, logical argument for founding new colonies. This plan, and the attempts to implement it, profoundly affected the subsequent course of the British Empire.

In studying the development of Wakefield's theory, it is necessary to know something about his life. The second chapter of this paper is a sketch of his life and character. Chapter three, the heart of this work, is concerned with the development and expansion of the theory of "systematic colonization" through Wakefield's writing and the testimony he gave before several select committees of Parliament. In the course of his life and the development of his theory, Wakefield relied upon a small group of friends to aid him. The fourth chapter gives a brief sketch of the four most important people involved with Wakefield. Having first propounded his ideas in 1829, Wakefield constantly worked and schemed to get them accepted by the Colonial Office. From 1830 through 1850, Wakefield struggled with the officials of that office. Chapter five discusses the quarrel between Wakefield and the Colonial Office and deals with the attempts to found colonies in South Australia and New Zealand according to the theory of "systematic colonization." In the last chapter, Wakefield, his theory, and the settlement of South Australia and New Zealand, are

reviewed and an attempt is made to place these ideas and activities in proper perspective.

The major primary sources for a study of Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization" are, of course, his own writings. Other primary sources that must be used are the British Sessional Papers and Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.

Of the four major biographies of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, only the first and last are worthy of particular notice. Richard Garnett's Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand (London, 1898), was the first major study of Wakefield's life. Garnett's work, while quite sound and highly interpretive, suffers from a lack of objectivity. It is a very romantic view of Wakefield's follies and exploits. The most recent and best study of Wakefield is Paul Bloomfield's Edward Gibbon Wakefield: Builder of the British Commonwealth (London, 1961). Bloomfield has done an admirable piece of research upon Wakefield's life, particularly in his investigation of the relationship with the Colonial Office. Both Garnett and Bloomfield, however, neglected the development of Wakefield's theory and how it was modified by his experiences and reason. The other two biographies of Gibbon Wakefield, while reputable, are of a more popular nature. Angus John Harrop's The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield (London, 1928), has something of a sensational character. Its greatest shortcoming, though, is the author's obvious hero-worship of Wakefield. Irma O'Connor's Edward Gibbon Wakefield:

The Man Himself (London, 1928), gives a remarkable insight into Wakefield's character, but this work must be used with some degree of care, for the author (Wakefield's great-granddaughter) is extremely defensive about her subject's early life.

Only one secondary work needs to be mentioned. Richard C. Mills's, Colonization of Australia (1829-1842): The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building (London, 1915), is the most comprehensive study in existence of the application of Wakefield's theory in the settlement of South Australia. It is, unfortunately, now somewhat outdated and in need of major revision, especially because of the massive amount of new material available on the subject. Until such a revision is made, or a completely new study appears, Mills's work will remain the standard treatise on the subject. When used with the afore-mentioned biographies and Mills's work, The Cambridge History of the British Empire, a standard reference for almost any topic concerning the British Empire, serves as a valuable aid for gaining an understanding of Wakefield and his theory of "systematic colonization."

CHAPTER II

EDWARD GIBBON WAKEFIELD

Biographical Sketch

Edward Gibbon Wakefield, the eldest son of Edward and Susanna Wakefield, was born in London on March 20, 1796.¹ His parents were Quakers and raised him in an atmosphere of aggressive philanthropy.² In early life, ". . . the serious influences which surrounded Wakefield's youth were of a humanitarian nature. . . ." ³ While in later life this philanthropic rearing showed, he did not follow the humanitarian Quaker way of life in his youth.

Wakefield received his name from his great-grandmother, Isabella Gibbon, a distant relative of Edward Gibbon, the famed historian.⁴ His father knew intimately many of the leading intellectuals of the time. These friends

¹Paul Bloomfield, Edward Gibbon Wakefield: Builder of the British Commonwealth (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1961), p. 15.

²Richard Garnett, Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1898), p. 12.

³Ibid.

⁴Richard C. Mills, Colonization of Australia 1829-42: The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd., 1915), p. 76.

included Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, and Francis Place. This circle of acquaintances expected much from Edward Gibbon Wakefield.⁵ In some respects, Wakefield lived up to those scholarly and humanitarian ancestors but fell far short of those high standards in other ways.

Wakefield received his first formal education at Westminster school.⁶ He began there on January 13, 1808, and left in September, 1810.⁷ From Westminster school, he moved to Edinburgh High School, and remained there until January, 1812.⁸ At Edinburgh he received his last bit of formal schooling.

In 1814, Wakefield became secretary to William Hill, the British envoy to the Court in Turin.⁹ Though assigned to Turin, Wakefield spent much time in Genoa, both for business and pleasure. Later, he was transferred to Paris where,

⁵Ibid. Bentham and Mill were philosophers and economists. Place was a radical philosopher and author.

⁶"Edward Gibbon Wakefield," British Authors of the Nineteenth Century, ed. Stanley J. Kunitz (1960), p. 641. Hereafter cited as British Authors of the Nineteenth Century.

⁷Edward Irving Carlyle, "Edward Gibbon Wakefield," Dictionary of National Biography, ed. (Sir) Leslie Stephen, XX (1922), p. 449. Hereafter cited as D. N. B.

⁸Garnett, p. 15.

⁹Angus John Harrop, The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928), p. 16. William Hill later became Lord Berwick.

during a brief assignment, he was introduced to the frivolous local society.¹⁰

In 1816, Wakefield eloped with Eliza Susan Pattle, an heiress and ward in chancery.¹¹ Her father had been a wealthy East Indian Merchant.¹² The marriage ceremony was performed on August 10, 1816, in London; but, there is some controversy over whether the two runaways had undergone an earlier ceremony in Edinburgh.¹³

Following the London ceremony, Wakefield returned to Turin with his bride, where he was appointed Secretary to the Under-Secretary of the British Legation.¹⁴ Wakefield and his wife, however, lived primarily in Genoa as he had done previously.¹⁵

The marriage to Eliza Susan Pattle had several immediate effects for Wakefield. It improved his official position and enhanced his social status. Most importantly, the marriage made him secure financially.¹⁶

¹⁰Ibid., p. 17.

¹¹British Authors of the Nineteenth Century, p. 641.

¹²Garnett, pp. 19-20.

¹³Bloomfield, p. 38. Bloomfield says there is no doubt about the earlier ceremony. Garnett and Harrop merely speculate on the possibility of an earlier ceremony.

¹⁴Garnett, p. 22.

¹⁵Harrop, p. 20.

¹⁶Bloomfield, p. 39. Wakefield was not so secure that he was wealthy for life. (Garnett, p. 22.)

Two children blessed the short marriage of Wakefield and his wife. The first, a daughter named Susan Priscilla (Nina), was born in Genoa on December 4, 1817.¹⁷ The second, a son named Edward Jerningham, was born in London on June 25, 1820.¹⁸ The second child, however, cost Eliza her life, as she died on July 5, 1820, of complications following Edward Jerningham's birth.¹⁹ Wakefield long resented his son for causing Eliza's death.²⁰

Wakefield returned to Turin following Eliza's death.²¹ Upon arrival in Turin, he learned he had been transferred to the Paris office and appointed Secretary-General.²² Wakefield's return to Paris marked his second entrance into Parisian society.²³ At that time he had a series of minor brushes with the law because of mischievous adventures.²⁴

While in Paris, Wakefield, his brother, William, and his step-mother, Frances, planned the abduction of Ellen Turner, an heiress attending school in Manchester, England.²⁵

¹⁷Harrop, p. 20.

¹⁸Garnett, p. 22.

¹⁹Bloomfield, pp. 43-44.

²⁰Ibid., p. 44. Garnett emphasizes this point more than Bloomfield.

²¹British Authors of the Nineteenth Century, p. 641.

²²D. N. B., XX, 449. See also, Garnett, p. 23.

²³Harrop, p. 20.

²⁴Garnett, p. 23.

²⁵Ibid., p. 31. See also, The Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 316. Hereafter cited as Annual Register.

They planned to lure her away from school and persuade her to marry Edward. Such a marriage, they thought, would open the doors of Parliament to young Edward.²⁶ Ellen's father, William, had an estimated yearly income of £5,000.²⁷ The Wakefield's interest in Ellen, however, centered not only upon her expected inheritance, but also upon her social position.²⁸

On March 7, 1826, the three Wakefields and their servant, Edward Thevenot, carried out their plot. They went to Manchester, where Ellen attended a school operated by the Misses Margaret, Phoebe, Elizabeth, Anne, and Catherine Daulby.²⁹ On the trumped up pretext that Ellen's mother was gravely ill, they persuaded the Daulby's to allow Ellen to leave the school with them.³⁰ The abductors then convinced Ellen that her father was bankrupt and told her that, if she wished to save him from his debtors, she must marry Edward Gibbon Wakefield.³¹ They told her, to make the

²⁶Harrop, p. 41. Garnett and Bloomfield indicate the social advantages interested Wakefield more than the financial.

²⁷Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 316.

²⁸Harrop, p. 41.

²⁹Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 316.

³⁰Charles Whibley, Review of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, by Richard Garnett, Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV (December, 1898), p. 822.

³¹The Edinburgh Review, XLVII (January, 1828), p. 100.

marriage suggestion more feasible, that her father owed money to an uncle of Edward's. If she would agree to marry Wakefield they said, the uncle would not force her father into bankruptcy.³² The alleged amount William Turner owed Wakefield's fictitious uncle was £60,000.³³ Ellen agreed to the marriage and the party traveled to Gretna Green, Scotland, to have the ceremony performed.³⁴

At Gretna Green, the couple took their vows according to the rites of the Scottish Church in a ceremony conducted by David Laing (a drunken blacksmith famous for performing runaway marriages).³⁵ Ellen Turner did not appear distressed or unduly upset about her strange fate. At a party following the ceremony, everyone appeared satisfied with the turn of events.³⁶

When the party broke up, the newly married couple traveled to London, then to Dover, and then on to Calais, supposedly looking for Ellen's father.³⁷ Meanwhile, her father, his brother, Robert, another uncle named Critchly, and a Bow Street Magistrate pursued the runaway pair to London.³⁸ William Turner remained in London while the others

³²Annual Register, LXIX (1827), pp. 318-320.

³³Ibid., p. 320.

³⁴Ibid., p. 321.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 324-325.

³⁶Harrop, p. 28.

³⁷Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 321.

³⁸Ibid.

went to Calais, where they caught the couple. When confronted by her relatives, Wakefield staunchly maintained the marriage had not been consummated, and even signed a statement saying the same.³⁹ Ellen's relatives, despite Wakefield's pleas, took her back to London with them.⁴⁰

Shortly thereafter, Wakefield wrote to his brother William and told him to leave England if he wished to avoid being arrested. Edward added that he intended to return to England from Calais and if need be, stand trial.⁴¹ A few days later, Wakefield did return to England to face the shambles he had made of his life.⁴² In the meantime, William had been arrested in Dover.⁴³

The three Wakefields and Edward Thevenot were indicted at the Lancaster Assizes of August, 1826, and charged with forcefully abducting Ellen Turner against her will.⁴⁴ Their trial was eventually held March 23, 1827.⁴⁵

Between the indictment of the Wakefields and their trial, the Turner abduction was a popular topic of discussion in Britain.⁴⁶ On the day of the trial, Lancaster,

³⁹Ibid., p. 322. The signed statement is reprinted. It is a very interesting document.

⁴⁰Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV (December, 1898), p. 823.

⁴¹Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 322.

⁴²Harrop, p. 32.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 33.

⁴⁵Garnett, p. 31.

⁴⁶Harrop, p. 39.

crowded with curious people, took on the air of a circus.⁴⁷

Edward, William, and Frances Wakefield were all found guilty of abducting Ellen Turner, but the charges of using force were thrown out.⁴⁸ Sentencing of the trio was set for May 14, 1827. Between the trial and the day of sentencing, Edward Gibbon Wakefield was lodged at Lancaster Castle.⁴⁹ The Wakefield brothers were sentenced to three years imprisonment on May 14, 1827. Edward Gibbon Wakefield served his prison term at Newgate Prison in London, and William served his prison term at Lancaster Castle.⁵⁰ Frances Wakefield, though found guilty, was not called up to be sentenced.⁵¹

The Turner Affair, while it appeared to have ended in total disgrace for Wakefield, had several interesting subsequent developments. David Laing, the blacksmith who married Edward Gibbon Wakefield and Ellen Turner, had been summoned to testify at the trial. While returning from Lancaster to Gretna Green, he caught a chill and died at seventy-two years of age.⁵²

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 33.

⁴⁸Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 326. No mention is made of Edward Thevenot after he was indicted with the Wakefields.

⁴⁹Harrop, p. 39.

⁵⁰Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 326.

⁵¹Garnett, p. 31.

⁵²Harrop, p. 40.

On May 15, 1827, the day following the sentencing of the Wakefield brothers, William Turner petitioned the House of Lords to annul the Scottish marriage between his daughter, Ellen, and Edward Gibbon Wakefield.⁵³ Several weeks later, Lord Redesdale introduced a bill for this purpose. A second bill for the same purpose was introduced into the House of Commons and shortly thereafter, moved for reading by Sir Robert Peel.⁵⁴ The measures passed both Houses and, thus, by Act of Parliament, the marriage between Ellen Turner and Edward Gibbon Wakefield was annulled in May, 1828.⁵⁵

Ellen Turner, in 1829, married a Mr. Legh. The marriage lasted only two years, for in 1831, she died in childbirth.⁵⁶ By that time, however, Edward Gibbon Wakefield had started his self-redemption, and his book, A Letter From Sydney, written in prison, first appeared in late 1829.

When Wakefield entered Newgate prison, his life appeared ruined. He had disgraced himself and his family. Newgate, however, proved to be Wakefield's salvation. To pass the time, he studied penal reforms, colonial policies, and colonial reforms.⁵⁷ He wrote several articles on penal

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Annual Register, LXIX (1827), p. 326.

⁵⁶Bloomfield, p. 74. See also, Garnett, p. 33, n. 1. No one appears to have any additional information on this mysterious Mr. Legh.

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 44-46.

reform which were warmly received by the Spectator, a responsible journal with a "radical" viewpoint.⁵⁸ While studying penal reform, Wakefield became interested in the transportation of convicts to Australasia. This led to a study of the penal settlements in Australia. As a result of this study he reached the conclusion that it was a lack of adequate labor that caused the misery which was so typical of the Australian colonies. He then conceived a plan to overcome this labor shortage.⁵⁹

Wakefield set forth his new scheme for improving colonization in a pamphlet called, Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia.⁶⁰ This pamphlet was printed, but not published, in 1829.⁶¹ Wakefield quickly changed his writing to the epistle style in order to present his plan in a more attractive and readable form.⁶² A series of articles in the Morning Chronicle, which appeared during August, September, and October of 1829, developed the scheme.⁶³ Late in 1829, these articles were brought together and published in book form, under the title, A Letter From Sydney.⁶⁴ The articles and the book appeared under the name of Robert Gouger, as Wakefield's disgrace and the fact that he did

⁵⁸ Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV (December, 1898), p. 825. See also, British Authors of the Nineteenth Century, p. 641.

⁵⁹ Mills, p. 85.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 82.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

not have a name as an authority on colonization, would have made the use of his own name inappropriate.⁶⁵ Gouger, a former colonist in New South Wales, was known as a colonial reformer.⁶⁶

The contents of A Letter From Sydney remained essentially unchanged from the earlier articles, except for those instances where Wakefield expanded upon the original material. The appendix to the book was essentially the same as the earlier pamphlet, Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia.⁶⁷

Wakefield set forth his plan of "systematic colonization" at a fortunate time. Transportation facilities and commercial activities had developed to a point which made such a plan feasible.⁶⁸ In addition, Wakefield's theory got at the very heart of the colonial problem--the lack of an adequate labor force, and the need to develop responsible self-government.⁶⁹

In his plan of "systematic colonization," Wakefield proposed to bring land, labor, and capital into a harmonious

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 78. Wakefield's name did not appear on the title page of any of his works until A View of the Art of Colonization was published in 1849.

⁶⁶Garnett, p. 60. Gouger later became Secretary for the Colony of South Australia.

⁶⁷Mills, pp. 82-83. According to Mills, the appendix was merely a refined copy of the pamphlet.

⁶⁸Garnett, p. 71.

⁶⁹Harrop, p. 205, and Garnett, p. 71.

ratio through control of the number of emigrants, the amount of land used, and the capital invested in the colonies. The key to achieving this balance was charging a fixed, uniform, "sufficient price" for all land, with the revenue from the sale of land to be used to bring more emigrants from Great Britain into the colony.⁷⁰

A Letter From Sydney had a dual purpose. It gave a vivid picture of the economic, social, and political conditions then existing in New South Wales. Secondly, it offered a solution to the major problems facing New South Wales: the shortage of labor, the lack of responsible self-government, and the decline in the skills of civilization in the people who had voluntarily emigrated to Australia, but had succumbed to the violent and barbarous manners of the freed convicts.

The Wakefield scheme, advanced in A Letter From Sydney, started agitation for colonial reform and "systematic colonization."⁷¹ It had a strong impact because Wakefield wrote as a settler who could not work the land he owned because of the scarcity of labor. Because almost everyone could get a free grant of land, the settler could not sell his land. Convict labor, though easily procured in New South Wales, was insufficient, unreliable, and limited;

⁷⁰D. N. B., XX, 450.

⁷¹Lillian C. A. Knowles, The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire, (2d ed.; London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1928), p. 101.

also inherent in its use was the possibility of the settler being murdered.

A Letter From Sydney, while it contained a feasible economic theory, is also important because it ranks with the finest pieces of literature produced in prison.⁷² It is even more brilliant when it is remembered that Wakefield had never been a colonist, or even visited a colony. Yet, by his superb imagination and solid research, he accurately described the conditions in New South Wales.⁷³

Shortly after A Letter From Sydney was published, Edward Gibbon Wakefield walked out of Newgate prison a free man. His post-prison years were to see the development of a career marked by devotion to high ideals and humanitarian philanthropy.⁷⁴ These new goals and achievements, however, were not achieved without difficulty. Because of the Ellen Turner abduction and the resulting prison term, Wakefield was forever denied access to public life and polite society.⁷⁵ He had to work behind-the-scenes and through other people to execute his ideas.⁷⁶

Immediately following his release from Newgate, Wakefield accompanied his cousin, John Head, to Ipswich,

⁷²Garnett, p. 58.

⁷³Mills, p. 84.

⁷⁴Wakefield was released in May, 1830.

⁷⁵Mills, p. 77.

⁷⁶C. E. Carrington, The British Overseas: Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers (Cambridge: University Press, 1950), p. 329.

where he stayed for some time, visiting his aging and ill grandmother.⁷⁷ From Ipswich, he returned to London and in 1830, founded the National Colonization Society.⁷⁸

This group grew out of blunderings in founding a settlement on the Swan River, in 1829 and 1830, at what is the present site of Perth, in Western Australia.⁷⁹ In settling Western Australia, no comprehensive plan had been followed. It was this factor that had helped to spur the formation of the National Colonization Society. The Society advocated colonization according to the principles set forth in A Letter From Sydney, and based its program upon three of Wakefield's contentions; the need for careful selection of emigrants, the concentration of settlers, and the sale of land at a fixed, uniform, "sufficient price" to provide funds for new emigrants.⁸¹ As Wakefield put it, emigration should take place within the framework of "systematic colonization."⁸²

Robert Gouger, the man who had loaned the use of his name to Wakefield's first book, was elected the first

⁷⁷Garnett, pp. 81-83.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 83.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 85.

⁸⁰D. N. B., XX, 450.

⁸¹A. Grenfell Price, "Experiments in Colonization," Australia, Vol. VII, Part I of The Cambridge History of the British Empire, ed. J. Holland Rose, A. P. Newton, and E. A. Benians (8 vols.; Cambridge: University Press, 1933), p. 214. Hereafter cited as C. H. B. E.

⁸²Hugh Edward Egerton, A Short History of British Colonial Policy (London: Methuen and Company, 1897), p. 281.

secretary of the Society.⁸³ Gouger and Wakefield later disagreed over the price to be charged for land and this quarrel momentarily split the colonial reform movement.

In 1831, the National Colonization Society converted Lord Howick, the Under-Secretary of the Colonial Office, to accept the Wakefieldian principle of selling land at a fixed, uniform price.⁸⁴ His conversion led to the issuance of the "Ripon Regulations" in February, 1831.⁸⁵ These "Regulations" abolished free land grants and instituted land sales at public auction at a minimum, upset price of five shillings per acre in New South Wales.⁸⁶ This development constituted a major victory for the Colonization Society because the "Ripon Regulations" implicitly recognized Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization."⁸⁷

Between 1831 and 1833, Wakefield and his followers tried to form a joint-stock company to found a colony in Australia to be based upon land sales and the resulting emigration.⁸⁸ They were supported in Parliament by W. W.

⁸³C. H. B. E., VII, I, 214.

⁸⁴Ibid. See also, Egerton, p. 282.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶C. Manning Clark, Sources of Australian History, (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 143. See also, C. H. B. E., VII, I, 214.

⁸⁷Carrington, p. 330.

⁸⁸C. H. B. E., VII, I, 214.

Whitmore and Colonel Robert Torrens.⁸⁹ They were opposed by Lord Coderich, Lord Stanley, and James Stephen.⁹⁰

After 1829, Wakefield's name was associated with several other "scientific theories" of colonization similar to his own scheme.⁹¹ People who accepted these new ideas were called "Systematic Colonizers," or more commonly, Colonial Reformers and "Radical Imperialists."⁹² This group of reformers generally took the part of the colonists.⁹³ By doing so, they aroused public interest in the colonies and Empire. This interest had been dormant since the British defeat in the American Revolution.⁹⁴

Wakefield regarded 1830, the date of the formation of the National Colonization Society, as the beginning of his movement for colonial reform.⁹⁵ Wakefield called the members of this organization, believed to be less than one

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰Ibid. The "Ripon Regulations," issued while Lord Goderich was colonial secretary, were opposed by him.

⁹¹Egerton, p. 4.

⁹²Clark, p. 144. The term "Systematic Colonizers" was used at that time. "Colonial Reformers" came into use shortly thereafter. "Radical Imperialists," the most commonly used term today, is a recently coined phrase.

⁹³Carrington, p. 326.

⁹⁴Garnett, p. 71.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 84.

dozen, the "theorists of 1830."⁹⁶ The "theorists of 1830," were responsible for the success of colonial reform in the following decade.

The formation of the Colonization Society gives a clear indication of one of the ways Wakefield achieved his success--working through other people. Wakefield attracted influential people to his movement.⁹⁷ One of the first such men he won over was Robert Stephen Rintoul, the editor of the Spectator.⁹⁸ From the very start Rintoul opened his publication to Wakefield and the "theorists of 1830."⁹⁹ Rintoul, a Scotsman from Dundee, first worked for the Atlas, then the Spectator. He has been described as a ". . . clear-headed, practical and at the same time tenacious and loyal . . ." man.¹⁰⁰

Colonel Robert Torrens was the second important figure Wakefield converted to his cause.¹⁰¹ Torrens, a member of Parliament for Ashburton, at first opposed the

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 85. Wakefield, in giving evidence before the Committee on Colonial Lands in 1836, used the phrase, "theorists of 1830."

⁹⁷J. L. Morison, "Emigration and Land Policy, 1815-1873," The Growth of the New Empire 1783-1870, C. H. B. E., II, 449.

⁹⁸Garnett, p. 89.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹D. N. B., XX, 450. Torrens was interested in the Irish problems of the time. At an earlier time, he advocated sending Irish emigrants abroad, thereby cutting down the population of Ireland and helping to ease the miserable conditions of the Irish poor.

Wakefield scheme, but he either changed his views or the Colonization Society changed its platform, for shortly after its formation Torrens joined.¹⁰² For the next several years, Torrens led the fight in Parliament for colonial reform.

Another important figure to accept the Wakefield program was Jeremy Bentham, the political economist.¹⁰³ Bentham was won over to Wakefield's theory in 1831 because of the doctrine of the "sufficient price" to be placed on all colonial land sold.¹⁰⁴ After Bentham's conversion, James Mill joined the Colonial Reformers. Others in the group by this time included Charles Buller, who became a Parliamentary leader of the group, and William Molesworth, a Radical Member of Parliament from East Cornwall, who led the movement to abolish transportation of convicts to the colonies. Regardless of how many intellectual and political leaders Wakefield won to his cause, however, he remained the center and the guiding spirit of the organization.

The British American Land Company formed and incorporated in 1833, was to plant colonies in the Canadian wilderness according to the Wakefield principles. It failed because of French-Canadian opposition.¹⁰⁵ Ironically, the Wakefield scheme, feasible in the North American plains,

¹⁰²Garnett, p. 90. ¹⁰³Carrington, p. 333.

¹⁰⁴Ibid. For an explanation of Wakefield's doctrine of the "sufficient price," infra, pp. 48-49, 66.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 328.

failed, but succeeded in Australasia, where it might have been expected to fail because of the great distance from Britain.

In 1833, Wakefield produced his second major work--England and America. Like his earlier book, A Letter From Sydney, it appeared without Wakefield's name gracing the title page. Regardless of how highly his friends might regard him, Wakefield remained a social outcast.¹⁰⁶

England and America sketched the English political practices and attempted to explain the course of American development. It stated what Wakefield believed to be wrong with both countries. Wakefield suggested "systematic colonization" as a remedy for the evils he found in both nations.¹⁰⁷ In "The Art of Colonization," the most important chapter in England and America, Wakefield refined his theory of "systematic colonization" and discussed the need for a preliminary land survey, which he had mentioned in A Letter From Sydney.¹⁰⁸ In England and America, Wakefield indicated that he knew A Letter From Sydney had been well-received and also that he had paid his debt to society for his past mistakes by his attempts at colonial reform.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶Mills, pp. 86-88.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 88.

¹⁰⁸"The Art of Colonization," a chapter in England and America, should not be confused with Wakefield's last work, A View of the Art of Colonization, published in 1849.

¹⁰⁹Referring to Wakefield's abduction of Ellen Turner.

After securing the "Ripon Regulations" in 1831, the National Colonization Society failed to gain further successes. Because of this, in 1834, Wakefield formed the South Australian Association. Through it he planned to found a colony in South Australia on the principles enunciated in his writings.¹¹⁰ Charles Buller, George Grote, Sir William Molesworth, Colonel Robert Torrens, and Sir Henry George Ward were the leaders of the new organization,¹¹¹ in which Wakefield did not hold any office.¹¹²

The South Australian Association succeeded where the Colonization Society had failed. In August, 1834, Parliament passed the South Australia Act.¹¹³ This Act provided for the appointment by the Crown of a Board of Commissioners to direct the settlement of a colony in South Australia. The South Australia Act was really a compromise between the systematic colonizers and the Colonial Office. The Board of Commissioners, appointed by the Crown, was to supervise the settlement of a new colony founded on the principles of land sold at a fixed, uniform price with the

¹¹⁰D. N. B., XX, 450.

¹¹¹Ibid. Buller, Molesworth, and Torrens have been identified earlier. Grote and Ward were Colonial Reformers of long standing, but had not joined the Wakefieldians immediately.

¹¹²Garnett, p. 99. One reason for this was Wakefield was not accepted by the people in the Government, and therefore, was not given an official Association position.

¹¹³Great Britain. Statutes at Large, 4 & 5 William IV, cap. 95 (1834).

resulting revenue to be used to pay the passage of pauper emigrants.¹¹⁴ Convict labor was prohibited and, when the settlement reached 50,000 persons, it was to receive self-government.¹¹⁵

The colony to be planted in South Australia was not to have the advantage of Edward Gibbon Wakefield's help or leadership. He quarreled with the Board of Commissioners over the price to be charged for land. The Board set a price of twelve shillings per acre, which Wakefield said was far too low.¹¹⁶ This led to a quarrel between Robert Gouger and Wakefield, and Wakefield disassociated himself from all connections with the foundation of a colony in South Australia.¹¹⁷

Another factor contributing to the split between Wakefield and the South Australia Association was the death of his daughter, Nina.¹¹⁸ Always physically weak, in 1835, she became seriously ill. In an attempt to save her life, Wakefield took her to Portugal. She died shortly after their arrival.¹¹⁹ But, during his absence from England, Wakefield lost his power in the South Australian Association.

¹¹⁴Ibid. For an explanation of how this fund would work, infra, pp. 48, 67.

¹¹⁵Ibid. The colony probably would have received responsible government, rather than self-government.

¹¹⁶Carrington, p. 335.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸Garnett, p. 103.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 119.

It was upon his return to England that the quarrel with Gouger came to a head, following which Wakefield withdrew from the Association. Wakefield now turned his attention to New Zealand.¹²⁰ The brightest fact about this rupture with the organization was that he had to accept none of the blame for the mistakes made in founding South Australia. He received credit for its success, however, because his ideas made it possible.¹²¹

The first landing in South Australia came in July, 1836, but the colony was not officially proclaimed until December, 1836.¹²² Adelaide, the major settlement in South Australia, was located at the mouth of the Murray River.¹²³ The land immediately beyond Adelaide, being rich, level, and well watered, allowed the Wakefield scheme to succeed.¹²⁴

The National Colonization Society was soon torn asunder over the same question that had separated Wakefield from Gouger and the others in the South Australian Association. The Society broke up in September, 1835, and was not revived until 1837, again under the leadership of Wakefield.¹²⁵

After he disassociated himself from the South Australia venture, Wakefield did not remain idle. In 1836, he testified before the House of Commons Select Committee on the Disposal of Colonial Land, and in 1837, he gave

¹²⁰Ibid.

¹²¹Ibid., p. 120.

¹²²D. N. B., XX, 450.

¹²³Carrington, p. 333.

¹²⁴C. H. B. E., VII, I, 208.

¹²⁵Garnett, p. 91.

evidence before a similar committee investigating transportation of criminals. He addressed, in 1840, a House of Commons committee conducting an investigation on the colonization of South Australia. Also in 1840, and again in 1844, he testified before committees considering affairs in New Zealand.¹²⁶

In testifying before the Committee on the Disposal of Colonial Lands in 1836, Wakefield said New Zealand would be colonized by British people.¹²⁷ By May, 1837, he had started organizing the new colonial venture.¹²⁸ This activity resulted in the formation, in October, 1837, of the New Zealand Association.¹²⁹ The leaders of the new Association were all men interested in colonial reform; Lord Durham, Francis Baring, Charles Buller, William Molesworth, and Sir John Hutt.¹³⁰ Francis Baring was named Chairman, with Buller, Hutt, and Molesworth the most important directors.¹³¹ The company offices were located in Adelphi

¹²⁶Mills, p. 88.

¹²⁷Garnett, pp. 126-127.

¹²⁸Ibid., p. 128.

¹²⁹John M. Ward, British Policy in the South Pacific (Sydney: Australian Publishing Co., Pty. Ltd., 1948), p. 98.

¹³⁰D. N. B., XX, 451. Francis Baring was involved in the New Zealand Association, the Colonial Lands Committee and the Transportation Committee. John Hutt also was involved in the New Zealand project and the Transportation Committee. Lord Durham, a Radical, nicknamed "Radical Jack," had long been interested in colonization. He was the Director of the New Zealand Company of 1825, supported by William Huskisson.

¹³¹Garnett, p. 142.

Terrace, London, from which the Association planned to plant a colony in New Zealand and retain control of the administration, government, and native affairs.¹³²

In June, 1838, the Association got a bill introduced into the House of Commons. This bill granted a charter to the Association to colonize New Zealand. The bill suffered a ninety-two to thirty-two defeat.¹³³ The Association, following this defeat, dissolved itself and Wakefield had to start all over on the New Zealand project.¹³⁴

In October, 1838, Wakefield succeeded in getting the New Zealand Colonization Company formed.¹³⁵ Founded as a joint-stock company, it had fewer colonial theorists and more London merchants in its membership.¹³⁶ The new organization, however, soon gave way to a third body, called the New Zealand Land Company, formed on April 27, 1839. The Land Company was composed of the remnants of the New Zealand Association of 1837, the New Zealand Colonization Company of 1838, and an earlier New Zealand Company supported by William Huskisson in 1825.¹³⁷ As Lord Durham had been the director of the company formed in 1825,¹³⁸ he was named chairman of the

¹³²Harold Miller, New Zealand (London: Hutchinson and Co., 1955), p. 20.

¹³³Garnett, p. 150.

¹³⁴Ibid.

¹³⁵Ibid.

¹³⁶D. N. B., XX, 451.

¹³⁷Ibid.

¹³⁸Garnett, p. 143.

New Zealand Land Company.¹³⁹ The Company planned to found a settlement in New Zealand according to Wakefield's theory.¹⁴⁰

The New Zealand Land Company failed to secure governmental sanction, but on May 5, 1839, nevertheless, sent out a ship named the Tory to New Zealand.¹⁴¹ Aboard the Tory were Wakefield's brother William, and Wakefield's nineteen year old son, Edward Jerningham, plus some thirty other settlers.¹⁴² The Tory was to stop at Plymouth before final departure from Britain. Wakefield feared governmental interference, and traveled to Plymouth, where he sent the ship on its way on May 12, before the Government had time to act.¹⁴³

The sailing of the Tory was the final action leading to Great Britain's annexation of New Zealand. Wakefield had urged such action for years, but the Government, not wishing to assume greater colonial responsibility, had

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 153.

¹⁴⁰James Truslow Adams, Empire on the Seven Seas: The British Empire, 1784-1939 (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1940), p. 137.

¹⁴¹Bloomfield, p. 210.

¹⁴²Garnett, pp. 153-154. See also, Bloomfield, pp. 210-211.

¹⁴³Garnett, p. 154. Bloomfield attempts to refute the statement about Wakefield's trip to Plymouth. He does not, however, completely dispel the controversy. At any rate, the Tory did sail for New Zealand on May 12, 1839.

steadfastly refused. With the actual sailing of British settlers for New Zealand, the Government acted.¹⁴⁴

Wakefield's settlers arrived at Port Nicholson, New Zealand, on September 20, 1839, before the British annexation.¹⁴⁵ Meanwhile, Captain William Hobson had been named Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand on August 14, 1839. He arrived at the Bay of Islands on January 29, 1840, and formally annexed New Zealand to the British Crown.¹⁴⁶ The islands were to be under the jurisdiction of the Governor of the New South Wales colony in Australia; hence Hobson's title of Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand.¹⁴⁷

In attempting to secure governmental approval for the colonization of New Zealand, Wakefield and his followers faced powerful opposition. Dandeson Coates, the Lay Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, opposed the project because he wanted New Zealand kept free of settlers and retained as a field for missionary activity alone.¹⁴⁸ The

¹⁴⁴Carrington, p. 378. On June 13, Lord Normanby told Lord Durham that Captain William Hobson was to be sent to negotiate a treaty with the Maori natives so Britain could formally annex New Zealand. Lord Normanby also forbade any convicts to be landed in New Zealand.

¹⁴⁵Adams, p. 137.

¹⁴⁶Garnett, p. 156.

¹⁴⁷D. N. B., XX, 451.

¹⁴⁸Garnett, p. 136. Samuel Marsden, also a member of the Church Missionary Society, opposed all British designs on New Zealand. He desired the creation of a native Christian state, but rather than have the chaos of the 1830's and 1840's in New Zealand, he preferred annexation.

Colonial Office, through such officials as Sir James Stephen, and Lord Stanley, opposed Wakefield because they felt the empire was already too large. Stephen was also an active member of the Church Missionary Society and tended to support the views of Coates.¹⁴⁹ Another source of opposition was even more formidable. Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, disliked Lord Durham and since Durham was Chairman of the New Zealand Land Company, Melbourne opposed it.¹⁵⁰

In spite of this array of opponents, the Company finally secured governmental sanction in 1841. Lord John Russell, the Colonial Secretary, favored the Colonial Reformers and arranged for the Government to issue the Company a charter of incorporation in February, 1841, more than a year after the Tory sailed and actual colonization in New Zealand began.¹⁵¹

While the fight to start a colony in New Zealand raged, other events of importance in the colonial realm occurred. Two armed uprisings took place in British North America in 1837. Louis Papineau led the uprising in Lower (French) Canada and William Lyon McKenzie led the rebels in Upper (British) Canada. The rebellions were put down, but they caused the British to give careful attention to the problems of governing overseas colonies. In an attempt to eliminate the causes of unrest in the Canadas, Lord Durham

¹⁴⁹Miller, p. 20.

¹⁵⁰Garnett, p. 144.

¹⁵¹D. N. B., XX, 451.

was sent in 1838, to British North America.¹⁵² He took Charles Buller as his secretary and Edward Gibbon Wakefield as an unofficial advisor.¹⁵³ Lord Durham leaned heavily upon Wakefield for advice and said in later years, "I have never erred [in colonial matters] except when I rejected Wakefield's advice."¹⁵⁴

Lord Durham's Report on the Affairs of British North America was the result of the Durham Commission to British North America.¹⁵⁵ The Durham Report, said to have been written by Buller, but containing Wakefield's ideas, had a profound effect upon the British world.¹⁵⁶ It set forth the whole program of the Colonial Reformers and has been referred to as ". . . the gospel of the Colonial Reformers."¹⁵⁷

¹⁵²Adams, p. 132. Lord Melbourne disliked Lord Durham. Melbourne hoped Durham would fail in British North America. At any rate, by sending Durham to British North America, he was temporarily out of Melbourne's way.

¹⁵³Anthony Wood, Nineteenth Century Britain 1815-1914 (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1960), pp. 209-210.

¹⁵⁴Quoted in Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV, (December, 1898), p. 827.

¹⁵⁵Carrington, p. 343.

¹⁵⁶Charles C. F. Greville, The Greville Memoirs, Vol. I (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885), pp. 162-163, n. 1. Hereafter cited as Greville Memoirs. This charge has been fairly well repudiated. The Durham Report is now regarded as an expression of Durham's beliefs, tempered by the influence of Wakefield and Buller. For further discussion of the topic, see Bloomfield, pp. 198-203.

¹⁵⁷Carrington, p. 325.

From the time Wakefield returned from Canada, he engaged in New Zealand affairs. Between 1841 and 1843, he returned to Canada twice on business for one of his companies, the North American Colonization Company.¹⁵⁸ He became embroiled in Canadian politics on his last trip to North America, and in September, 1843, he won election to the Canadian Parliament from the French constituency of Beauharnois.¹⁵⁹ During this time, Wakefield served as a secret advisor to Sir Charles Metcalfe, the Governor-General of Canada.¹⁶⁰ Wakefield returned to Britain early in 1843, after receiving word of his brother Arthur's death in the massacre at Wairau in New Zealand.¹⁶¹

Wakefield continued his activities to forward colonization in New Zealand during the following years. In 1846, as a result of the strain and overwork he had borne since

¹⁵⁸The Company was negotiating with the Government for permission to build a canal through the Beauharnois District.

¹⁵⁹George Bennett (ed.), The Concept of Empire: Burke to Attlee, 1774-1947, Vol. VI of The British Political Tradition, ed. Allan Bullock and F. W. Deakin (2d ed.; London: A. and C. Black, 1962), p. 127. See also, John Norman, Edward Gibbon Wakefield: A Political Reappraisal (Fairfield, Conn.: New Frontiers of Fairfield University, 1963), p. 12.

¹⁶⁰*Ibid.* See also, Carrington, p. 389. For a full account of Wakefield's activities in Canada, see Bloomfield, pp. 238-273.

¹⁶¹Carrington, p. 389.

1829, he suffered a stroke.¹⁶² After partially recovering his health in 1847, Wakefield resigned from the New Zealand Land Company. As had happened in 1835, during his daughter's illness, Wakefield's absence from the Company had seen his influence lessened.¹⁶³

In the succeeding years, Wakefield became more violent and secretive about his affairs. In his public life, however, he reached the zenith of his career as a colonizer. The two best colonies founded under his influence were complete successes and his most mature work, A View of the Art of Colonization, appeared. The two colonies, Otago and Canterbury, both founded in New Zealand, were the result of Wakefield's cooperation with the Free Church of Scotland and the Church of England.

In 1847, working with the Free Church of Scotland, the Otago settlement with Dunedin as its center, was founded. At the time the Otago colony was being founded, Wakefield joined John Robert Godley and working through the Canterbury Association, colonized the Canterbury settlement.¹⁶⁴ These two settlements proved to be the most successful applications of Wakefield's theory. The colony at Canterbury became the Wakefield "model." It had been established along the principles laid down by him, and became the best example of his work. He retired to Canterbury for his last few years.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶²British Authors of the Nineteenth Century, p. 641.

¹⁶³Carrington, pp. 393-394. ¹⁶⁴Ibid. ¹⁶⁵Wood, p. 213.

In the meantime, Wakefield concentrated on his last major written work, A View of the Art of Colonization, published in 1849. In this treatise he set forth his theories as they had been modified by experience in South Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. A View of the Art of Colonization reverted to the epistle form of writing which he had used in A Letter From Sydney, but not in England and America.¹⁶⁶

In 1850, while the settlement of Canterbury was being established, Wakefield joined with Charles Bowyer Adderley (later Lord Norton) to found the Colonial Reform Society. This organization's purpose was to continue the work started by Wakefield and the Colonial Reformers.¹⁶⁷

Wakefield, following the thousands of emigrants from Great Britain he had sent out, emigrated to Canterbury, New Zealand, in 1852.¹⁶⁸ He landed at Port Lyttleton on February 2, 1853.¹⁶⁹ In New Zealand, he became active in politics and served as advisor to Colonel Robert Henry Wynyard, the acting governor.¹⁷⁰ In 1853, he won election to the first session of the Parliament of New Zealand.¹⁷¹ When his relations with Wynyard became known, Wakefield lost the confidence of the Legislature and became involved in a vicious

¹⁶⁶Miller, p. 89.

¹⁶⁷D. N. B., XX, 451. See also, British Authors of the Nineteenth Century, p. 641.

¹⁶⁸Bennett, p. 127. ¹⁶⁹D. N. B., XX, 451. ¹⁷⁰Ibid.

¹⁷¹Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV (1898), p. 827.

political fight.¹⁷² In December, 1854, he suffered a complete mental and physical breakdown which forced him to retire from public life.¹⁷³

After his breakdown in 1854, Wakefield lived in obscurity. When he died on May 16, 1862, he was a forgotten man.¹⁷⁴ No statues were raised in his honor and no belated honors were bestowed upon him. He did, however, have the knowledge that through his work, Australia and New Zealand had been securely attached to the British Empire. Years passed before Edward Gibbon Wakefield received any posthumous honors. Yet, today, he is recognized as the chief architect of the modern British Empire and the Commonwealth of Nations.

Character Sketch

For the most part, Wakefield's character can be understood from a biographical summary. There are, however, some facets of his character that need careful examination as Wakefield was an unusual man, with unusual abilities and real determination to achieve his ambitions.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷²D. N. B., XX, 451.

¹⁷³Bloomfield, pp. 334-348. Bloomfield does not date the breakdown, but in a quotation, it is placed around December 12, 1854.

¹⁷⁴Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV (1898), p. 827.

¹⁷⁵The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art, LXXXVI (December 24, 1898), p. 856.

Wakefield's character, like his life, had two parts-- before Newgate and after Newgate. Before Newgate, Wakefield appears as a grasping, frivolous character. After Newgate, he developed the humanitarian, philanthropic interests of his Quaker rearing.¹⁷⁶

The Newgate experience is undoubtedly the key to Wakefield's character change and development. After his first successful, runaway marriage with Eliza Susan Pattle, many doors opened to him. He was promoted in the diplomatic service and climbed higher on the social ladder. After Eliza's death, and his transfer to Paris, he became a social success. Needing money to pay his way, and to fulfill his ambition to enter Parliament, Wakefield and his family planned and carried out the Turner abduction which led to his imprisonment.¹⁷⁷ While in Newgate, Wakefield seems to have experienced a complete character transformation. Those who knew him best, however, regarded it merely as the time when he came to know and understand himself.¹⁷⁸

Upon emerging from prison, Wakefield showed only a strong determination and a magnetic personality.¹⁷⁹ He needed these attributes to overcome the disgrace he had brought down upon himself. He exhibited this determination

¹⁷⁶Garnett, pp. 50-51. ¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 50-53. Garnett's interpretation is favorable to Wakefield.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 47.

during the struggle to found a colony in South Australia. It appeared again in the fight to annex and colonize New Zealand. During those trying years, Wakefield's determination kept the colonial reform movement alive.¹⁸⁰ He used his personality to attract men to him and convert them to his tasks. These two characteristics carried him through the time when, because of the unscrupulousness of his past, no one placed confidence in him.¹⁸¹

Wakefield reflected his Quaker and humanitarian background when he advocated an apparent radical philosophy. It was, however, essentially conservative for he wished to maintain ". . . the existing social and economic structure. . . ." ¹⁸² While Wakefield believed in humanitarianism and advocated colonial responsible self-government, he definitely did not believe in democracy. He consistently favored a stratified economic and social order, and supported a property qualification for the vote.¹⁸³

Before the Newgate prison term, Wakefield showed little indication of his true nature. After serving his sentence at Newgate, a true reformatory for him, he emerged as ". . . a vigorous, hard-headed, liberal-minded, optimistic

¹⁸⁰Bloomfield, p. 125.

¹⁸¹D. N. B., XX, 452.

¹⁸²Keith Sinclair, A History of New Zealand (London: Penguin Books, 1960), p. 59.

¹⁸³Ibid., pp. 56 and 59.

patriot."¹⁸⁴ He proved himself capable of conceiving ideas and ". . . surrendering himself to them with absolute devotion."¹⁸⁵

Opponents called Wakefield a ". . . cold-blooded schemer and manipulator of puppets for selfish ends."¹⁸⁶ Wakefield, however, had no selfish motives, for he concerned himself with the condition of the pauper class in Great Britain and tried to help this group to help themselves.

To his supporters, Wakefield was ". . . the regenerator of colonial policy, and the apostle of colonial freedom."¹⁸⁷ There is no doubt about the truth in this statement. Wakefield and his followers regenerated British colonial policy. The shot he fired in 1829 (A Letter From Sydney) reverberated throughout the Empire until it evolved into the Commonwealth of Nations. He became the "apostle of colonial freedom" when the Dominions of the Empire achieved self-government and independence.

Edward Gibbon Wakefield was more than the author of a colonial scheme--he implemented his scheme by working through other men.¹⁸⁸ To illustrate Wakefield as a man of action,¹⁸⁹ it is only necessary to relate the story of the

¹⁸⁴Saturday Review, LXXXVI, p. 857.

¹⁸⁵Garnett, p. 47.

¹⁸⁶Mills, p. 81. Quoted from Samuel Sidney, The Three Colonies of Australia, 1853, 2nd ed., p. 208.

¹⁸⁷Ibid.

¹⁸⁸Garnett, p. 90.

"releasing" of the Durham Report to the press. When Lord Durham submitted his Report to the Government, the ministry feared submitting it to Parliament. To make sure the Report was placed before Parliament, Wakefield released it to The Times on February 8, 1839.¹⁹⁰

While not the first man to think and write about the British Empire,¹⁹¹ Wakefield had ". . . one of the most original . . . elastic, and teachable intellects of his time. . . ." ¹⁹² By using these abilities, he brought together into one compact, feasible colonial theory many of the earlier, divergent views on colonies and colonization.

The Turner abduction and the resulting prison sentence turned Wakefield away from his frivolous life and ended his ambitions to enter Parliament. With a public career closed to him, Wakefield concentrated his thoughts on the process of colonization. By doing so, he regenerated the British Empire and laid down the foundations upon which the Commonwealth of Nations later arose.

As an imperial theorist and statesman, Wakefield ranks high. He combined the mind of a philosopher and a statesman with the ability to conceive and direct a

¹⁸⁹Ward, p. 98. See also, Harrop, p. 192.

¹⁹⁰D. N. B., XX, 451.

¹⁹¹Many of Wakefield's ideas were borrowed from Robert Gurlay's A Statistical Account of Upper Canada, 1823.

¹⁹²Mills, "Introduction," by Graham Wallas, p. xviii.

comprehensive theory of colonial settlement,¹⁹³ Wakefield may have been the most important imperial statesman Britain produced in the nineteenth century. If not, he at least changed the British Empire from a stagnant, outmoded institution into a dynamic, growing, changing body.

Wakefield, in addition to being a statesman of the Empire, was also a prophet. He did not know or understand what role his ideas would play in the future, but he accurately described the way in which the British Empire later evolved into the Commonwealth of Nations.

¹⁹³D. N. B., XX, 452.

CHAPTER III

THE THEORY OF "SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION" AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Early Stages

In A Letter From Sydney

Edward Gibbon Wakefield set forth a new theory of colonization in 1829. First published as a series of articles in the Morning Chronicle, the work appeared in book form, under the title of A Letter From Sydney late in the same year. Wakefield argued for the integrated use of colonial land, labor, and capital into a unified economic, social, and political theory and called his policy a scheme for "systematic colonization."

The economic portion of the Wakefield scheme centered on a balance between the amount of land used in proportion to the labor applied, and the capital needed to assure effective utilization of the land, and labor resources. While not entirely new, this economic concept of a balanced ratio between land, labor, and capital had not been combined before with a plan of social structure and political organization of the British Empire into a comprehensive theory of colonization.¹

¹Robert Gourlay had developed a similar theory in the 1820's in his book, A Statistical Account of Upper Canada.

Wakefield asserted in beginning his plan for colonial development that land was so plentiful in New South Wales, Australia, that it cost ". . . next to nothing, so it is worth next to nothing."² The cause of this, according to Wakefield, was the excessive amount of land in proportion to the number of people desiring and capable of working it.³ There were not enough people to work the land, claimed or unclaimed. This absence of people caused most of the Australian colonial problems.⁴

The over-abundance of land in proportion to the number of people allowed immigrants to Australia to become land owners immediately, rather than forcing them to work as laborers for existing property holders.⁵ This made the labor supply problem more critical because the number of potential employers increased but the number of available laborers remained the same. The disparity between the supply of labor and the number of employers seeking labor increased.

This scarcity of laborers resulted in high building costs and a comparable rent scale.⁶ If a builder could not get a high rent for his proposed structure, he did not build which increased the demand for the existing buildings and forced rents still higher.⁷

²Edward Gibbon Wakefield, A Letter From Sydney (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1929), p. 7.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 7-8. ⁵Ibid., p. 9.

⁶Ibid., p. 13.

⁷Ibid.

"The scarcity of laborers . . ." caused the economic distress described by Wakefield.⁸ He analyzed the use of indentured laborers as a possible solution to this condition. Wakefield rejected their use because they became unhappy with their state upon learning about the high wages the non-indentured workers earned. The indentured laborers no longer earned their pay or their maintenance, and became a burden to the employer, rather than an aid.⁹ Upon becoming free, the indentured servants took up farming on their own land, and compounded the labor scarcity by reducing the supply of labor and competing with their former employers for laborers.¹⁰

As another alternative, Wakefield considered bonded workers as a solution to the labor shortage.¹¹ They were to be paid in cash and land. He rejected this plan because with land so cheap, a bondsman, by being frugal, could still amass enough capital to purchase land and then compete with his former employer for labor.¹²

Slavery appeared as a possible third solution to the Australian labor shortage.¹³ In support of this possibility, Wakefield said:

In most other new countries, it [Labor scarcity] has been practically remedied by means of slavery; and a time may come when its [the scarcity of labor] evils will be mitigated here [referring to New South Wales] in the same way.¹⁴

⁸ Ibid., p. 14. ⁹ Ibid., pp. 14-15. ¹⁰ Ibid., p. 15.

¹¹ Ibid. ¹² Ibid., pp. 15-16. ¹³ Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁴ Ibid.

He rejected slavery but did not discount its eventual use as a means of escaping the dilemma.

Transported convicts were, to Wakefield, ". . . a species of slave-labour,"¹⁵ and always a dangerous risk, but they could be obtained from the government of New South Wales.¹⁶ If the employers of convict labor were not murdered or harmed, they still would not profit much from convict labor because convicts often failed to work to capacity.¹⁷

As a solution to the labor shortage, and in discussing the possibilities confronting an emigrant from Great Britain, Wakefield declared only sheep-raising was feasible.¹⁸ He said sheep-raising needed the least amount of labor and for that reason seemed to be the only practical line to follow.¹⁹

Land in Australia could be made available too cheaply according to Wakefield.²⁰ If the use of transported convicts ceased, land would become cheaper because labor would be even more scarce.²¹ This would lead to a higher price for the

¹⁵Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., p. 34.

²¹Ibid. Wakefield wrote, "Land is cheaper, and as soon as the present system of Penal Slavery shall be at an end, labour will be dearer, than in any other new countries. I say that land is cheaper than elsewhere, because the use of land can be obtained at a less price."

decreased amount of available labor and would ". . . prevent the accumulation of wealth. . . ."22

Wakefield attributed the limited wealth of Australia to the cheap labor supplied by the transported convicts. He said,

. . . Production . . . has exceeded consumption, and the degree of that excess is the measure of our accumulation--that is, of our wealth.²³

He continued and asserted cheap land and cheap convict labor were ". . . the fire and water of political economy."²⁴

Because of this cheap land and labor, which Wakefield believed an unnatural phenomenon, the Australian economy had a precarious balance.²⁵ To protect this economy and to increase the labor supply, Wakefield advocated importing emigrants from Britain. This must be accomplished, he cautioned, without increasing the demand for labor.²⁶ By increasing the supply of labor and holding the demand constant, a concentration of people would result. This ". . . CONCENTRATION would produce what never did and never can exist without it--CIVILIZATION."²⁷

As a cure for the excessive amount of land in use in proportion to the population, Wakefield proposed governmental regulation by using titles.²⁸ He asserted no one would cultivate land without possessing a title.²⁹ If the

²²Ibid., p. 34. ²³Ibid., p. 38. ²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. 39. ²⁶Ibid., p. 43. ²⁷Ibid., p. 47.

²⁸Ibid., p. 77. ²⁹Ibid.

government placed stringent regulations on the granting of land titles, it would be able to regulate the amount of land in use in proportion to the size of the population. By such regulation of land usage, the population would become more concentrated and hence, from concentration, would become civilized. "Every . . . government, therefore possesses the power to civilize its subjects," he said.³⁰ The precise type of regulations on land would depend upon the varying local conditions, but ". . . a wise government would grant just enough land to enable the people to exert their utmost capacity for doubling themselves, but no more."³¹ Each government would have to work out for itself the regulations needed for its purposes ". . . for it is not enough to say that land ought to be doubled in quantity as often as the people should double in number."³²

In Wakefield's system, the Government would charge a fee for a land title.³³ This constituted purchasing the land from the Government and eliminated free grants. Wakefield believed it would be years before people would buy land from the Government because it would take a long time to increase the size of the population to the point where more land than already in use would be needed.³⁴ According to this plan, a concentrated population could be achieved

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid., p. 78.

³⁴Ibid.

". . . by fixing some considerable price on waste land."³⁵
 The price placed on waste land should be high enough to ensure a demand for a supply of well-paid labor³⁶--it should be a "sufficient price."

Wakefield did not develop the doctrine of the "sufficient price" fully in his A Letter From Sydney. This doctrine placed a fixed, uniform price upon all land--fertile or unfertile, regardless of location. The price had to be high enough to force immigrants to work for wages for a number of years before they had enough capital to purchase their own land. This would increase the labor supply, and also, as the laborers secured land of their own, gradually expand the demand for labor.

Revenue from the sale of land would go to an emigration fund to be used to pay the passage of emigrants from Britain, thereby keeping the supply of labor flowing into the colonies. Wakefield did not intend by this plan to keep the immigrants permanently restricted to a laboring position; he just wanted to increase the supply of labor, and to keep it increasing.

Nowhere in A Letter From Sydney did Wakefield state, in a definite way, what he believed to be a "sufficient price." Neither did he specifically state the period of

³⁵Ibid. The term "waste land" refers to any unsettled, unclaimed land.

³⁶Ibid.

time an emigrant would or should serve as a laborer before he might purchase land. This depended upon the ambition and thrift of the laborer and upon how long it took him to save the necessary money to enable him to buy land.

If the government priced the land too high, no land would be sold until the population reached a certain point in proportion to the land then in use. At that point, people would spill over onto the non-appropriated land, and the Government's upset price would be paid.³⁷ As an example, Wakefield cited the emigration of paupers from Great Britain into the United States. The more paupers that went to the United States, the more wealth America would accumulate, and the demand for land would increase.³⁸

Because of the lack of a concentrated population in the United States, Wakefield asserted fertile lands, unless near a city or town, were not being used.³⁹ To overcome this, and to raise the value of fertile land, Wakefield suggested land be taxed. The resulting revenue would also be used to transport new immigrants to the United States.⁴⁰ The security of land values, coming from the tax placed upon it, would attract capital.⁴¹ If it did not, ". . . the government might add to it [the security of land] the future proceeds of sales of land, the amount of which would be increased by every loan, exactly as in the case of rent. . . ." ⁴² This

³⁷Ibid., p. 79. ³⁸Ibid., p. 80. ³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 81. ⁴¹Ibid., p. 82. ⁴²Ibid.

anticipation of land security would be a strong factor in securing the greatest good at a reasonably early period for old settlers and new immigrants alike.⁴³ If applied in places other than the United States this ". . . theory of Restriction, Anticipation, and Free Migration . . ." would help build ". . . a bridge . . . from Britain to Australasia. . . ." People desiring land would be able to secure it in Australasia and, the more immigrants going to Australasia, the greater the demand for land and the more land sold. If the money received from land purchases were used to pay the transportation fees of pauper emigrants from Britain, Australasia would receive more immigrants.⁴⁶

By the removal of part of the paupers from Britain, some crime and "misery" would be alleviated and all of the country would benefit. The small colonies in Australia would gain from the labor of the new immigrants.⁴⁷ In addition, an increase in colonial population would lead to an increase in the colonial capital and a greater demand for land would develop.⁴⁸ This would lead to land purchases at a "sufficient price" and the money raised would finance the transportation of more laborers to the colonies.

Young workers would replace the pauper emigrants Britain lost through colonization. To combat this, Wakefield

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 82-83.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 83.

proposed sending young, newly-wed couples to the colonies, thereby decreasing the potential work force in Britain and increasing the potential work force in the colonies.⁴⁹ The selection of young emigrants of both sexes, according to Wakefield, would help prevent the disproportion between sexes in the penal colonies of Australia. These young emigrants would probably be more willing to leave Britain and be more adaptable to the new climate.⁵⁰ They should be thrifty and thereby increase the capital of the colony.⁵¹ The increased capital would cause more land purchases and create more funds to pay for new emigrants and increase the demand for labor.⁵²

The social aspect of the Wakefield system dealt primarily with the development of society or civilization. Wakefield advocated concentrating settlers in a small area rather than dispersing them throughout a vast area.⁵³ Wakefield, in discussing the establishment of a society, said ". . . cheapness of land and dearness of labor render men's minds as narrow as their territory is extensive. . . ." ⁵⁴ When people are scattered about a vast, seemingly unending land, a "New People" emerge. He described this "New People" as follows:

We mean, it strikes me, a people like what the Canadians will be, and the United States' Americans are--a people who, though they continually increase in number, make

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 84. ⁵⁰Ibid. ⁵¹Ibid., p. 85.

⁵²Ibid. ⁵³Supra, p. 46.

⁵⁴Wakefield, A Letter From Sydney, p. 32.

no progress in the art of living; who, in respect to wealth, knowledge, skill, taste and whatever belongs to civilization, have degenerated from their ancestors; who are precluded from acquiring wealth except by the labour of slaves; whose education, though universal stops before the age of puberty, and thus becomes, if not an evil, at least a dangerous thing, instead of the greatest good; who, ever on the move, are unable to bring anything to perfection; whose opinions are only violent and false prejudices, the necessary fruit of ignorance; whose character is a compound of vanity, bigotry, obstinacy, and hatred most comprehensive, including whatever does not meet their own pinched notions of right; and who delight in a forced equality, not equality before the law only, but equality against nature and truth; an equality which, to keep the balance always even regards the mean rather than the great, and gives more honour to the vile than to the noble. . . . We mean, in two words, a people who become rotten before they are ripe.⁵⁵

This "newness" of the people came from an excessive amount of land in proportion to the population.⁵⁶ Wakefield drew upon antiquity and wrote that Greek colonies were segments of the society of the mother city-state, transplanted to a distant land.⁵⁷ He also referred to the United States and declared, that the United States, though free for some time,⁵⁸ had not contributed much to culture or civilization because of the nation's dispersed population.⁵⁹ Consequently, the American people did not have adequate opportunity for the free exchange of ideas. To support his contention, he cited the low taxes, the great river system, the growing population,

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 68-69. ⁵⁶Ibid., p. 69. ⁵⁷Ibid., p. 73.

⁵⁸Fifty-three years at the time Wakefield wrote A Letter From Sydney, in 1829.

⁵⁹Wakefield, A Letter From Sydney, pp. 73-74.

the great mineral wealth, and the free enterprise, but still no growing civilization.⁶⁰ He added, though,

Doubtless, the people of America are laying a most extensive foundation of future wealth and greatness--of a national greatness surpassing any that has occurred in the world.⁶¹

Wakefield predicted the greatness would not be achieved until after the American people stopped spreading over vast territories, and began to concentrate. Then, civilization would grow.⁶² With a concentrated population, brought about through restrictive land grant policies, labor would become less scarce and cheaper. Wealth would accumulate, and more people could turn to intellectual pursuits. With these developments, Wakefield believed slavery in the United States would gradually die out and be replaced by cheap labor. When this point had been reached, the United States would no longer have a "New People" because they would begin to use their capacity for greatness, instead of having it dispersed throughout a huge, sparsely populated area.⁶³

If this doctrine were applied to Australasia, many of the emigrants from Britain would not need their passage paid by money from the emigration fund, but would migrate to the colonies on their own and take their capital with them. This would increase the colonial population and capital,⁶⁴ which would cause the value of colonial lands to

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 74. ⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid., p. 76. ⁶⁴Ibid., p. 85.

rise and increase the price paid for land. It would also provide a place for the investment of surplus British capital.⁶⁵ The new colonies, if settled by the Wakefield scheme, would contain elements from all walks of society-- from paupers to capitalists. The settlements would be concentrated, and would be extensions of Britain, not new societies like the one growing up at that time in the United States.⁶⁶ As Wakefield put it,

. . . Every grant of land in their colonies would be an extension, though distant, of Britain itself, and would provide so much more room for all classes of Britons.⁶⁷

The new colonies envisioned by Wakefield had no place for convict labor.⁶⁸ If necessary, however, it should be limited to building facilities for the new colonists before they arrived, or used to construct public works.⁶⁹ These buildings, erected by the convicts before the colonists arrived, should be sold to colonists at a price commensurate to the improvements made upon the land, not at the usual "sufficient price."⁷⁰ In this manner, the Government would be partially repaid for the maintenance required for the convicts.⁷¹

According to Wakefield, the demand for land and labor would increase regularly until all available land was

⁶⁵Ibid. ⁶⁶Ibid., p. 86. ⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 87. ⁶⁹Ibid. ⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹Ibid.

claimed.⁷² This demand for land and labor would be most easily satisfied by providing transportation for pauper emigrants. At first they would provide the labor. As they gained in wealth, purchased land, and sought laborers, other emigrants would be brought over.

If the demands for labor in Australasia were not satisfied by emigrants from Britain, Wakefield considered using Chinese laborers.⁷³ If Chinese people were allowed to settle in Australasia, Wakefield believed it might lead to an increase in trade with China, and this, he felt, would benefit the British manufacturers.⁷⁴ If his plans were adopted, this latter measure would be unnecessary.

Wakefield, writing in 1829, described the colonial government in Australia as quite despotic in its dealings with criminals and free men alike. He said the Governor of New South Wales had more power over the residents than the monarch in Britain possessed.⁷⁵ To Wakefield, the function of a colonial government was not to rule despotically, but to protect the colonists and to regulate the amount of land in use in proportion to the size of the population. This, he believed, would eliminate the earlier fluctuations in the prices of land and labor.⁷⁶

⁷²Ibid., p. 93.

⁷³Ibid., p. 98.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 99.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 24.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 25.

The government in Australia had one advantage over that of Britain; it could regulate the amount of land in use according to the size of the population. This factor, according to Wakefield, made the colonial government superior to the home government.⁷⁷ If the British Government could increase the size of Britain as the population rose, it would perform the greatest good--Wakefield believed the Government could do that if it followed his theory of "systematic colonization."⁷⁸ Wakefield advocated changing the policies and laws to make British dependencies extensions of Great Britain, and thereby greatly increase her territory. This would give her more than enough land to accommodate her growing population.

The other side of Wakefield's political concept in his theory of "systematic colonization" was probably the most significant. It consisted of a visionary scheme that attempted to answer "the problem of empire."⁷⁹ The Wakefield theory of empire has largely been implemented today by the evolution of the British Empire into the Commonwealth of Nations.

Wakefield set forth this revolutionary concept of empire by first discussing the question of the "new societies" he feared were growing up in the colonies.⁸⁰ By following

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 65.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹"The problem of empire" refers to the question of local government of colonies vs. centralized government of colonies.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 85.

his doctrine of concentration, the colonies would develop as extensions of the old British society. They would have elements of all parts of the British social structure.⁸¹

As such, the people of these settlements would demand British goods and increase British trade and manufacturing.⁸² The type of people he envisioned demanding British goods were

. . . farming bailiffs, surveyors, builders, architects and engineers; . . . lawyers, clergymen, singers, music and dancing masters, milliners and other female artists, and at least one good Political Economist at each settlement. . . .⁸³

To Wakefield, Britain and her colonies would be partners in the trade of ". . . happy human beings. . . ." ⁸⁴ Britain would supply the people and the colonies would provide the land where they could live and prosper.⁸⁵ If this partnership were disrupted, Britain would suffer the most because she had the problem of surplus population.⁸⁶

To prevent a rupture between Britain and her colonies, like the American Revolution, Wakefield proposed a new concept of empire--responsible colonial self-government.⁸⁷ He first suggested granting the colonies seats in Parliament and allowing the colonists to share in framing the imperial

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Ibid., p. 88.

⁸³Ibid., p. 85.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 89.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 90.

laws.⁸⁸ Being practical-minded, he did not foresee the implementation of this idea and therefore proposed granting the colonies responsible self-government.⁸⁹ By granting responsible self-government, the colonies would have no desire to become independent. They would, instead, feel much closer to Britain, because while the ties of the Imperial Government would be loosened, the "invisible bonds" of culture, language, and family would grow stronger. The mother-country and the colonies would both enjoy a fuller

⁸⁸ Ibid. Wakefield wrote: "The colonists, being an instructed and civilized people, would be as well qualified to govern themselves as the people of Britain; and, being a wealthy people, they would be able, without going to war, [meaning a war of independence] to assert the birth-right of all British subjects--to enforce in the British Parliament, against a bad British ministry, their claim to equality before the law. Qualified, entitled, and powerful to govern themselves, they might either take a share in framing the general laws of the empire, by means of their representatives in the British Parliament; or, if a mean jealousy on the part of Englishmen should prevent such an arrangement, they might frame their own laws, in a Colonial Assembly, under the eye of a viceroy, incapable of wrong and possessing a veto like the king of England, but whose secretaries, like the ministers of England, should be responsible to the people! At all events, they must be governed, by whatever machinery, with a view to their good and their contentment, which is the greatest good, instead of to the satisfaction of their governors only. This would render them happy in a most intimate connection with their mother country; and the American war of independence would no longer be a favourite theme in the still dependent colonies of Britain. Mutual dependence would prevent oppression on the one part, and on the other a wish for independence; reciprocity of interest would occasion mutual good will; there would no longer be injurious distinctions, or malignant jealousies, or vulgar hatred between British subjects, wherever born; and Britain would become the centre of the most extensive, the most civilized, and, above all, the happiest empire of the world."

⁸⁹ Ibid. supra, n. 88.

relationship. The British Government, Wakefield assumed, would control the colonial foreign affairs and imperial defense, but the colonies would control their own domestic affairs. Countries of Dominion status within the British Empire and Commonwealth, until quite recently, enjoyed such a relationship.⁹⁰ Those Dominions now exercise control, in their own right, over their foreign affairs and defense.

Within this political framework, Gibbon Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization" centered around nine basic points.⁹¹ They were: a "sufficient price" be charged for all land; a tax be placed on the rent charged for all land; the revenue from the sale of land and the tax on rent be used to transport British laborers to the colony; the overseers of the Colonization Fund be allowed to borrow money, using the expected revenue of the fund as security; the supply of laborers be regulated so that the demand for labor never exceeded the supply or the supply exceeded the demand; the emigrants preferably should be young people, with a balance between males and females; colonists who paid the passage fee of emigrant laborers should be reimbursed; land grants should be sold at a fixed, uniform price with no conditions; any surplus in the Emigration Fund be used to defray the costs of the Colonial Government.⁹²

⁹⁰The Statute of Westminster (1931) ended this arrangement.

⁹¹Wakefield, A Letter From Sydney, Appendix, pp. 100-104. For an outline of these nine points, see Appendix A.

⁹²Ibid.

The implementation of this basic plan remained Wakefield's goal for the duration of his life. He did modify the plan when further thought and experience in application indicated weaknesses, but in most respects, the original theory remained intact.

In England and America

In England and America, published in 1833, Wakefield discussed the reasons why a nation desired to found colonies. He also developed the new concept of empire he had set forth in A Letter From Sydney. The major portion of the work analyzed and compared the social and political structure of England and America. The chapter "The Art of Colonization" contained the major revisions of the original theory of "systematic colonization" found in A Letter From Sydney (1829).

Wakefield, in England and America, defined the terms he used in A Letter From Sydney. Waste land, he said, was ". . . land not yet the property of individuals, but liable to become so through the intervention of government. . . ."93 He defined migration as ". . . the removal of people to settle in a new place."94 According to him, there were two kinds of migration; ". . . the removal of people from an old to a new country; secondly, the removal of people from

⁹³ Edward Gibbon Wakefield, England and America: A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1834), p. 238.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

a settled part to a waste part of the colony."⁹⁵ By this definition, two kinds of colonization existed; the outward movement of people from an old country to colonies, and the outward movement of people from the settled areas of the colony to unclaimed, uninhabited areas of the colony.⁹⁶ Colonization, by the above definition, consisted of a movement of people from an old, settled, civilized area to a new, unsettled, uncivilized area.

Continuing this argument, Wakefield declared there were two classes for the ends of colonization. They were: those belonging to the old country; and those belonging to the colony.⁹⁷ The mother country had three objectives of colonization: increased markets for the sale of surplus goods, a place for redundant population, and a place for the investment of capital.⁹⁸ All three stemmed from the nation's desire to increase the employment of labor and capital.⁹⁹

For the colony, the ends of colonization were to increase the supply of labor and the amount of capital. This allowed the colony to grow and to increase its wealth.¹⁰⁰

Wakefield summed up this contention by declaring:

. . . Though the immediate object of an old state be to send out people, and that of a colony to receive people, though the colony want to sell, and the old country want to buy, the means of life; still they have a common object, that of increasing the number

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 242.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 255.

and enjoyments of mankind. Their common object is to give full play to the principle of population, so long as any habitable part of the colony remains uninhabited.¹⁰¹

In discussing emigration in England and America, Wakefield said the mother country should rid herself of the segment of the increasing population she could not gainfully employ, meaning those qualified young people who were unable to secure employment.¹⁰² Conversely, the colony should seek to attract as immigrants those qualified young people in such numbers as could be employed at a decent and profitable wage rate.¹⁰³

The colony should buy manufactured goods from the mother country and pay with raw produce and grain.¹⁰⁴ In return, the old society should buy raw materials and grain from the colony and pay with manufactured goods.¹⁰⁵ To achieve this harmonious economic relationship, the colony had to secure more laborers to produce raw materials and grain needed by the old society to feed the laborers who manufactured the goods she traded for her necessities.¹⁰⁶

Wakefield, in continuing to develop his theory, stated ". . . the elements of colonization [were] waste land and the removal of people."¹⁰⁷ If the people had no place to go, there would be no colonization, and conversely,

¹⁰¹ Ibid., p. 256.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 259.

if no people went to waste land no colonization would take place. Uninhabited land, therefore, remained the first necessary requirement for colonization.¹⁰⁸

Waste land, Wakefield believed, served not only as a receptacle for emigrating people, but also as the motivating factor in fostering a desire to emigrate.¹⁰⁹ To support this contention, Wakefield cited the example of United States emigration from the eastern seaboard states to the western waste lands. He said this migration of people westward was "the greatest emigration of people that ever took place in the world. . . ." ¹¹⁰

In discussing this westward expansion of the United States, Wakefield appears to have, unknowingly, stumbled onto one of the keys to a proper understanding of the subsequent development of the British Empire. The major Imperial Dominions of the Empire began as fringe settlements along the seacoast of vast continents. In the American Colonies, settlers turned and faced the interior. The same phenomenon occurred in Canada, Australia, and South Africa. In all four cases, the people, originally a part of an international, trans-oceanic, commercial world, turned away from the sea as immigrants flowed into their land. They became instead, a continental-minded people, interested principally in the development of the interior. After the continent or interior

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 260.

¹⁰⁹Ibid.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

had been subdued, these people turned back toward the sea and again became internationally and commercially oriented.¹¹¹

Wakefield further asserted that the disposal of waste land should be considered applicable to the mother country and colony.¹¹² From the colonial viewpoint, waste land served as a motive for attracting people by offering the prospect of owning land. He supported this contention by saying ". . . people will not use land without a title, but they will obtain a title to land without using their property meaning the newly acquired land or to more land than they can possibly use."¹¹³ Hence, appropriated waste land no longer served as a motive for colonization because it was private property. Properly disposed, waste land would serve as a motive for colonization, if not, it would no longer fulfill the function. He said:

Land, to be an element of colonization must not only be waste, but it must be public property, liable to be converted into private property for the end in view. In the art of colonization, therefore, the first rule is of a negative kind: it is that governments, having power over waste land, and seeking to promote the removal of people should never dispose of waste land except for the object in view, for the removal of people, for the greatest progress of colonization.¹¹⁴

Whenever a government disposed of waste land by improper methods (non-Wakefieldian methods) the governing body reduced its power to conduct colonization in the best manner.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹Infra., p. 158.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 260.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 262.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 263-264.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 268.

The land policies of the United States came the closest to the Wakefieldian system. Here, a fixed, upset price was charged, except when Congress made a special grant.¹¹⁶ Other than this case, colonization was not being carried out in a systematic manner anywhere.¹¹⁷

In Wakefield's estimation the colonizing governments of an old society, in disposing of waste lands, should retain rigid controls over land policies.¹¹⁸ Their immediate goals should be to send out emigrants and to give these people the best opportunities possible. To do this, the governments must attract capital to the colony, and especially capital to employ labor.¹¹⁹

Another of the goals for old societies was to aid the immigrants to the colonies in securing all the advantages possible. This, according to the initiator of the scheme, was one of the most essential aims of colonization.¹²⁰ To achieve this aim, the governments of the old societies must strive to place colonial profits and wages at a maximum level.¹²¹ By this device, the governments of the colonizing nations would be able to retain their power over the waste lands in the colonies.¹²²

In regard to land prices, the governments of the old societies should guarantee the sufficiency of the price

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 274. ¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 275.

¹¹⁹Ibid.

¹²⁰Ibid.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid.

of land ". . . to prevent the improper acquisition of land. . . ."123 It should not be so high as to impede the securing of titles to new land or to restrict the use of land at less than its maximum productivity.¹²⁴ In line with this concept of land price, Wakefield stated that there should be no prohibition on land purchases when made at the "sufficient price."¹²⁵ In fact, he declared that if land was sold at a fixed, uniform price, which would be the best price no unsettled land would exist between the settlers' holdings.¹²⁶ By these qualifications, no one could dispose of their land at less than the government's price.¹²⁷ This would assure both buyer and seller of just treatment in land transactions.¹²⁸ The most important land policy, to Wakefield, was that of a fixed, uniform, "sufficient price" for land.¹²⁹ Land was the most important element of colonization because without it, no colonization would be possible.¹³⁰

As a conclusion to his discussion of the ends of colonization for old societies, he contended that permanent land titles were necessary.¹³¹ Without this "permanency" the ends of colonization could not be achieved.¹³²

With the aforementioned ends of colonization in mind, theoretically, ". . . an old society in everything,

¹²³Ibid., p. 279.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 282.

¹²⁶Ibid., pp. 282-283.

¹²⁷Ibid.

¹²⁸Ibid., p. 283.

¹²⁹Ibid., p. 284.

¹³⁰Ibid.

¹³¹Ibid.

¹³²Ibid.

save the uneasiness of capitalists and the misery of the bulk of the people"¹³³ would be secured in the colonies. The colonies would then be mere extensions of Great Britain in all ways, except for the less desirable aspects of British society.

Laborers would be induced to emigrate from Britain for higher wages; capitalists for higher profits.¹³⁴ The capitalists would have the means to pay their own passage. The laborers, who could not pay their transportation fees, would work for wages and dream of becoming land owners and capitalists.¹³⁵ As the laborers graduated to these latter positions more pauper laborers would be brought over to replace them, thus establishing a continuous cycle. The sufficient, fixed, uniform price on land, with the proceeds going into the emigration fund, was the key to the entire theory.¹³⁶

If Wakefield's scheme were to succeed, a sufficient number of emigrant laborers would be needed.¹³⁷ As the colony grew in population, the demand for labor would grow, requiring more laborers.¹³⁸ They could be secured only if the revenue from land sales and rent taxes went into the emigration fund.¹³⁹

¹³³Ibid., p. 288. ¹³⁴Ibid., p. 292. ¹³⁵Ibid.

¹³⁶Ibid. ¹³⁷Ibid., p. 296. ¹³⁸Ibid.

¹³⁹Ibid.

The price on land, if uniform, would increase the wealth of the colony in proportion to the increase of capital and labor, the other two elements of wealth.¹⁴⁰ A uniform land price would insure the supply of labor, for the number of laborers brought over would be in direct proportion to the amount of land sold.¹⁴¹ The revenue from land sales, if used to import laborers, would raise the value of the land in proportion to the increase of the colonial population.¹⁴²

The ultimate price of land would be determined by the percentage of profits and the wages paid in the colony.¹⁴³ The price of land, therefore, should be set at a low price in the beginning and as profits and wages rise, the price of land should also rise. Land prices, however, should not be so low that the whole scheme would be defeated.¹⁴⁴

The establishment of an emigration fund would allow places like Australia and South Africa to compete with Canada and the United States for emigrants from Great Britain.¹⁴⁵ This would keep many of these emigrants within the British world, rather than channeling them to North America.

As to composition, the emigrants from Britain should have equal numbers of young men and women, with married people preferred.¹⁴⁶ This would reduce the numbers of young married

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 297.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 298.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 299.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 301.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 302.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 303.

workers in Britain and would increase the actual and potential size of the labor force in the colonies.¹⁴⁷

To illustrate this, Wakefield cited the previously mentioned migration in the United States. He said the majority of those people moving west were young married couples.¹⁴⁸ The reasons he gave for this occurrence were the same as those he offered as enticements for immigration to the Southern Hemisphere.¹⁴⁹ The young couples were first attracted by the high wages, the prospect of owning land, a desire for independence, a strong ambition to get ahead, and a desire to bequeath to their children a better position.¹⁵⁰ These same advantages and opportunities were available in Australasia, if the prohibitive cost of passage could be overcome. Wakefield believed it was possible to overcome this transportation barrier by using the emigration fund found in his system of colonization.

Those who went to Australasia by utilizing the emigration fund were to be carefully selected young couples of character and potential.¹⁵¹ They could be transported as cheaply as older couples and would add to the colonial population in two ways--by actual immigration and an increased birthrate.¹⁵² If the policy of transporting selected young people were followed, and the emigration fund utilized, the

¹⁴⁷Ibid., p. 304. ¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 305. ¹⁴⁹Ibid.

¹⁵⁰Ibid. ¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 307. ¹⁵²Ibid.

result would be a greater demand and sale of land, and an increased amount of revenue in the emigration fund.¹⁵³

The reproduction by the young couples would turn the colony into ". . . an immense nursery, and . . . would offer the finest opportunity that ever occurred, to see what may be done for society by universal education.¹⁵⁴ Since the colonists would be concentrated in a small area, it would be no problem to set up a school system for the children.¹⁵⁵ This phase of the Wakefield scheme, however, was not one that readily appealed to people and he did not develop it as a major portion of his theory of "systematic colonization."

Wakefield succinctly stated his ideal when he declared:

The sale of all waste land should be by public auction at a fixed upset price, with the most perfect liberty of appropriation at that price; and the employment of the whole of the fund so obtained in bringing people to the colony; a preference being always given to young couples who have just reached the age of puberty.¹⁵⁶

This statement showed his views in 1833, on the sale of land, the emigration fund, and the selection of colonists.

To achieve this ideal, the mother country and the colonies must co-operate with each other. Wakefield believed immigrants should be attracted to the colonies by sound, judicious policies, not driven from the mother country by harsh, repressive measures against the pauper class.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³Ibid.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 308. ¹⁵⁵Ibid.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 309.

¹⁵⁷Ibid.

To attract immigrants, both the mother country and the colonies must make it advantageous for the people involved.¹⁵⁸ The mother country could do this by passing laws and initiating policies favorable to those wishing to emigrate. The colonies could achieve their goal by taking advantage of the generous laws and policies enacted by the mother country, and be securing for the immigrants all the rights and privileges they possessed at home and extending these customs to them when possible.

Wakefield maintained he was not defying the principle of population growth with his scheme. He insisted his plan would mitigate the worst effects of the rapid growth in population by siphoning-off that excess portion of the population the British society and economy could not absorb and gainfully employ.¹⁵⁹ His theory of "systematic colonization" offered a relief to the redundant portion of the population--the excessive numbers.¹⁶⁰ When such a relief had been effected, emigration would cease because there would be no need to leave Britain to better one's lot. If the population again rose, emigration would also increase.¹⁶¹ In this respect, the "safety valve" idea in Frederick Jackson Turner's thesis regarding the American Frontier resembled Wakefield's theory.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 315.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

The Wakefield thesis attacked the problem of a redundant population at its source--the rapid reproduction of offspring by young married couples. By getting this group to emigrate, a lower birth rate would result and the remainder of the population would again become self-supporting.¹⁶²

The Wakefield theory did not propose to appreciably reduce the British population, but sought to increase and expand the British Colonies.¹⁶³ As the Empire grew it would become a series of "Little Englands," and would increase British trade and manufacturing by providing new areas of investment for surplus British capital.¹⁶⁴

The whole plan, however, rested upon the implementation of a "sufficient price" on land and using the proceeds of land sales and rent taxes to transport laborers to the colonies. As the author of the plan stated:

The certainty of obtaining labor in the new colony would be the strongest inducement to the emigration of capitalists, ambitious to take part in laying the foundations of an empire. Thus would all the elements of wealth [land, labor, and capital] be brought together, with no further trouble to the government of the mother-country than what should be required for establishing in the colony a fixed and uniform system in the disposal of waste land.¹⁶⁵

Wakefield, in England and America, expanded his earlier theory of empire. He took the original idea of his theory, the concept of local colonial autonomy within a loose imperial framework, and gave it a clear, concise expression.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 316.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 320.

New colonies, he said, if founded on his proposed plan of "systematic colonization," ". . . would be the extension of an old society to a new place, with all the good, but without the evils, which belong especially to old countries."¹⁶⁶

These colonies, Wakefield claimed, could never be governed from a distant center like London.¹⁶⁷ They would be, if founded according to his principles, a rich, intelligent, and strong body, capable of self-government, which they would demand, because of their strength.¹⁶⁸ With the ability to govern themselves would come the strength to exercise it. A people with such ability, and strength, would never submit to a distant governing body.¹⁶⁹ If offered a choice between self-government and distant control, the colonies would choose self-government.¹⁷⁰

Since any government must rule by force, Wakefield wrote, only a local government could maintain sufficient force to govern. A distant government, not knowing of local conditions, could not hope to govern well. With the resulting poor government, the colonies would be ill-disposed to accept the government and disorder would result.¹⁷¹ If, on the other hand, the colonies were allowed to govern themselves,

¹⁶⁶Ibid., p. 318.

¹⁶⁷Ibid.

¹⁶⁸Ibid. Wakefield wrote: "With the capacity for self-government comes the power to exercise it. A people entirely fit to manage themselves, will never long submit to be managed at a great distance from them."

¹⁶⁹Ibid.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 323.

¹⁷¹Ibid.

Wakefield assumed they would be peaceful, prosperous, and contented.¹⁷²

To defend and support the above contentions, Wakefield drew upon colonial history. He said that in the early period of British colonial history, colonies had self-government in local affairs.¹⁷³ This self-government was upheld in charters issued to companies to found and govern colonies.¹⁷⁴ These chartered colonies paid for their self-government, while the crown colonies had to be subsidized from royal revenues.¹⁷⁵ Wakefield believed the difference between self-governing, self-supporting chartered colonies, and royally administered, royally financed crown colonies, lay in the differences in origins of the colonies.¹⁷⁶ The chartered colonies, having the opportunity to govern themselves, were moderate in finances, while the crown colonies, being administered from a distance, were a financial burden upon society.¹⁷⁷

In arguing for local self-government, Wakefield wrote that colonies with "home rule" would govern themselves better, even if they did it poorly, than it would be possible to do from a distance.¹⁷⁸ This, he asserted, would be so

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 325.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 326.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 327.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

because the colonists would have more personal concern for their own well-being than any distant official.¹⁷⁹

In Testimony before the House of Commons
Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands
in British Colonies, 1836

Edward Gibbon Wakefield appeared in 1836 before the House of Commons Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in British Colonies. As a witness, his testimony concerned his philosophy of colonization and his criticisms of the Government's colonial policies.¹⁸⁰ Wakefield, in his testimony, presented several new aspects of his theory that had not appeared in A Letter From Sydney or England and America. For the most part, though, the evidence he gave consisted of repeating and supporting the major portions of his theory of "systematic colonization" presented in his earlier publications. Much of this testimony developed and explained his ideas on colonial land policy.

¹⁷⁹Ibid. Wakefield wrote: ". . . a body of colonists who should manage their own affairs, in their own way for their own advantage, would be sure to manage better than any foreign government, whether on the spot or at a distance: the local government, unless very ill-constituted, would have the deepest interest in the prosperity of the colony. But secondly, the form and substance of the local government would very much depend upon the character of the first settlers."

¹⁸⁰British Sessional Papers, House of Commons (1836), Series 1, 1820-1884, edited by Edgar L. Erickson. "Report of the Select Committee on the Disposal of Lands in British Colonies," Minutes of Evidence, Vol. XI, pp. 550-623. Hereafter cited as B. S. P.

Land, Wakefield said, should be disposed of in proportion to the number of colonists going out to a colony.¹⁸¹ This proportion between land in use and colonists should be determined according to the varying local conditions such as the type of soil, the climate, the major use of the land, and the needs of the colony.

In accordance with the above idea, Wakefield believed the Government should both sell land and refuse requests for land purchases, in order to best benefit the colony by attracting both labor and capital to the colony.¹⁸² This would be necessary because,

Whenever land is very cheap, men who are free have a disposition . . . to obtain land of their own. . . . when everyone does the same thing . . . there can be no combination of labour among them.¹⁸³

Assuming this to be true, unless the Government regulated the amount of land in use, settlers would acquire more land than they could use. This would result in a dispersed population rather than the concentration of people Wakefield believed necessary.

In discussing the doctrine of the "sufficient price," Wakefield believed that if the price were right, the problem

¹⁸¹Ibid., XI, question 512, p. 550.

¹⁸²Ibid., XI, question 570-571, p. 555.

¹⁸³Ibid., XI, question 580, p. 557.

of "squatters" would be eliminated.¹⁸⁴ Since the "sufficient price" should be the lowest possible price (always allowing for the success of the theory) it would be neither too high to prevent the "squatters" from buying the land upon which they lived, nor too low to make it unwise in terms of value to buy the land.¹⁸⁵

The best way to control the use of and requests for land would be to require a cash fee for land titles, according to Gibbon Wakefield.¹⁸⁶ The price of the title, however, must be just right, so only needed land would be sold.¹⁸⁷

The best test of the "sufficient price" would be to see the reaction to it. If no one purchased land, the price was too high, but if too many people purchased land, it was too low.¹⁸⁸ The "sufficient price" would be between the two extremes, where there would be a steady rate of land purchases, in proportion to the population. Within three days after establishing a price Wakefield believed the correctness of it would become apparent.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴Ibid., XI, question 636, p. 566. The "squatter problem" had arisen in New South Wales in the "outback" region where people had settled without title to the land. When another settler received land a "squatter" had improved, there was often a quarrel over ownership.

¹⁸⁵Ibid.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., XI, questions 656-657, pp. 568-569.

¹⁸⁷Ibid. ¹⁸⁸Ibid., XI, question 669, p. 570.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., XI, question 776, p. 584.

The "sufficient price," other than to regulate land usage, should make a colony attractive to potential immigrants by making the value and permanency of land ownership secure.¹⁹⁰ A "sufficient price" would make a colony attractive but a price too high or low would make a colony unattractive to potential settlers.¹⁹¹ In determining the "sufficient price," the more people in a colony, the lower the price; the fewer people, the higher the price.¹⁹²

Wakefield intended to use the revenue from the "sufficient price" to finance the transportation of pauper emigrants. These emigrants would not lower the standards of the other colonial settlers because only people of good character would be selected.¹⁹³ Wakefield concluded his testimony on the "sufficient price" by stating,

With a sufficient price the land will be colonized as well as possible: employing the purchase-money as an immigration /emigration/ fund, the land will be colonized as fast as possible.¹⁹⁴

The Government, in addition to regulating land usage and encouraging emigration should aid the colonists in every way possible to enable labor to combine.¹⁹⁵ This aid would entail encouraging professional people and skilled laborers to emigrate as well as unemployed and unskilled pauper laborers.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., XI, question 785, p. 585. ¹⁹¹Ibid.

¹⁹²Ibid., XI, question 860, p. 595.

¹⁹³Ibid., XI, question 878, p. 597. ¹⁹⁴Ibid.

¹⁹⁵Ibid., XI, question 994, p. 619.

Once the emigrants from Britain arrived in the colony, the Government should not load the thrifty and frugal laborers with unnecessary burdens.¹⁹⁶ These laborers should be allowed to advance as rapidly as possible and others should be encouraged to emulate them.

To administer the proposed governmental land policies, Wakefield urged establishing a separate agency.¹⁹⁷ This agency, acting in behalf of the Imperial Government, would regulate all emigration within the Empire, thereby preventing a whole series of irregularities, which would develop if each colony had its own immigration policy.¹⁹⁸

Wakefield, in his testimony, said, an emigrant laborer should work three years before purchasing land.¹⁹⁹ This was the first time he stated a specific length of time an emigrant should serve as a laborer. Even then, he qualified his statement by putting the three year period of service in the form of a suggestion, not an adamant rule.²⁰⁰

In response to a question about feasible places for colonization, Wakefield declared New Zealand a suitable location. He said:

¹⁹⁶Ibid., XI, question 996, p. 620.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., XI, question 1002, pp. 620-621.

¹⁹⁸Ibid., XI, question 1018, pp. 622-623.

¹⁹⁹Ibid., XI, question 620, p. 563.

²⁰⁰Ibid., XI, question 622, p. 564.

We [meaning the British] are, I think, going to colonize New Zealand, though we be doing so in a most slovenly, and scrambling, and disgraceful manner.²⁰¹

When he appeared before the Committee in 1836, he was already deeply involved in planning the colonization of New Zealand.²⁰²

Later Stages

In Testimony before the House of Commons
Select Committee on South Australia, 1841

In 1841, Wakefield appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee on South Australia.²⁰³ This body, appointed to investigate the errors and disasters connected with the establishment of the colony of South Australia in 1836, had requested Wakefield to testify. He attacked the Government's policy of selling land at a public auction.²⁰⁴ As he asserted numerous times before, land should be sold at a fixed, uniform price, preferably not at a public auction.²⁰⁵ He meant, in other words, land should be sold by an agency of the Government. The price should be a fixed or constant price, and uniform for all waste land within the boundaries

²⁰¹Ibid., XI, question 961, p. 614.

²⁰²Supra, p. 27.

²⁰³B. S. P. (1841), "Report of the Select Committee on South Australia," Minutes of Evidence, Vol. IV, pp. 228-308.

²⁰⁴Ibid., IV, question 2611, p. 228.

²⁰⁵Ibid.

of a given colony. The price should be changed only if the sales were too high or low. Wakefield believed that selling land at an auction placed a burden upon the thrifty laborers trying to save enough money to buy land.²⁰⁶ A fixed, uniform price would allow these laborers to know just how much money they needed to purchase their land.

Wakefield asserted, in his testimony in 1841, as he had done in England and America (1833), that colonies generally prospered more under the direction of a company than under the auspices of the Government.²⁰⁷ He cited, as he had done before, the differences between the Crown colonies and the chartered colonies in North America before 1776.²⁰⁸

The "sufficient price," in addition to making a colony attractive by fixing the value of land, would keep the population of the colony concentrated, because the Government determined it.²⁰⁹ The resulting concentration of people, Wakefield asserted, restrained the immigrants from regressing into the state of the "New People" he described in A Letter From Sydney.²¹⁰ Such a concentration of population, according to the Wakefield theory, also prevented the dispersion of the available labor force.²¹¹

²⁰⁶Ibid., IV, question 2662, p. 234.

²⁰⁷Ibid., IV, question 2632, p. 230. ²⁰⁸Ibid.

²⁰⁹Ibid., IV, question 2662, p. 234.

²¹⁰Ibid.; supra, pp. 51-52. ²¹¹Ibid.

The only deviation from the doctrine of the "sufficient price" should be when the Government founded a town.²¹² According to Wakefield, a private company could do this better than the Government.²¹³ This digression from the "sufficient price" is not the same as the earlier comment about the Government raising or lowering the fixed, uniform price.²¹⁴ In establishing a town, the affected land increases in value because of the costs of erecting buildings, laying out streets, and other capital improvements. The price, therefore, should be higher than the usual "sufficient price." In changing the prices on land, the Government would adjust the "sufficient price" to meet altered conditions as the proportion changed between the land in use and the number of people in the colony.²¹⁵

Wakefield reasserted his belief that all revenue from land sales should be used for the emigration fund. He made only one exception to this rule; in case of a financial emergency, the Government could divert a fixed proportion of the land revenue (he did not indicate what proportion could be diverted) for other use.²¹⁶ In his testimony in 1841,

²¹²Ibid., IV, question 2663, p. 234.

²¹³Ibid.

²¹⁴Supra, p. 54.

²¹⁵The adjustment of the sufficient price would generally be raised as more people in the colony would increase the value of land.

²¹⁶B. S. P. (1841), IV, question 3020, p. 308.

Wakefield supported these contentions by saying all land purchasers should know what percentage of the money they paid for land would be used by the Government to transport laborers to the colony.²¹⁷ This would prevent the use of money intended for the emigration fund from being used for other governmental purposes, except in emergencies.

In a letter to the Board of Commissioners for South Australia, and appended to the "Report From the Select Committee on Australia" in 1841, Wakefield stated that the price placed on land was the most important single element involved in the successful planting of a colony in South Australia.²¹⁸ In this letter, he also said the only reason South Australia could succeed was,

. . . by requiring for all land that becomes private property such a price per acre as will enable capitalists to maintain controls for the service of hired labourers.²¹⁹

The South Australia Act, by excluding all forms of labor procurement except labor attracted to the colony by the "sufficient price," also contributed to the success of South Australia.²²⁰ In addition, the South Australia Act placed the minimum price on land at twelve shillings per

²¹⁷Ibid.

²¹⁸Ibid., "Appendix to the Report From the Select Committee on South Australia," Letter from Edward Gibbon Wakefield to the Colonization Commission, IV, p. 666.

²¹⁹Ibid.

²²⁰Ibid., IV, 668.

acre. The underlying assumption of the provision meant, according to Wakefield, that the actual price would be higher.²²¹

Wakefield emphasized in his letter to the Board of Commissioners that,

The proper price . . . [of land] depends . . . upon the length of the term during which it is proposed that labourers should work for hire. . . . I have supposed that three years would be long enough for the capitalist, and short enough for the labourer.²²²

The "sufficient price," in addition to being determined by the proportion between land and people, should also reflect the amount of time an emigrant served as a laborer before purchasing land.²²³ The term of labor should be just long enough to allow the laborer to save enough money to buy land.²²⁴

The price of land, always foremost in Wakefield's theory, should be determined by ". . . the proper proportion of people to land."²²⁵ This price would enable a colony to maintain a proper hired labor force during the immigrant's term of labor.²²⁶ Any price failing to secure this labor force would be an improper price by the amount that it failed to achieve the intended ends.²²⁷

The price on land should not keep laborers from owning land.²²⁸ They should be able to buy land after

²²¹Ibid.

²²²Ibid.

²²³Ibid.

²²⁴Ibid.

²²⁵Ibid., IV, 669.

²²⁶Ibid.

²²⁷Ibid. See also, Ibid., IV, 670.

²²⁸Ibid., IV, 668.

several years of labor and their land purchase money would be used to pay the transportation costs for other laborers, who would replace them.²²⁹

The "sufficient price," according to Wakefield, could not be fully determined until it was known how many people wanted how much land.²³⁰ The end result, giving the most good to the most people, determined whether or not a price was sufficient.²³¹

In regard to South Australia, which the 1841 Committee investigated, Wakefield said the price set by the Board of Commissioners for South Australia should be the only price charged for land in South Australia. They set a fixed, uniform price of twelve shillings per acre, the minimum price allowed by the South Australia Act, which Wakefield believed insufficient.²³² He said, concerning this matter,

. . . the price named by the Commissioner for South Australia should be the only price, whatever the quantity, quality, or situation of the land sold, or whoever the buyer.²³³

In establishing uniform policies for South Australia, Wakefield urged, in addition to the above statement on land, that the ". . . regulations for the sale of land and the

²²⁹Ibid.

²³⁰Ibid., IV, 671.

²³¹Ibid.

²³²Supra, p. 25.

²³³E. S. F. (1841), IV, Appendix, p. 671.

emigration of labourers should be clearly explained to the public."²³⁴ The sale of land should be made on a pre-announced day in England with proper notice given.²³⁵ Revenue bonds, needed to finance the original expedition, were to be sold on the same day.²³⁶ Those capitalists emigrating from England should purchase the revenue bonds.²³⁷ All of the rules and laws of the colony, the names of the colonial officers, and the date of departure should be announced on the pre-arranged day.²³⁸

In A View of the Art of Colonization

Down to 1831, the general practice of the British Government had been to grant land for nothing, and without stint as to quantity: the new theory proposed, among other changes, to substitute for this plan, that of uniformly selling the land for a price in ready money.²³⁹

This passage, written by Gibbon Wakefield in 1849, clearly stated his mature interpretation of the innovation he introduced in 1829--selling waste land at an upset, fixed, uniform "sufficient price." A View of the Art of Colonization, published in 1849, reverted to the epistle form of writing used in A Letter From Sydney (1829).²⁴⁰

²³⁴ Ibid., IV, 672.

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Ibid., IV, 673.

²³⁹ Edward Gibbon Wakefield, A View of the Art of Colonization, with Present Reference to the British Empire; In Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist (London: John W. Parker, 1849), p. 44. Hereafter cited as Art of Colonization.

²⁴⁰ In A View of the Art of Colonization, Wakefield responded to the criticism leveled against the theory of

In Wakefield's opinion, the price being charged for land in South Australia and New Zealand remained too low.²⁴¹ To concentrate the population, serve as a source of revenue for the emigration fund, and increase the value of colonial lands, land prices must be sufficient.²⁴² The "sufficient price," determined by the proportion of land in use to the number of people in the colony, would tend to regulate the quantity of land sold.²⁴³

While the Government placed a price on land in 1831, little was accomplished.²⁴⁴ If the price was too low, which Wakefield believed to be true in New South Wales in 1831, none of the above-mentioned purposes of a "sufficient price" would result. In order to accomplish the intended purposes, the price must be sufficient--neither too low nor too high--and should tend to regulate the sale of land in the proper proportion to the usage of it and to the colonial population.²⁴⁵

While the "sufficient price" would be a fixed, uniform, upset price, it should not be all-inclusive for

systematic colonization and to the requests of Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, and other "Radicals" who desired Wakefield to develop and explain his ideas on the emigration fund and the sufficient price.

²⁴¹Wakefield, Art of Colonization, p. 338.

²⁴²Ibid.

²⁴³Ibid.

²⁴⁴The "Ripon Regulations" placed a price on all land in New South Wales in 1831. The revenue from the sale of land was to be used to transport pauper laborers from Great Britain to New South Wales.

²⁴⁵Wakefield, Art of Colonization, p. 339.

the whole British Empire.²⁴⁶ A price sufficient in South Australia might be too high or low in New Zealand, Canada, or South Africa. On this point, Wakefield said, "To name a price for all the colonies, would be as absurd as to fix the size of a coat for mankind."²⁴⁷ In each colony, the varied local conditions, the size of the population, the amount of land in use, and the period of labor for an immigrant must be considered before a "sufficient price" could be determined.²⁴⁸ The only way this price could be determined would be to experiment with tentative prices.²⁴⁹ Wakefield's inability to show how to specifically determine the "sufficient price" and his inability to precisely state the amount of the "sufficient price" constituted the weakest point in his theory of "systematic colonization."

Wakefield's mature interpretation of the "sufficient price" appeared much narrower than his earlier thoughts.

He said:

The sole object of a price [a "sufficient price"] is to prevent laborers from turning into landowners too soon: the price must be sufficient for that one purpose and no other.²⁵⁰

His means of determining the "sufficient price" were, however, much broader. They included: how long was "too soon?" what was the proper term of laborers?²⁵¹ what was the rate

²⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 346-347.

²⁴⁷Ibid., p. 348.

²⁴⁸Ibid., p. 347.

²⁴⁹Ibid.

²⁵⁰Ibid.

²⁵¹In testifying in 1836, Wakefield said about three years would be proper. supra, p. 79.

of population growth? what was the rate of immigration? what was the distance between the mother country and the colony? what was the cost of the passage for those who paid their own way? what price would produce the desired effects? what was the rate of wages? what was the cost of living? how fast could laborers save money? what was the soil and climate like? and how much land did a settler need?²⁵²

To Wakefield in 1849, the "sufficient price" should never be lowered.²⁵³ It should, when possible, be started at a price known to be low, and raised as the need for increases arose. The increases, though, were to be small and gradual.²⁵⁴ This kind of a policy would keep the good will of the early land purchasers and not alienate later purchasers. The latter would pay more but would reap the benefits of a long term policy. The colonizing Government, therefore, should set a low price and gradually raise it.²⁵⁵

In his testimony before the several parliamentary committees, Wakefield had consistently denounced the practice of selling land at public auction.²⁵⁶ In A View of the Art of Colonization, he reiterated his opposition to this by saying,

²⁵²Wakefield, Art of Colonization, pp. 347-348.

²⁵³Ibid., p. 350.

²⁵⁴Ibid.

²⁵⁵Ibid., p. 352.

²⁵⁶Supra, pp. 76, 80-81.

SELLING WASTE LAND BY AUCTION . . . IS EITHER
A FOOLISH CONCEIT OR A FALSE PRETENSE.²⁵⁷

The upset price (the lowest price, pre-set, accepted for land sold at an auction) must be a "sufficient price."²⁵⁸

This would keep the sale of land consistent with the remainder of the comprehensive theory of "systematic colonization."

Also, the amount of land sold at auction should be limited, thereby causing competition for it.²⁵⁹ The price of the land would then be above the minimum "sufficient price."

In support of this concept, Wakefield said:

. . . the government must needs determine what degree of limitation would produce enough competition to make the lowest selling price a sufficient price. The sufficient price would still be determined by the government, but by means of a sufficient limitation of the quantity offered for sale.²⁶⁰

Wakefield, however, still objected to the policy of selling land at auction. He listed seven major objections against land auctions.²⁶¹ As an alternative to land auctions, he re-stated his theory. A settler should buy land from the Government at a fixed, uniform, "sufficient price" and take possession of it.²⁶² If his land increased in value, he profited.²⁶³ In this way "Land buying--in other words emigration and settlement--would be promoted."²⁶⁴

²⁵⁷Wakefield, Art of Colonization, p. 355. This quotation came from the caption to "Letter L."

²⁵⁸Ibid., p. 354.

²⁵⁹Ibid.

²⁶⁰Ibid.

²⁶¹See Appendix B.

²⁶²Wakefield, Art of Colonization, p. 361.

²⁶³Ibid., p. 362.

²⁶⁴Ibid.

Wakefield believed that by following his concept of the "sufficient price," laborers would not become landowners too soon.²⁶⁵ Capitalists would then emigrate from the mother country, and the colonies would prosper.²⁶⁶ Colonization would increase rapidly, but would be of a good quality and would produce a civilized colony--an extension of British society, ". . . and the sole cause of the whole improvement would be the sufficient price."²⁶⁷

In A View of the Art of Colonization, Wakefield restated the value and importance of a preliminary survey.²⁶⁸ In A Letter From Sydney, he had mentioned but not emphasized this idea. In England and America, he also pointed out the use of a preliminary survey. After the early debacle in South Australia, Wakefield came to believe strongly in the need for a preliminary survey. In making his point about the importance of such a survey in 1849, he said:

. . . in order to let the purchaser choose his land with a sufficient knowledge of the country, and further in order to let him point out his choice to the government and obtain a properly descriptive title, a good map, the result of a careful survey, is indispensable.²⁶⁹

As he had done earlier, Wakefield declared that proceeds from land sales at the "sufficient price" should go into an emigration fund to be used to pay the passage of pauper emigrants to serve as laborers for a few years.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁵Ibid., p. 372. ²⁶⁶Ibid. ²⁶⁷Ibid., p. 374.

²⁶⁸Ibid., p. 402. ²⁶⁹Ibid. ²⁷⁰Ibid., p. 375.

The use of an emigration fund would speed up immigration into a colony.²⁷¹ The increased population would raise land values, and decrease the scarcity of labor.²⁷² As these results came about, capital would be attracted into the colony and the whole cycle would be repeated. Wakefield believed by using the emigration fund, the laborer's term of service would be decreased, which would allow laborers to become landowners sooner.²⁷³ If the labor supply did not decrease, the whole colony would benefit.²⁷⁴

The emigration fund should placate objections raised by the working class to the use of the "sufficient price,"²⁷⁵ and help to make the whole theory of "systematic colonization" more popular with them.²⁷⁶ This, in itself, would help to make possible the success of "systematic colonization."

In selecting people to emigrate from Britain through use of the emigration fund, Wakefield still held to the idea that ". . . preference should always be given to young married couples, or to young people of marriageable age in an equal proportion of the sexes."²⁷⁷ This would create a society of nearly all married people and children, which would make it possible to discover through experimentation what effect education would have upon a society of common people.²⁷⁸

²⁷¹Ibid., p. 380.

²⁷²Ibid.

²⁷³Ibid., p. 381.

²⁷⁴Ibid.

²⁷⁵Ibid.

²⁷⁶Ibid.

²⁷⁷Ibid., p. 405.

²⁷⁸Ibid., p. 414.

In summing up his final views on the emigration fund, Wakefield stated,

Altogether, the effect of devoting the purchase-money of land to emigration, would be to augment more quickly than by any other disposition of the fund, the population, wealth, and greatness of the British empire.²⁷⁹

In regard to emigrants, other than young people, Wakefield wanted all kinds of people from all walks of life to migrate from Britain.²⁸⁰ In particular, he encouraged people of means to emigrate.²⁸¹ He presumed they would be educated and could assume positions of leadership in the colony.²⁸² They would likely encourage education, patronize the arts, and uplift (at least on the surface) the morals of the colony.²⁸³ This latter was desperately needed in the hell holes of the former penal colonies in Australia.

The immigration of young women to Australia would help to ease the conditions of extreme depravity into which the former penal colonies had sunk.²⁸⁴ Immigration into a colony by those of means would also contribute to the strengthening of the colonies as extensions of British society. These people were, in Wakefield's words, ". . . the highest order, and the most valuable class of emigrants."²⁸⁵

²⁷⁹Ibid., p. 380. ²⁸⁰Ibid., p. 136. ²⁸¹Ibid.

²⁸²Ibid.

²⁸³Ibid.

²⁸⁴Wakefield, A Letter From Sydney, pp. 47-54. See also, Clark, pp. 189-223.

²⁸⁵Wakefield, Art of Colonization, p. 136.

The emigration of wealthier people from Britain would help to eradicate the idea that it would be disgraceful to migrate to Australia. Emigration should not be faced ". . . with dislike and terror."²⁸⁶ This idea had grown up when transportation of criminals to Australia occurred regularly.²⁸⁷ The fact that convicts and ex-convicts lived in the Australian colonies deterred some possible emigrants. The reports sent back by convicts from the penal colonies, however, indicated they lived a good life.²⁸⁸ "Such reports from convicts are being continually received amongst the poor in all parts of this country. They may encourage crime; but they certainly discourage emigration,"²⁸⁹ Wakefield wrote in 1849. The presence of convicts in a colony, according to him, discouraged the common people from emigrating.²⁹⁰

As a general rule, women in nineteenth century Britain played a rather small supporting role compared to men. Wakefield asserted, however, in colonization women played a major role; perhaps the most important.²⁹¹ In fact Wakefield said ". . . all depends on their participation in the work."²⁹² A religious woman, according to him, contributed even more because she would be ". . . a guide, a stay, and a comfort"²⁹³ to the men who emigrated. The influence

²⁸⁶Ibid., p. 138. ²⁸⁷Ibid., p. 139. ²⁸⁸Ibid.

²⁸⁹Ibid. ²⁹⁰Ibid., p. 138. ²⁹¹Ibid., p. 155.

²⁹²Ibid. ²⁹³Ibid.

of such women in a colony would be one of making the colony more ". . . virtuous and polite."²⁹⁴

The role of the "legislator" or of one who proposed colonial theories Wakefield stated, consisted of complicated calculations in attempting to put into effect the theory of "systematic colonization."²⁹⁵ For the most part, to solve these needed calculations, the legislator must rely on experience, common sense, and the facts, as they existed.²⁹⁶ To affirm this contention, Wakefield wrote,

He [the legislator] could always tell whether or not labour for hire was too scarce or too plentiful in the colony. If it were too plentiful, he would know that the price of new land was too high; that is, more than sufficient: if it [Labor] were hurtfully scarce, he would know that the price was too low, or not sufficient.²⁹⁷

He added that his system did not regulate itself, but needed the guidance of a skillful legislator [himself] or administrative body.²⁹⁸

Wakefield, in 1849, did not modify the theory of empire he had proposed in A Letter From Sydney twenty years earlier, but used different terms to describe it.²⁹⁹ To him, only two kinds of government were possible--municipal or local on the one hand, and imperial or central on the

²⁹⁴ Ibid. ²⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 348. ²⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 349.

²⁹⁷ Ibid. ²⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 352.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 224. Local autonomous government he called "municipal" and Imperial Government he called "central."

other hand.³⁰⁰ It mattered not at all whether the Government of a colony was ". . . democratic, aristocratic, or despotic, it must be either municipal or central, or both combined in some proportion to each other."³⁰¹

Wakefield believed that the principle of municipal government could be applied to the lesser matters,³⁰² while the questions of over-all policy should be handled by the Imperial Government.³⁰³ He cited the experiences in the thirteen American colonies, which he said had been governed locally, for the most part, within the limits imposed by royal restrictions.³⁰⁴ As these restrictions on the local colonial governments increased, the American settlers became restive and eventually broke away from the Imperial Government.³⁰⁵

Following the successful revolt of the American colonies, the penal colonies in Australia were founded.³⁰⁶ This led to complete colonial government by the imperial authority because local self-government was impractical.³⁰⁷ In an attempt to more effectively govern these penal colonies from London, the Government created a ". . . Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies . . ."³⁰⁸ who had charge of all colonial affairs. This Colonial Secretary curtailed

³⁰⁰Ibid. ³⁰¹Ibid. ³⁰²Ibid., p. 226.

³⁰³Ibid., p. 227. ³⁰⁴Ibid., p. 230. ³⁰⁵Ibid., p. 232.

³⁰⁶Ibid. ³⁰⁷Ibid. ³⁰⁸Ibid., p. 232-233.

local colonial self-government throughout the Empire. One man, however, was not capable of administering the whole imperial structure.³⁰⁹ To overcome this obstacle, the Government allowed a bureaucracy to grow up to aid the Colonial Secretary.³¹⁰ As this bureaucracy grew and gained strength, it became an almost autonomous department, with executive and legislative powers over the colonies, and almost separate from the actual government.³¹¹ To Wakefield, this colonial government by bureaucracy was ". . . essentially repugnant to our [the British] general institutions, and even to our national character."³¹²

The Wakefield theory of empire would leave the governing of a colony to the colonial inhabitants who ". . . would perform this function better than the mother-country could."³¹³ The local colonial government would operate within the broad imperial framework instituted by the Imperial Parliament and Government. This colonial government would be a responsible government, with strong allegiance to the mother-country because of cultural and family ties and political institutions. In Wakefield's words,

. . . the imperial government would establish an imperial policy; but instead of attempting, what it could not perform well, the particular execution of this policy in every colony, it would confide that task of executive details to the parties most deeply,

³⁰⁹Ibid., p. 233.

³¹⁰Ibid., pp. 233-234.

³¹¹Ibid.

³¹²Ibid., p. 234.

³¹³Ibid., p. 439.

immediately, and unremittingly interested in its best possible performance: that is, for each colony separately, to the responsible municipal [local] government of that colony alone.³¹⁴

In essence, Wakefield proposed a federal system of government, with the Imperial Government making general policy and the local governments implementing this policy as it would best suit their needs.

Summary of the Wakefield Theory of
"Systematic Colonization"

In 1829, Edward Gibbon Wakefield proposed a theory of colonization that unified the three elements of wealth needed for colonization; land, labor, and capital. This theory, in addition to its economic aspect, also contained social and political counterparts. The comprehensive nature of the proposed theory attracted many adherents. While Wakefield modified some of his particular ideas in 1833, 1836, 1841, and 1849, the over-all plan and component parts remained essentially unchanged. In actual implementation, in South Australia in 1836 and New Zealand in the 1840's, the Wakefield scheme did not receive a complete trial. Had it been fully implemented, because it was utopian and idealistic, it probably would have failed.

The political side of the theory, however, has been generally accepted, and today, the Commonwealth of Nations stands upon the foundations of a loose imperial policy effected by the local responsible self-governments of the

³¹⁴ Ibid., p. 440.

various member states of the Commonwealth in a way that Wakefield would have understood. Thus the political aspects of the plan for "systematic colonization" have enjoyed greater success than the economic and social ideas set forth at the same time. Nevertheless, these two parts of the Wakefield theory did enjoy some limited acceptance in Australia and New Zealand where modern society shows evidence of a stable, middle class, nineteenth century British social order.

CHAPTER IV

THE "WAKEFIELDIANS" OR COLONIAL REFORMERS

Introduction

Edward Gibbon Wakefield, because of his previous prison record, could not publicly lead his movement for colonial reform.¹ To overcome this stigma, he brought together a small group of followers and worked through them to carry his campaign to the Government, Parliament, and the public.² Sir William Molesworth, Charles Buller, Robert Torrens, and John George Lambton, the first Earl of Durham emerged as the most important members of this group. These "Wakefieldians" vehemently opposed the indifference of the Government toward the British Empire, though they believed it might eventually disintegrate.³

The "Radical Imperialists," beginning in 1830, agitated for colonial reform and advocated the theory of

¹George Bennett (ed.), The Concept of Empire: Burke to Attlee, 1774-1947, Vol. VI of The British Political Tradition, ed. Allan Bullock and F. W. Deakin (8 vols; London: A. and C. Black, 1962), p. 127.

²Ibid. See also, John Norman, Edward Gibbon Wakefield: A Political Reappraisal, Vol. VIII, No. 3 of New Frontiers (Fairfield, Conn.: New Frontiers of Fairfield University, 1963), p. xiii.

³Carrington, p. 325.

"systematic colonization." They

. . . took up the theme of a colony to ease the labour problem in the British Isles, and to offer a gracious career open to talent and enterprise in an Elysian setting.⁴

The philosophical roots for the "Radical Imperialists" came from the Whig Radicals and the Classical Economists of the early nineteenth century.⁵ The link between the Colonial Reformers and these groups existed through John Stuart Mill, who said:

Colonization, in the present state of the world, is the very best affair of business, in which the capital of an old wealthy country can possibly engage.⁶

The "Wakefieldians" developed this theme of using colonies for investing surplus capital. They also stressed the idea that overseas colonies helped reduce the redundancy of the British population.⁷

By a rather strange quirk of fate, the leaders of colonial reform died young,⁸ with the exceptions of Wakefield and Torrens. Molesworth passed away at forty-five, Durham at forty-eight, Buller at forty-two, and Wakefield, who suffered brain paralysis at fifty-one, died when sixty-six.

⁴Clark, pp. 143-144.

⁵Carrington, p. 325.

⁶Ibid., pp. 326-327, quoting John Stuart Mill.

⁷Woodward, p. 368.

⁸Somervell, English Thought in the Nineteenth Century (New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1929), p. 179.

Torrens, the only one who lived a lengthy life, died at eighty-four.⁹

Of the four leading "Radical Imperialists" through whom Wakefield worked, Lord Durham became the most widely known because of his 1839 Durham Report on conditions in Canada. The remaining three, as members of the House of Commons, brought the Wakefield theory before that body and the public.

Sir William Molesworth

Sir William Molesworth, born in London on May 23, 1810, became the eighth Baronet of Pencarrow.¹⁰ As a youth, he suffered from poor health and was permanently disfigured when stricken by scrofula.¹¹

Molesworth studied at the University of Edinburgh from 1824 until 1827, and then entered St. John's College, but shortly thereafter switched to Trinity College.¹² Following a quarrel with his tutor Henry Barnard, Molesworth was sent down from Cambridge in 1828.¹³ The following year, he crossed the channel, dueled with Barnard, and then set out on a three year tour of Germany and Italy.¹⁴

⁹Woodward, p. 96.

¹⁰Leslie Stephen, "William Molesworth," D. N. B., XIII, 570. See also, Bloomfield, p. 56.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Woodward, p. 95, n. 3. See also, Bloomfield, p. 112.

¹⁴Ibid. No one was harmed in the duel.

After he returned from the Continent in 1831, an East Cornwall constituency elected Molesworth to the House of Commons.¹⁵ In 1833, he joined the colonial reform element in the Commons and developed into one of their foremost leaders.¹⁶

In addition to his activities as a Parliamentary leader for colonial reform, Molesworth assumed a crucial role in investigating, condemning, and abolishing transportation of criminals to the colonies.¹⁷ In leading this humanitarian crusade, Molesworth founded the London Review, in April, 1835.¹⁸ In 1838, he purchased the Westminster Review, combined it with the London Review, and called the new publication the London and Westminster Review.¹⁹ Besides editing this journal, Molesworth contributed many articles in which he supported the cause of the Colonial Reformers.²⁰

Sir William, returned to the House of Commons by a Leeds constituency in 1837, became Chairman of the Committee on Transportation.²¹ The following year, he delivered a savage attack upon Lord Gleneig of the Colonial Office for

¹⁵D. N. B., XIII, p. 570. ¹⁶Bloomfield, p. 114.

¹⁷D. N. B., XIII, 570. See also, Bloomfield, p. 149.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 571.

¹⁹Ibid. See also, Bloomfield, p. 149.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 571-572.

²¹Ibid., p. 571. See also, Woodward, p. 386.

his lack of action in the matter of the deteriorating situation in New Zealand.²² New Zealand, embroiled at the time in a quarrel between the English and Maori natives, appeared to be rapidly heading toward a bitter civil war. Lord Glenelg had not attempted to avert this disaster, according to Molesworth.

For the most part, Molesworth supported the ideas and policies of Wakefield.²³ In 1838, however, these two had a slight altercation because Molesworth refused to support Wakefield's attempt to secure local governmental councils in addition to a New Zealand Parliament.²⁴ Wakefield, while not openly castigating Molesworth, declared that Sir William did not understand the necessity of having local government in the colonies.²⁵

Molesworth often puzzled his friends and opponents alike. Subject to periodical moodiness, violent rages, and biting sarcasm, he also amazed his acquaintances quite frequently by his bizarre actions. Paul Bloomfield, one of Wakefield's biographers, wrote:

Molesworth amazed him [Lord Adderley] almost as much as Wakefield did. The way the long-haired Cornish baronet [Molesworth] prepared his speeches Adderley found, was to lounge about in a gorgeous dressing-gown

²²Great Britain, 3 Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, XLI (1838), 476-512. Hereafter cited as Parliamentary Debates.

²³D. N. B., XIII, 571. ²⁴Bloomfield, p. 319.

²⁵Ibid.

dictating to a secretary, to the accompaniment of screeches from two caged macaws specially introduced to give a general impression of conditions in the House of Commons. Molesworth then learnt his matter by heart and delivered it without using notes.²⁶

In a speech prepared in the preceding manner, and delivered before the House of Commons in 1838, Molesworth definitely disassociated himself from the Parliamentary faction that desired to grant full independence to all of the British colonies.²⁷ He declared:

. . . do not "Emancipate your Colonies," but multiply them, and improve--reform your system of colonial government. . . . I yield to no man in the House in a desire to preserve and extend the colonial empire of England.²⁸

Molesworth then paraphrased Wakefield's contention in A Letter From Sydney that Britain had changed from a system of self-governing colonies to an empire of crown colonies administered from London.²⁹ He also reiterated Wakefield's assertion in England and America that "the Ripon Regulations," passed in 1831, aided immigration to New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land and that at the present time (1838) an emigration fund of £400,000 existed.³⁰

²⁶ Ibid., p. 305.

²⁷ Parliamentary Debates, XLI (1838), 476.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 483.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 482.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 492; supra, p. 87, n. 244.

When he addressed the House of Commons in 1839, Molesworth restated the essentials of "systematic colonization." He said land should be sold at a fixed price, with the resulting revenue to be used to encourage emigration in proportion to land sales. The price of land should be high enough to prevent people from buying more land than they needed. These regulations, if fully employed, would lead to regular purchases of land with a steady supply of labor to work this land, "For land, without labor to cultivate it, is worthless."³¹ Molesworth added, that this theory

. . . form^{ed} no inconsiderable and by no means the least valuable portion of Lord Durham's Report on Canada.³²

On May 5, 1840, Sir William again addressed the House of Commons, this time to report the findings of the Committee on Transportation.³³ He began his speech by listing the reasons for which the Committee had been authorized.

³¹Ibid., XLVIII (1839), 869-870. The quotation is found on page 870. Molesworth continued to develop the complete Wakefield theory in detail and said ". . . the justice of those principles have been acknowledged by most persons well versed in the science of political economy. They were first put forth about the year 1829 by my friend, Mr. Wakefield, to whom . . . the great merit of their discovery is exclusively due. In 1833 they were fully developed, in an admirable work of Mr. Wakefield's, called "England and America." The preceding year ^{really in 1831} they had been partially adopted by the Colonial Office, in certain regulations, known by the name of Lord Howick's Regulations ^{also known as the Ripon Regulations}. . . . In 1833 they were embodied in the Act for creating the colony of South Australia ^{referring to the South Australia Act of 1834}, and they constitute the basis of that rapidly flourishing colony." (Parliamentary Debates, XLVIII ¹⁸³⁹, 872).

³²Ibid., p. 872.

³³Ibid., LIII (1840), 1237.

He said the Committee

. . . was appointed for the threefold purpose, first, of inquiring into the efficacy of transportation as a punishment; secondly, of ascertaining its moral effect on the penal colonies; and lastly, the committee were directed to consider of what improvements the existing system was susceptible."³⁴

The only evidence the Committee considered consisted of documents, Colonial Office despatches to and from the several colonial governors, court records, and testimony for witnesses.³⁵ Molesworth's speech on the "Report of the Committee on Transportation" was detailed and specific. In delivering it, he once again outlined the Wakefield theory of "systematic colonization" and declared that if transportation were abolished, the emigration of free settlers from Britain to Australia would increase.³⁶ Sir William concluded his brief, gory description of transportation by moving,

that the punishment of transportation should be abolished, and the penitentiary system of punishment be adopted in its stead as soon as practicable: and that the funds to be derived from the sale of waste lands in New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land ought to be anticipated by means of loans on that security, for the purpose of promoting extensive emigration to those colonies.³⁷

Shortly after this address on transportation, Molesworth retired from the House of Commons.³⁸ Four years later,

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid. Testimony from witnesses was admitted and considered only if it could be supported by official documents. (Ibid.)

³⁶Ibid., pp. 1276-78.

³⁷Ibid., p. 1279.

³⁸D. N. B., XIII, 571.

he married a widow, Andalusia Grant, ". . . a vivacious lady who had been on the stage."³⁹ After an absence of five years, Molesworth, representing Southwark, returned to the Commons in September, 1845.⁴⁰ He again espoused colonial reform, which earned for him the position of First Commissioner of the Board of Works and a seat in Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet in 1853.⁴¹

Following Lord John Russell's resignation in 1855, Lord Palmerston, the Prime Minister, appointed Molesworth Colonial Secretary.⁴² He held this office less than four months as he died on October 22, 1855.⁴³

Charles Buller

Charles Buller, born in Calcutta on August 6, 1806, proved to be a leading advocate of colonial reform in the House of Commons.⁴⁴ He suffered a severe leg injury as a youth from which he never fully recovered.⁴⁵

³⁹Ibid. See also, Bloomfield, p. 57.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid. See also, Woodward, p. 95, n. 3, and Bloomfield, p. 338.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴William Prideaux Courtney, "Charles Buller," D. N. B., III, 246.

⁴⁵Ibid.

For his education, Buller first attended Harrow School and, in 1821, moved to Edinburgh with his brother, to study with Thomas Carlyle.⁴⁶ While there, he entered Edinburgh University for a part of the term in 1821-22 and again in 1822-23.⁴⁷ From Edinburgh, Buller went to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his B. A. degree in 1828.⁴⁸ At Cambridge, Buller served as President of the Union, and acquired the reputation of being a practical joker.⁴⁹

In 1830, Charles Buller replaced his father as Member of Parliament for West Loos⁵⁰ and upon taking his seat, he promptly joined the Colonial Reformers.⁵¹ During the 1830-31 Parliamentary session, Buller became known as a liberal politician. This became obvious in 1832, when he supported the Reform Bill which eliminated his own Parliamentary constituency.⁵² Following the enactment of the Reform Bill, he became the representative for the Liskeard constituency⁵³ and held this seat until his death.⁵⁴

As a liberal Whig and a Colonial Reformer, Buller helped Wakefield plan the proposed colony in South Australia in 1834.⁵⁵ These two men spent hours poring over the

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 247.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Bloomfield, p. 112.

⁵⁰D. N. B., III, 247.

⁵¹Bloomfield, p. 114.

⁵²D. N. B., III, 247.

⁵³Ibid., XIII, 570.

⁵⁴Ibid., III, 247.

⁵⁵Garnett, pp. 92-93.

available maps of Australia and laid out the colony of their dreams.⁵⁶ Their ability as organizers became apparent years after the founding of the colony.

In the meantime, Buller became involved in reforming the system of keeping official records, and served as Chairman of a House of Commons committee inquiring into the Irish election laws.⁵⁷ In 1837, he appeared as a witness before the Committee on Transportation. Like Molesworth, the Chairman of the Committee, Buller opposed transportation and urged its abolition.⁵⁸

Following Lord Durham's appointment to investigate the causes of the Rebellions of 1837 in Canada, Durham invited Charles Buller to be his chief secretary--Buller accepted and accompanied Lord Durham to Canada in 1838.⁵⁹ Upon their return to Britain, Buller and Wakefield assisted Lord Durham in writing the Durham Report.⁶⁰

⁵⁶Bloomfield, p. 119.

⁵⁷D. N. B., III, 247.

⁵⁸Bloomfield, p. 170.

⁵⁹D. N. B., III, 247.

⁶⁰William Prideaux Courtney, in his essay on Charles Buller in the D. N. B., and Edward Irving Carlyle, in his essay on Edward Gibbon Wakefield, asserted Lord Durham had little to do with the writing of the Durham Report. Paul Bloomfield, on the other hand, declared in his biography of Wakefield that Durham probably wrote most of the Report. In essence, it really makes little difference who wrote the Report--it expressed the ideas and opinions of all three participants. Carrington, in regard to this matter said, "The Report is graced here and there with flashes of Buller's lively wit and is strengthened with the close contexture of Wakefield's forceful argument in those passages dealing with

When the Report had been completed, Charles Buller turned to the practice of law,⁶¹ the profession in which he had received his training. He had not chosen to enter into the practice of law when he received his admittance to the bar in 1831.⁶² Now, in 1839, he concentrated upon trying cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and specialized in Colonial and Indian Affairs.⁶³ In 1840, he sat on the Commons' Committee investigating New Zealand affairs. He became Secretary to the Board of Control in 1841, but resigned when Sir Robert Peel came into office in 1841.⁶⁴ Buller returned to the Government in 1846 when Lord John Russell named him Judge-advocate-general.⁶⁵ In 1847, he became Chief Poor Law Commissioner and the following year he carried several minor poor law reforms through Parliament.⁶⁶

While being deeply involved with his legal practice and Parliamentary affairs, Charles Buller remained active with the Colonial Reformers. In 1845, he tried to effect an arrangement with Earl Grey of the Colonial Office to keep the New Zealand Company from being dissolved.⁶⁷ He succeeded in thwarting this development for several years, but in

subjects in which he was expert; clearly Durham would not have employed these men if he had not intended to make use of their talents." (Carrington, The British Overseas, p. 344.)

⁶¹D. N. B., III, 247.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Bloomfield, p. 288.

1850, the Company lost its charter. Buller, however, did not live to see the dissolution of the Company, as he died on November 29, 1848, from complications following an operation.⁶⁸ Only forty-one at the time of his death, his passing came as a shock to most people.⁶⁹

Buller, like Molesworth, came from a wealthy family.⁷⁰ Unlike Molesworth though, Buller had a pleasing, striking appearance, a keen wit, and a good disposition. This made him attractive to women wherever he went but despite this, he remained a bachelor.⁷¹

In addition to his parliamentary activities and his interest in colonial reform, Buller wrote many articles which appeared in the Globe, The Guide, the Edinburgh Review, and the Westminster Review.⁷² In fact, he helped found The Guide (a new weekly paper) in 1837, and remained with it as co-editor for several years.⁷³

Charles Buller, in his speeches before the House of Commons, supported the program propounded and advocated by Edward Gibbon Wakefield. His speeches ring with an unqualified, absolute sincerity, and a belief that the program he supported was a positive, forward looking policy. For

⁶⁸D. N. B., III, 248. ⁶⁹Bloomfield, p. 113.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 56.

⁷¹D. N. B., III, 248. See also, Bloomfield, p. 57.

⁷²Ibid. ⁷³Ibid., p. 247.

example, in 1839, Buller said he was glad the Government had adopted some of the principles set forth in the Durham Report.⁷⁴ In particular, he approved of the unification of Upper and Lower Canada.⁷⁵ He was, however, disappointed because the Government had not proposed the unification of all the provinces in British North America.⁷⁶

Later in 1839, Buller moved several resolutions that read as though Wakefield had drafted them. They were:

1. That the occupation, and cultivation, of waste lands in the British colonies, by means of emigration, tend to improve the condition of all the industrial classes in the United Kingdom, by diminishing competition for employment at home, in consequence new markets, and increasing the demand for shipping and manufactures.

2. That the prosperity of colonies, and the progress of colonization, mainly depend upon the manner in which a right of private property in the waste lands of a colony may be acquired; and that, amidst the great variety of methods of disposing of waste lands which have been pursued by the British Government, the most effectual, beyond all comparison is the plan of sale, at a fixed, uniform, and "sufficient" price, for ready money, without any other condition or restriction; and the employment of the whole, or a large fixed proportion, of the purchase-money, in affording a passage to the colony, cost-free, to young persons of the labouring class, in an equal proportion of sexes.

3. That in order to derive the greatest possible advantage from this method of colonizing, it is essential that the permanence of the system should be secured by the Legislature, and that its administration should be intrusted to a distinct subordinate branch of the Colonial Department, authorized to sell colonial lands in this country; to anticipate the sales of land by raising loans for emigration, on the security of future land sales, and generally to superintend the arrangements by which the comfort and well-being of the emigrants are to be secured.

⁷⁴Parliamentary Debates, XLVII (1839), 1282.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Ibid.

4. That this method of colonizing has been applied by the Legislature to the new colony of South Australia with very remarkable and gratifying results, and that it is expedient that Parliament should extend the South Australian system to all other colonies which are suited to its operation.⁷⁷

In 1843, Buller again advocated systematic colonization as the solution to the redundant population and economic hardship then prevalent in Britain. He said,

. . . the competition both of capital and labour in a restrictive field, I propose colonization as a means of remedying that evil by enlarging the field of employment.⁷⁸

. . . for the relief of distress . . . I advocate . . . opening a wider field of employment to the labour and capital of the country. This it is proposed to do by freely admitting the produce of foreign countries; supporting our labourers by all the additional supplies of food which we can draw from abroad; and exchanging for that food and other produce the manufactures wrought by the labourers who subsist on that imported food.⁷⁹

I propose colonization as subsidiary to Free-trade; as an additional mode of carrying out the same principles, and attaining the same object. You advocates of Free-trade wish to bring food to the people. I suggest to you at the same time to take your people to the food.⁸⁰

Since the free-traders wished to gain more markets, Buller suggested that in addition to securing these markets, they could be created by starting new colonies which would open

⁷⁷Clark, Sources of Australian History, pp. 144-145. (From Parliamentary Debates, XLVIII (1839), pp. 841ff.)

⁷⁸Parliamentary Debates, LXVIII (1843), 499.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 500.

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 500-501.

investment opportunities for capital and provide jobs at home by expanding trade.⁸¹

Buller concluded his powerful argument for founding new colonies by urging,

that an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that she will take into her most gracious consideration the means by which extensive and systematic colonization may be effectually rendered available for augmenting the resources of her Majesty's empire, giving additional employment to capital and labour, both in the United Kingdom and in the colonies, and thereby bettering the condition of her people.⁸²

Robert Torrens

Robert Torrens, born in 1780, first stood for election to Parliament in 1818, in the Rochester constituency.⁸³ He entered Parliament as the representative for Ipswich in 1826, and he represented Ashburton in 1831.⁸⁴ When the fight to pass the Reform Bill of 1832 became bitter, Torrens strongly supported the Bill.⁸⁵ Following its passage, he became the representative for Bolton, Lancashire and held this seat for a number of years.⁸⁶

During his lifetime, Robert Torrens wrote many tracts and articles on economics and colonization in which he combined land, labor, and capital, and asserted they were the three elements of production.⁸⁷ Several of his more

⁸¹Ibid., p. 501.

⁸²Ibid., p. 531.

⁸³D. N. B., XIX, 993.

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵Ibid. ⁸⁶Ibid., p. 994. ⁸⁷Ibid., p. 993-994.

noted works were: On the Colonisation of South Australia (1835), Systematic Colonisation (1849), and The Budget, or a Commercial and Colonial Policy (1844).⁸⁸ In addition to his writing, Torrens edited the Globe (a weekly newspaper), owned a share of the Traveller (another weekly newspaper), and directed the merging of these two papers.⁸⁹ His literary achievements were recognized by his membership in the Political Economy Club, and his election as a Fellow of the Royal Society.⁹⁰

In 1828, Torrens advocated selling colonial waste lands, thereby increasing the Government's revenue. To support his contentions, he cited the United States' land sales policy.⁹¹ This proposal may have influenced Wakefield's thoughts, as he did not write A Letter From Sydney until 1829, but there is no proof of a definite influence.

When Wakefield organized his group in 1830, Robert Torrens joined and became an active, resourceful, though at times a contrary associate.⁹² As new Wakefield enterprises formed and old ones disappeared, Torrens supported the new endeavors.⁹³ In defending his support of Wakefield's theory, Torrens said:

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 994.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ B. S. P., XI (1836), Minutes of Evidence, q. 1178, p. 640.

⁹² Bloomfield, p. 114.

⁹³ D. N. B., XIX, 994.

The objection, that the abstraction of labour and capital in establishing new colonies, checks prosperity, and diminishes employment in the mother country, is not a deduction derived from experience, but an inference drawn from the assumed principle that the increase of capital is, in itself, sufficient to increase the field of employment, and the demand for labour. This assumed principle is erroneous.⁹⁴

Torrens, in 1831, joined the South Australian Land Company.⁹⁵ Later in the same year under Wakefield's obvious influence, he declared during a Common's debate on supply for the convicts at Botany Bay, that colonial lands if sold under proper regulations could provide adequate funds for Botany Bay.⁹⁶ Again in 1831, Torrens asserted that colonies would be self-supporting from their beginning if managed properly. As an outlet (escape valve) for the redundant population of Britain, the colonies provided relief from the high poor-rates in England.⁹⁷ Torrens continued:

. . . Government should take care no grants were made, and that no individual occupied the best parts of it [land], without paying for it, when it . . . became valuable.⁹⁸

During the long, arduous fight to get governmental approval to found a colony in South Australia, Wakefield and the others often became depressed. Torrens, however,

⁹⁴Klaus E. Knorr, British Colonial Theories 1570-1850 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), p. 297, quoting Robert Torrens, The Budget, p. 85.

⁹⁵D. N. B., XIX, 994.

⁹⁶Parliamentary Debates, IV (1831), 1443-1444.

⁹⁷Ibid., V (1831), 301.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 302.

did not because he viewed the projected colony as a patriotic endeavor to rid England of pauperism, and as a scientific experiment in economics.⁹⁹

When the South Australian Land Company broke up in 1834, Robert Torrens joined the South Australian Association.¹⁰⁰ In May, 1835, he became Chairman of the Commissioners of South Australia, a body created by the Government to oversee the founding of a colony in South Australia.¹⁰¹ Torrens testified in 1836, before the Select Committee on Disposal of Lands in the British Colonies and advocated the extension of the provisions of the South Australia Act to all of Australia.¹⁰² This, he felt, would expedite colonization by allowing loans to be raised based upon the revenue of future land sales.¹⁰³ His testimony before this Committee received wide attention because many people knew Torrens had helped Gibbon Wakefield modify the proposed plans for founding South Australia.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹Garnett, p. 95. ¹⁰⁰D. N. B., XIX, 994.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²B. S. P. (Commons), XI (1836), Minutes of Evidence, q. 1181, p. 641.

¹⁰³Ibid.

¹⁰⁴Bloomfield, p. 123. The part of the plan they changed concerned the form of government Wakefield desired for the colony. He wanted responsible government, but Lord Howick, the Colonial Secretary, said it was incompatible with the Government of the United Kingdom. In order to secure Howick's approval to found the colony, Wakefield had to strike the offending form of government he had proposed.

Robert Torrens, in 1840, accepted an appointment to the newly formed Board of Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners.¹⁰⁵ This Board assumed all the duties and responsibilities previously exercised by the Commissioners of South Australia and other bodies of a similar nature concerned with colonial lands and emigration.¹⁰⁶

As a tribute to his outstanding work and devotion to the cause of colonial reform, Torrens received the honor of having Lake Torrens and the Torrens River in South Australia named after him.¹⁰⁷ After his involvement in colonial reform, Robert Torrens retired from public life and eventually died on May 27, 1864.

Lord Durham

Born on April 12, 1792, John George Lambton, the first earl of Durham, received his education at Eaton.¹⁰⁸ He entered the 10th dragoons in 1809, but retired from them two years later.¹⁰⁹ In 1813, representing the Durham constituency, he entered the House of Commons as a liberal Whig.¹¹⁰ Known as "Radical Jack," Lambton became one of the principal leaders of the liberal wing of the Whig party.

¹⁰⁵C. H. B. E., II, 450.

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁷D. N. B., XIX, 994.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., XI, 463.

¹⁰⁹Ibid. See also, Woodward, p. 95, n. 5.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

In 1828, "Radical Jack" married Louisa Grey, the eldest daughter of the second Earl Grey.¹¹¹ This marriage led to his elevation to the baronage, as he became the Baron of Durham.¹¹² Lambton then became a privy councillor and in 1830, the Lord privy seal.¹¹³ He resigned from the Commons and entered the House of Lords, but still played a vital role in guiding the Reform Bill of 1832 through the lower house.¹¹⁴

Shortly after the passage of "the Bill," the future Lord Durham accepted an appointment as ambassador extraordinary to St. Petersburg.¹¹⁵ This assignment was extended to cover the courts at Berlin and Vienna on September 14.¹¹⁶ He resigned these positions on March 23, 1833, and on the same day became Viscount Lambton and Earl of Durham.¹¹⁷ After this abortive mission to the Continent, Lord Durham involved himself with the Colonial Reformers and soon became their public leader.¹¹⁸

¹¹¹Bloomfield, p. 179. See also, Woodward, p. 95, n. 5.

¹¹²D. N. B., XI, 463. Lambton became Baron of Durham on January 29, and entered the House of Lords on January 31, 1828. (Ibid.).

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Bloomfield, p. 178.

¹¹⁵D. N. B., XI, 464. The appointment was made on July 3, 1832.

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸Bloomfield, pp. 114 and 220.

Again appointed ambassador extraordinary to St. Petersburg,¹¹⁹ Lord Durham remained in Russia through 1836, and returned to Britain in the spring of 1837.¹²⁰ Durham then became involved in the recently organized New Zealand Association.¹²¹ He had been associated with an earlier New Zealand venture in 1825, but since that episode he had not participated in founding colonies.¹²²

When Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, began receiving reports of unrest in Canada in early 1837, he looked about for a man with enough political stature to send to Canada to investigate. As the storm clouds over Canada became more ominous, Melbourne's thoughts turned to Lord Durham. Durham, a powerful political figure and an opposition Whig, posed a constant threat to the Melbourne Government. Because of these factors, Melbourne asked Durham to undertake the investigation of the unrest in Canada. Melbourne, knowing the Canadian question to be fraught with political danger, thought perhaps Durham would wreck his public career. At the least, Durham would be out of the country for a while and Melbourne would not have to contend with him. Melbourne thought of Durham ". . . for an experiment in imperial knight-errantry in North America."¹²³

¹¹⁹D. N. B., XI, 464.

¹²⁰Bloomfield, p. 166.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid., p. 156.

¹²³C. H. B. E., VI, 288.

In 1838, Lord Melbourne appointed Lord Durham to the office of High Commissioner and Governor-General of North America.¹²⁴ To aid him in his work, Durham invited Charles Buller and Edward Gibbon Wakefield to accompany him to Canada¹²⁵ and both accepted the invitation.¹²⁶

The Durham Mission to Canada started under an ominous cloud--Lord Durham was ill when he sailed.¹²⁷ Durham, and later Buller, remained ill for the greater part of the mission to Canada.¹²⁸ The Durham party, consisting of twenty-two people, sailed from Portsmouth on April 23, 1838,¹²⁹ and arrived at Quebec on May 29.¹³⁰ While not enthusiastically welcomed at Quebec, the Durham party received a warm reception.¹³¹

Wakefield, deeply engaged in planning for the proposed colony in New Zealand, did not accompany the main Durham party; instead, he embarked for Canada in May.¹³² While in Canada Wakefield worked as "Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands," Buller's official position, while Buller served as Durham's chief secretary and advisor.¹³³

¹²⁴Bloomfield, p. 176. ¹²⁵C. H. B. E., VI, 291.

¹²⁶Bloomfield, pp. 170 and 179. ¹²⁷Ibid.

¹²⁸Ibid., pp. 188-189. ¹²⁹Ibid., p. 181.

¹³⁰C. H. B. E., II, 337. ¹³¹Bloomfield, p. 182.

¹³²Ibid., p. 171. ¹³³Ibid., p. 183.

The five months the Durham Mission remained in Canada were a tempestuous period. On June 28, Durham exiled several leaders of the Rebellions of 1837 to Bermuda.¹³⁴ He then forbade Louis Papineau, a rebel leader from Quebec who had fled to the United States, to return to Canada upon the pain of death.¹³⁵ Fourteen other rebels who had also fled across the border were included in this action, known as the Durham Ordinance.¹³⁶ Lord Durham, however, had exceeded his powers in issuing this Ordinance, for he summarily convicted and exiled the rebels without due process of law. This decision may have been just, but it was not good law, and it placed Lord Durham in a vulnerable position.

In Britain, Durham's opponents attacked the Ordinance. Lord Brougham, a man with a violent temper, conservative beliefs, and long-time foe of Durham led the Opposition.¹³⁷ Melbourne, not having the intestinal fortitude to face the critics, refused to support Durham's action, and disallowed the Ordinance.¹³⁸ Durham, attempting to justify his decision, strongly denounced Melbourne's action in the Proclamation he read before a packed assembly-house in Quebec on October 9, 1838.¹³⁹

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 135.

¹³⁵ D. N. B., XI, 465.

¹³⁶ Bloomfield, pp. 185-186.

¹³⁷ Ibid., pp. 192-193.

¹³⁸ D. N. B., XI, 465.

¹³⁹ Bloomfield, p. 194.

With this Proclamation, Lord Durham packed his belongings and embarked from Canada on November 1.¹⁴⁰ He arrived at Plymouth on November 26, having been absent from Britain slightly longer than six months.¹⁴¹ On December 10, Lord Durham formally resigned his commission and retired from public life to write his Report on the Affairs of British North America.¹⁴² He submitted this Report to the Colonial Office on January 31, 1839.¹⁴³

Wakefield, fearing the Government might not place the complete Report before Parliament, released a copy of it to The Times on February 8.¹⁴⁴ Through such action he made certain that Parliament and the public would be able to learn the contents of the Report.

The question of who wrote the Durham Report, though long debated, is not of great importance. All three of the major participants in the Durham Mission to Canada--Lord Durham, Charles Buller, and Edward Gibbon Wakefield--helped write it. Durham would not have taken Buller and Wakefield along unless he intended to utilize their special talents and knowledge.

Upon concluding the mission to Canada, all three of the leaders believed the Canadian problems of the 1830's stemmed from the Colonial government policies of the Colonial

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 195.

¹⁴¹ C. H. B. E., VI, 295.

¹⁴² Bloomfield, p. 195.

¹⁴³ D. N. B., XI, 465.

¹⁴⁴ Bloomfield, pp. 196-197.

Office.¹⁴⁵ This is the major importance of the Durham Report, which advocated a radical departure from past policy. The Report urged the unification of Upper and Lower Canada, and the creation of an elected assembly with the powers of Parliament. The official ministers of the Crown should be members of the Assembly, and were to be responsible to the Assembly for all official ministerial actions.¹⁴⁶ This Government and the accompanying Assembly would control all spheres of internal affairs, except public lands, which remained in the hands of the Imperial Government. The British Government would also exercise the power over foreign relations, trade, and the preparation of a new constitution.¹⁴⁷ All of the above mentioned concepts and ideas can be traced to the earlier writings and testimony of Edward Gibbon Wakefield.¹⁴⁸

The Durham Report stands as a landmark in British imperial history, for it embodied the goals sought for the preceding ten years by the "Radical Imperialists" led by Gibbon Wakefield. The Durham Report remains alive today because

¹⁴⁵Norman, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, p. 11.

¹⁴⁶Sir C. P. Lucas (ed.), Lord Durham's Report on the Affairs of British North America, Vol. II (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1912), p. 312.

¹⁴⁷Ibid.

¹⁴⁸Supra, Chapter III.

. . . it prescribed for Canada, and through Canada for the rest of the English-speaking Empire, the one form of government by which imperial unity could be preserved.¹⁴⁹

Following an active and violent debate, portions of the Durham Report were incorporated into the Act of Union for Canada, signed by Queen Victoria on July 23, 1840.¹⁵⁰ Lord Durham, who became seriously ill shortly after his return from Canada, lived long enough to learn of the passage and signing of the Act of Union. He knew parts of his Report had been adopted and he believed the remainder would be later enacted. Lord Durham died at the age of forty-eight, five days after Queen Victoria signed the Act of Union.¹⁵¹

Conclusion

After examining the principal Colonial Reformers with whom Edward Gibbon Wakefield associated, it is readily apparent how he achieved his goals. He used fellow reformers to spread his ideas and to persuade others to adopt them. The speeches Buller and Molesworth delivered in the House of Commons ring with the power and forcefulness of Wakefield's plan. The phrases they used to clinch their debates can be found in Wakefield's writings.

¹⁴⁹C. H. B. E., VI, 304.

¹⁵⁰Bloomfield, p. 203.

¹⁵¹Ibid. His death came on July 28, 1840.

In Robert Torrens, Wakefield found a man who would use his pen to advance the plan of "systematic colonization." Torrens, a very articulate man, also proved highly useful in giving evidence before several of the committees of the House of Commons.

Lord Durham, by his prestige, lent the movement for colonial reform a certain respectability. His major contribution, though, came through advancing the Wakefield scheme in the Report on the Affairs in British North America. Shortly after completing this Report, a portion of the Wakefield plan became enacted into law in the Act of Union for Canada.

Unable to personally advance his cause, Edward Gibbon Wakefield succeeded because he attracted to his standard men who could effectively espouse his concept of colonial reform. Without these men, Wakefield probably could not have succeeded.

CHAPTER V

"SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION" IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

South Australia

The two areas in the world most profoundly affected by Edward Gibbon Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization" were New Zealand and South Australia. The latter, founded in 1836, represented the first attempt to implement Wakefield's ideas as expressed in A Letter From Sydney and England and America. The former, founded during the 1840's, today stands as a monument to the mature scheme propounded and set forth by Wakefield in A View of the Art of Colonization. Both former colonies, while now parts of the Commonwealth, bear the indelible mark of Wakefield's theory.

Wakefield's theory first began to affect colonial policies when "the Theorists of 1830" banded together and formed the Colonization Society.¹ This Society, composed of less than a dozen members, proved to be far more

¹B. S. P. (1841), IV, Appendix to the Report From the Select Committee on South Australia (Letter from Wakefield to the Colonization Commissioners), p. 666. Bloomfield, in his biography of Wakefield, does not distinguish between the Colonization Society and the National Colonization Society. It appears as though the principal difference between the two organizations was in the name, not the members or purposes of the societies.

influential than their numbers would indicate.² They achieved their first success in 1831, when "the Ripon Regulations" were placed on land grants in New South Wales, Australia.³ These "Regulations" abolished all free land grants and placed a price of five shillings per acre upon all land purchased.⁴ By placing a small price upon the land, the Colonial Office implicitly acknowledged the feasibility of at least a part of the Wakefield scheme and thereby opened the door to future gains by the advocates of this theory.

One of the side effects of "the Ripon Regulations" came with the establishment in 1831 of ". . . a new governmental⁷ department to sell the land and send out emigrants."⁵ This ended the ancient and honored practice by the Colonial Office of making free land grants.

Even though the Government implicitly acknowledged the correctness of at least part of his theory, Wakefield remained dissatisfied because he believed the price of five shillings per acre was too low.⁶ At this point, he decided that his theory would be more successful if applied by

²Garnett, p. 88.

³B. S. P. (1836), XI, Report of the Select Committee on Disposal of Land in British Colonies, Minutes of Evidence, q. 776, p. 584.

⁴Ibid. The "Ripon Regulations," named after Lord Ripon, were placed into effect while Lord Howick was Under-Secretary of the Colonial Office and Lord Goderich was Colonial Secretary.

⁵Knowles, p. 101.

⁶Garnett, pp. 91-92.

founding a new colony in South Australia.⁷ This decision to plant a new colony perhaps changed the history of the British Empire, for it proved to be a decision of far-reaching consequences. It resulted in the firm control of Australia by Great Britain and led to the subsequent annexation of New Zealand. In addition, it proved beyond a doubt that thousands of British laborers could be enticed to emigrate and secure the Southern Hemisphere islands for Great Britain.

Following the issuance of "the Ripon Regulations," the Colonization Society tried and failed to secure the support of the Colonial Office to plant a colony in South Australia. Lord Howick opposed the charter Wakefield drafted for the proposed colony. It gave the founding company complete control of the government and social development of the colony.⁸ The officials in the Colonial Office feared that the burden of expense involved in starting the colony would eventually fall upon the Government.⁹ They also objected to the proposed charter because, in their estimation, the plan had been advanced by Radicals and Dissenters who were "republican" in sentiment and were seeking to found a colony with overtones of "republicanism."¹⁰ The ideas in

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 97.

⁹C. H. B. E., VII, I, 214-215.

¹⁰Ibid.

the proposed charter, tossed aside in 1832, reappeared to haunt the Colonial Office in 1839, in the form of the Durham Report.¹¹

Failing to secure approval to plant a colony in South Australia, the Colonization Society disbanded and the National Colonization Society, formed in 1833, replaced it.¹² The members of this new organization hoped to succeed where its predecessor had failed, but it did not gain favor with the officials of the Colonial Office, and soon faded into oblivion.¹³

In December, 1833, Wakefield again tried to win approval to found a colony in South Australia by forming yet another company called the South Australian Land Company.¹⁴ This company intended to promote colonization in South Australia, but it planned to make the settlement a Crown Colony with the Wakefield scheme of land sales and emigration in effect.¹⁵

In early 1834, after the Colonial Office repeatedly turned deaf ears to the Company's proposals, Wakefield formed the South Australian Association.¹⁶ Its efforts met with

¹¹Garnett, p. 98.

¹²Carrington, p. 332. Supra, n. 1.

¹³Greenwood, Australia, p. 73.

¹⁴C. H. B. E., VII, I, 215, and Greenwood, p. 73.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Greenwood, p. 73.

success on August 2, when the House of Lords passed the South Australia Act.¹⁷ The measure had been approved earlier by the House of Commons on July 25.¹⁸

The South Australia Act contained the two basic tenets of the Wakefield system; land was to be sold at a fixed, uniform price, and the proceeds from land sales were to be used to pay the passage of emigrants from Great Britain.¹⁹ The original price of land was set at £1 per acre, but when land sales slumped in 1835, the price was reduced to twelve shillings.²⁰

The colony of South Australia, though founded under the auspices of the South Australian Association was directed by the Board of Commissioners, appointed jointly by the Association and the Colonial Office.²¹ The leading member of the Board was George Fife Angas, a wealthy capitalistic supporter of Wakefield.²²

When the land sales in England slumped in 1835, Angas formed the South Australian Company, composed of a group of land speculators and London merchants, who purchased 102 sections of land (out of a total of 437 sections) for a

¹⁷Garnett, p. 100.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 99.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 102.

²⁰C. H. B. E., VII, I, 216.

²¹Ibid. The Board of Commissioners was organized in February, 1835. In actual practice, Robert Torrens and Robert Gouger nominated the members of the Board of Commissioners and the Colonial Office approved the nominations.

²²Ibid.

total price of £320,000.²³ This development modified the entire nature of the South Australian venture, by changing it from an experiment in economics and humanitarianism, to capitalistic, speculative, profit-oriented enterprise. Had it not been for Angas and the South Australian Company, however, the original plan drawn up by Wakefield and the "Radical Imperialists" would not have received a trial, for the Association did not have the necessary capital to implement the scheme.

The entrance of land speculators into the South Australian enterprise, however, had serious consequences. Three groups now contested for control of the colony. Problems arose because these three groups had different goals. The Association desired to carry out an experiment in colonization, while the capitalists, not caring about colonial theories, wished to earn a profit on their investments. The Board of Commissioners, who normally would be expected to arbitrate between the other two groups, had representatives on it from the Colonial Office and they opposed the entire project. In short, the Commissioners, the Company, and the Association were caught in a triangular fight.

At the time of this intense controversy between the three factions interested in South Australia, Wakefield's daughter, Nina, became ill and he was absent from England because he took her to Portugal.²⁴ When he returned to

²³Ibid., pp. 216-217.

²⁴Supra, p. 25.

England, Wakefield expressed his dissatisfaction with the plans for the colony. In particular, he objected to the reduced price on the land and forthwith disassociated himself from all further activity concerning South Australia.²⁵

The withdrawal of Wakefield left the field momentarily clear for the capitalists, and they succeeded in getting John Hindmarsh appointed as Governor of South Australia and William Light as Surveyor-General.²⁶ The control of the venture by the capitalists proved short-lived, for after a brief period of hesitancy, the Board of Commissioners began to exercise their control over the source of revenue for the colony.²⁷

In May, 1836, William Light sailed with two ships from Great Britain for South Australia.²⁸ He was to select a site for settlement and to survey the land in preparation for the arrival of the main body of settlers.²⁹ After arriving at Kangaroo Island off the coast of South Australia, Light selected the area around the mouth of the Murray River to be the main settlement. He proceeded to lay out the site where present-day Adelaide stands.³⁰ This task had to be

²⁵Supra, pp. 25-26.

²⁶C. H. B. E., VII, I, 217. Other officers of the colony were: J. H. Fisher, Resident Commissioner; Robert Gouger, Colonial Secretary; Osmond Gilles, Treasurer; and John Brown, Commissioner of Immigration. (Ibid., p. 217.)

²⁷Ibid., p. 216.

²⁸Ibid., p. 218.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid., p. 222.

completed before he could get on with surveying the countryside behind the future city. He requested additional assistance for this task but was refused and criticized for not getting the job done sooner. He and his staff of surveyors then resigned.³¹

Meanwhile, Governor John Hindmarsh, with the major portion of settlers accompanying him, sailed from Britain on June 29th. Hindmarsh and his group arrived at Adelaide in December, 1836.³² With him were approximately 3,500 settlers, raising the total of these early pioneers to nearly 3,600, for about 100 had traveled with Light's expedition.³³ Because of Light's resignation, very little of the land outside the limits of Adelaide had been surveyed, thus making it almost impossible for the colonists to settle on the land they had purchased. Instead, they remained huddled in the confines of the still-being-erected city of Adelaide.³⁴

After two years of quarreling and inaction, the Board of Commissioners recalled Governor Hindmarsh, dismissed J. H. Fisher, the Resident Commissioner, and appointed Colonel George Gawler to both positions, thereby consolidating the executive powers in the hands of one man.³⁵ Gawler, a man of ambition and action, began to get the colony moving forward.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³Carrington, p. 365.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵C. H. B. E., VII, I, 233.

In attempting to follow the principles laid down by Wakefield, Gawler drew bills of credit upon the Commissioners to meet the expenses of the colony.³⁶ At the same time, he used the revenue from land sales to bring more immigrants into the settlement.³⁷ This made conditions worse, for the first 3,600 settlers still resided in Adelaide in 1838,³⁸ and they were living off the Company's rations. Shortly after Gawler's arrival in South Australia, the population rose to 5,000.³⁹ During his administration, the figure soared to about 13,000.⁴⁰ To ease this crowdedness, Gawler encouraged immigrants to settle in the country, rather than in the town, but this program ultimately failed.⁴¹

While Gawler's administration had been marked by some achievements,⁴² the Commissioners replaced him with Captain George Grey in May, 1841.⁴³ After several trying

³⁶Carrington, p. 365. ³⁷Ibid.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹C. H. B. E., VII, I, 223.

⁴⁰Ibid. This rapid increase was due in part, at least, to the Rebellions of 1837 in the two Canadas. In 1838 alone, 3,154 emigrants from Britain went to South Australia in thirty ships. (B. S. P. [1839], XVII, 693.)

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²By the time Gawler was relieved, 5,000 people had been settled in the country, leaving approximately 8,000 settlers in Adelaide. (C. H. B. E., VII, I, 223.)

⁴³Garnett, p. 121. Grey later became Sir George Grey and served as Governor in New Zealand, South Africa, and a second time in New Zealand.

years under Grey, South Australia gradually emerged as a strong, prosperous colony.⁴⁴

The experiment in colonization carried out in South Australia followed in broad terms the Wakefield theory. There was a price charged for land, with the revenue used to transport emigrants from Great Britain into the colony. The details of the actual process of colonization in South Australia, however, were not those set forth by Wakefield. In the first place, the price of land, in Wakefield's estimation, was too low. Secondly, the land had not been surveyed before the first settlers arrived. After a period of five or six years of chaos and wastefulness, these mistakes were rectified and the colony began to prosper.

Since his scheme of "systematic colonization" was not strictly followed, and since Wakefield withdrew from participation in the settlement before any settlers embarked from Great Britain, his theory can not be said to have failed. It can be said, however, that the colony of South Australia was not an immediate success, partially because it was impossible to follow Wakefield's theory in an actual attempt at colonization, and partially because Wakefield had not stressed the importance of a preliminary survey in his early writings. The settlement of South Australia was, however, far superior to any of the other early settlements in Australia because some of Wakefield's principles of colonization were followed.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

New Zealand

The history of New Zealand in the mid-nineteenth century serves as an example of the colonial problems of that period. On the one hand, "the Radical Imperialists" wished to extend British sovereignty over new territory, thereby enlarging the Empire. On the other hand, the Church Missionary Society, whose "Little England" views were firmly entrenched in the Government and the Colonial Office, opposed the intervention of private British subjects with New Zealand. They fought any extension of the authority of the Crown over additional overseas territory.⁴⁵

⁴⁵During the period of the major attempts at founding colonies according to Wakefield's scheme of "systematic colonization," eleven men served as Secretary of State for the Colonies. They were:

Sir George Murray, 1828-1830
 Viscount Goderich, 1830-1833
 E. G. Stanley, 1833-1834
 T. Spring Rice, 1834
 Earl of Aberdeen, 1834-1835
 Lord Glenelg, 1835-1839
 Marquis of Normanby, 1839
 Lord John Russell, 1839-1841
 Lord Stanley, 1841-1845
 W. E. Gladstone, 1845-1846
 Earl Grey, 1846-1852

Significantly, at the same time, only three men served as Permanent Under-secretary of State for the Colonies. They were:

R. W. Hay, 1825-1836
 Sir James Stephen, 1836-1847
 H. Merivale, 1847-1859 (Greenwood, p. 50.)

The most crucial period for the Radical Imperialists found Sir James Stephen, the Permanent Under-secretary, as the real power in the Colonial Office. He opposed the plans of Wakefield and the "Radical Imperialists" throughout his tenure in office. Stephens, a member of the Church Missionary Society, brought that organization's views into his office. He followed the lead of Dandeson Coates, the

This gap between these two opposing groups widened when other nations showed an interest in the unclaimed territories that interested Britishers. These divergent viewpoints became sharply defined as questions arose over native rights, property ownership, and the role of missionaries in the distant lands.

Formal British attempts at colonization in New Zealand began in May, 1837, when Wakefield organized the New Zealand Association.⁴⁶ In June, Lord Howick, the Under-Secretary of the Colonial Office, told the Association the Government could not agree to the tentative plans it had submitted, unless strict controls were placed on the operations of the Association.⁴⁷ The organization then modified

Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, who wished to preserve New Zealand as a special field of activity for Society missionaries. Their goal was to create a civilized, Christian, native state in New Zealand.

Lord Glenelg, Colonial Secretary from 1835 to 1839, was also a member of the Society. Between Stephen and Glenelg, the Wakefieldians faced a strong center of entrenched opposition in the Colonial Office. (Carrington, pp. 376-377, and C. H. B. E., VII, II, 67-68.)

⁴⁶Garnett, p. 128.

⁴⁷C. H. B. E., VII, II, 68. In researching this portion of Chapter V, I found a rather difficult matter to handle. Garnett's Edward Gibbon Wakefield is quite outdated on the settlement of New Zealand. The same is true of William Pember Reeves's The Long White Cloud (2nd ed.; London: Horace Marshall and Son, 1899). Neither A. J. Harrop nor Irma O'Conner, in their biographies of Wakefield, have handled the matter in sufficient detail. Paul Bloomfield's Edward Gibbon Wakefield, while containing much information, seems to rely quite heavily upon A. J. Harrop's essay, "The Companies and British Sovereignty 1825-1850," Chapter V, Vol. VII, Part II, New Zealand, of the Cambridge History of

its plans and again submitted them to Howick, who once more withheld his approval.⁴⁸

By December, 1837, Lord Glenelg, the Colonial Secretary, agreed to the plans drawn up by the Association.⁴⁹ He believed that organized colonization would be superior to the chaos and immorality then prevalent in New Zealand.⁵⁰ He also believed it would be impossible, however, to allow the Association, in its present form, to direct the settlement of New Zealand.⁵¹ In a letter to Lord Durham, the Director of the Association, Glenelg said that if the organization incorporated, and if the Government exercised a veto power over the members of the Company's directors, the new body could apply for and receive a royal charter. Lord Durham, in replying to this letter, declared that his organization was composed of dedicated men who were not seeking profits and therefore, the offer by Glenelg must be refused.⁵³

The New Zealand Association then sought support in Parliament. The campaign for governmental sanction opened with William Molesworth's savage attack upon Lord Glenelg

the British Empire. Because of this situation, I have also relied primarily upon Harrop's essay. I have, however, felt free to draw upon any of the above mentioned references, plus other materials whenever needed. I have also used multiple footnotes for some citations wherever I felt this to be appropriate.

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 69.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Garnett, p. 148.

⁵³C. H. B. E., VII, II, 69.

in the House of Commons on March 6, 1838.⁵⁴ Sir Francis Baring's speech followed the opening salvo. He introduced ". . . a Bill for the establishment of a British colony in New Zealand."⁵⁵ In introducing the measure, Baring asserted that the Association had been founded to develop a colony in New Zealand--something the Government itself should do.⁵⁶

After some debate, Baring moved the second reading of the bill.⁵⁷ Viscount Howick, speaking in support of the proposal, declared that Parliament had previously upheld Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization when the South Australia Act (1834) had been passed.⁵⁸ He also asserted that the Government had not adequately supported the earlier measure after passing it.⁵⁹ Despite these speeches, the measure was defeated ninety-two to thirty-two.⁶⁰

After this crushing defeat in the House of Commons the Association had no alternative--it had to accept Glenelg's earlier ultimatum and convert itself into a joint-stock company. The New Zealand Colonization Company, with £200,000 for capital, was formed on August 29, 1838.⁶¹ Lord Durham,

⁵⁴Parliamentary Debates, XLI (1838), 476-512.

⁵⁵Ibid., XLIII (1838), 542.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 872.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 878-879.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 880.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 882.

⁶¹Carrington, p. 377. See also, C. H. B. E., VII, II, 70.

in Canada investigating the Rebellions of 1837, became the Company's first president.⁶² Wakefield, also in Canada, did not play a major role in the formation of the Company, but later became the guiding spirit behind it.⁶³ The Company opened for business in October, only several weeks before Wakefield returned from Canada.⁶⁴

The Company, however, had been organized too late, for Lord Glenelg resigned in February, 1839, before the new joint-stock enterprise could meet all of his earlier demands.⁶⁵ Glenelg's successor, Lord Normanby, opposed all colonization carried out by any company.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, on March 4, the Company informed the new Colonial Secretary that it had complied with the Government's earlier objections and was now applying for a royal charter.⁶⁷ Lord Normanby refused the application.⁶⁸

As a result of Normanby's decision, the New Zealand Colonization Company reorganized itself into the New Zealand Land Company on April 27, 1839.⁶⁹ This Company then prepared to force the Government's hand by sending colonists to New

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ C. H. B. E., VII, II, 71.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Garnett, p. 152.

⁶⁶ William Pember Reeves, The Long White Cloud (2nd ed.; London: Horace Marshall and Son, 1899), p. 173.

⁶⁷ Garnett, p. 152.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ D. N. B., XX, 451.

Zealand.⁷⁰ On May 5, 1839, the Tory, carrying thirty-five people including the crew, sailed from Plymouth for New Zealand.⁷¹

In the meantime, Lord John Russell, Lord Melbourne's Home Secretary, abolished all previously organized colonial boards and commissions and created the Land and Emigration Board in 1839.⁷² It was to direct all new colonial enterprises within the British Empire.⁷³

The Tory arrived in New Zealand on August 16, 1839.⁷⁴ The first large group of colonists, however, did not sail from Great Britain until September 17, 1839. They arrived at Port Nicholson, New Zealand, on January 22, 1840.⁷⁵

Two days before the Tory arrived in New Zealand, the Government appointed Captain William Hobson Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand.⁷⁶ Hobson was to uphold native ownership of the land and to place New Zealand under British control.⁷⁷ In addition, he was not to allow any convicts to enter New Zealand--not even to erect public works.⁷⁸ Hobson

⁷⁰C. H. B. E., VII, II, 71. ⁷¹Reeves, p. 174.

⁷²Carrington, p. 366. ⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴C. H. B. E., VII, II, 72.

⁷⁵Miller, New Zealand, p. 21. See also, C. H. B. E., VII, II, 74-75.

⁷⁶C. H. B. E., VII, II, 72. ⁷⁷Reeves, p. 177.

⁷⁸C. H. B. E., VII, II, 73.

arrived at the Bay of Islands, New Zealand, on January 29, 1840,⁷⁹ and immediately set to work. On February 6, he negotiated the Treaty of Waitangi, which made New Zealand a British territory, with full sovereignty under the Crown, but allowed the native chiefs to retain possession of their tribal land.⁸⁰ To restrain them from selling their land to the Company, the treaty provided that native land could only be sold with the permission of the Crown.⁸¹

The Treaty of Waitangi, though signed on February 6, was not proclaimed until May 21, 1840.⁸² Its provisions originally covered only the North Island, but on June 17, Hobson extended the scope of the treaty to include the South Island, where the Company had been going about its business of establishing colonies.⁸³

While Wakefield and the Colonial Reformers developed and carried out their plans to colonize New Zealand, France showed a more than casual interest in New Zealand.⁸⁴ The French had two proposed objectives: to establish a French

⁷⁹Bloomfield, p. 223.

⁸⁰Reeves, p. 180. Reeves included a reprint of the Treaty of Waitangi.

⁸¹C. H. B. E., VII, II, 74.

⁸²Reeves, p. 179.

⁸³C. H. B. E., VII, II, 76.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 73. See also, Reeves, p. 177.

penal colony in New Zealand⁸⁵ and to enable the Compagnie Nante-Bordelaise to plant a colony there.⁸⁶ The French Government exhibited their interest by signing an agreement with the Compagnie providing a Government ship to transport settlers to New Zealand in return for state ownership of one-fifth of the land the Compagnie claimed.⁸⁷

To explore the feasibility of this enterprise, and to establish a strong claim, the French Government sent a ship to New Zealand.⁸⁸ On July 11, 1840, it arrived at the Bay of Islands, only to find that Lieutenant-Governor Hobson had claimed both of the islands for the British on June 17.⁸⁹

The "race" between Great Britain and France for possession of New Zealand really consisted of a contest between Captain Langlois of France and Wakefield to see who could arouse their respective Governments into action.⁹⁰ Wakefield, through his precipitate action of sending out the Tory, on May 5, won the contest.⁹¹ His decision to send out the Tory, coupled with the French interest, forced the British Government to annex New Zealand.⁹² When the French ship carrying fifty-six settlers arrived off the South Island, on July 11, the British were in firm control.⁹³

⁸⁵C. H. B. E., VII, II, 76.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Ibid.

⁸⁸Ibid.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 76.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Reeves, p. 177.

⁹³C. H. B. E., VII, II, 76.

Besides contesting with the French, the Company negotiated with a German company interested in colonizing New Zealand.⁹⁴ At one point in 1839, the Company contemplated selling some land to the Germans but the British Government forbade this transaction.⁹⁵ Later, however, a number of Germans settled in New Zealand under the auspices of the Company but with the approval of the British Government.⁹⁶

Following the first limited success in New Zealand, the Company opened negotiations with Lord John Russell, and on February 12, 1841, received a charter to carry on colonization in New Zealand.⁹⁷ As part of this agreement, the Company received four times as many acres of land as the value of what it had expended on its activities from 1839, through 1841.⁹⁸

In settling Port Nicholson (present-day Wellington) and Nelson, the Company did not make a preliminary survey of the land.⁹⁹ Because of this failure to survey the land, much confusion resulted in the early days of the two settlements.¹⁰⁰ The New Zealand Land Company should not have sent out settlers before William Wakefield, the Company representative aboard the Tory, sent back a report of his arrangements,

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 76-77. ⁹⁵Ibid., p. 76. ⁹⁶Ibid., p. 77.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 78. See also, Bloomfield, p. 230.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

land purchases, and the results of a preliminary survey. This is probably the most serious criticism one can make about the early Wakefieldian settlements in New Zealand.

The next major colonization attempt by Wakefield was of a different nature than any of the earlier settlements. In 1843, he had conceived the idea of founding a colony in New Zealand, to be peopled by members of the Church of England.¹⁰¹ After his coup de grace in 1839, though, Wakefield and the New Zealand Company became embroiled in a controversy with the Colonial Office.¹⁰² This quarrel lasted until 1850, and for most of this period, Wakefield had been unable to act upon his idea of a church colony.

In 1847, assisted by Captain William Cargill, a Peninsular Campaign veteran, and Rev. Thomas Burns of the Free Church of Scotland, Wakefield planned a settlement on the South Island of New Zealand, at present-day Dunedin in Otago Township.¹⁰³ The final plan called for the Lay Association of the Free Church of Scotland to sell the land to selected colonists.¹⁰⁴ The New Zealand Company was to survey the land and charter ships for the colonists.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 89.

¹⁰²Supra, pp. 29-30.

¹⁰³Reeves, pp. 231-232.

¹⁰⁴C. H. B. E., VII, II, 88.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

The land sold for £2 per acre, with three-fourths of the revenue being used to pay the passage of new settlers, finance the government, pay for surveying, provide educational facilities, and pay for public and religious works.¹⁰⁶ One-fourth of the revenue went to the New Zealand Company for arranging transportation and directing the settlement of the colony.¹⁰⁷

The first settlers sailed from Gravesend, England, and Greenock, Scotland, in November, 1847, and arrived in New Zealand in early 1848.¹⁰⁸ At first conditions were crude in the Otago settlement but they eventually improved.¹⁰⁹ The failure of the Lay Association to sell enough land was the major obstacle faced by the "pilgrims" who founded Otago.¹¹⁰ Despite this shortcoming, things went well because an adequate survey had been made and the colonists could immediately claim their land and begin their settlement. A second aid to the rapid progress of the settlement was the establishment of an efficient local government, concerned with the needs and desires of the colonists.¹¹¹

The Lay Association, from 1847 to 1852, sold only 15,000 acres of land--less than ten percent of the amount they originally contracted to sell.¹¹² Because of this failure

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁷Ibid.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., pp. 88-89.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 89.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Ibid.

to sell the necessary amount of land, the revenue was insufficient, and on December 23, 1852, the Lay Association of the Free Church of Scotland declared bankruptcy and gave the administration of the Otago settlement to the Colonial Office.¹¹³

The Otago colony significantly demonstrated the feasibility of Wakefield's scheme of "systematic colonization" if the most important factors of it were followed. They were: charging a price for land sufficient to pay the necessary expenses of the colony, using a preliminary survey, and allowing some local self-government.

The careful selection of emigrants also substantially contributed to the success of the Otago colony. The Lay Association selected the colonists on the basis of initiative, ability, health, and age; with young married couples being the first selected.¹¹⁴ As an indication of the success of this practice, the population of Otago rose to 3,800 in 1856, as compared to a little over 100 in 1847.¹¹⁵ This growth factor alone testified to the effectiveness of "systematic colonization."

Just as the Otago settlement plans and preparations had reached completion in May, 1847, Wakefield met John Robert Godley.¹¹⁶ Godley, a young, religious squire in poor health,

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

was ambitious for a public career.¹¹⁷ Wakefield, following their meeting in May, convinced Godley to support a Church of England colony in New Zealand. The two of them began at once to plan for such a settlement.¹¹⁸ In carrying out their plans, Godley founded the Canterbury Association of 1848. It was the organization through which a colony in New Zealand was to be settled for the Church of England. The Association's membership included Arch-Bishop Sumner of Canterbury, Arch-Bishop Whately of Dublin, and seven other bishops of the Church of England, plus forty-six other members.¹¹⁹ The plans for the projected colony called for it to consist of 1,000,000 acres of land, which were to be sold by the Association.¹²⁰ The first 100,000 acres were to be sold by October, 1848, with the remaining 900,000 acres scheduled to be disposed of at the rate of 100,000 acres per year.¹²¹

The Association placed a price of ten shillings per acre on the land.¹²² In addition, each settler had to pay £1 per acre to defray religious and educational expenses.¹²³ The emigrants also had to pay £1 per acre to cover emigration expenses and ten shillings per acre for the

¹¹⁷W. H. Oliver, The Story of New Zealand (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), p. 68. He later became Under-secretary of the War Office.

¹¹⁸C. H. B. E., VII, II, 89.

¹¹⁹Ibid.

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 89.

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²Ibid.

¹²³Ibid.

expenses of the Association, surveying the land, building roads, and erecting public buildings.¹²⁴ The total cost to each emigrant was £3 per acre of land purchased.

As in the case of the settlement of Otago, the Association carefully selected the emigrants, with young married couples receiving preference.¹²⁵ By and large, most of the emigrants were from the lower middle class, which has remained the characteristic element of New Zealand society until the present.

When all of the plans were complete, the 1,512 colonists were carried to New Zealand on eight ships, between September, 1850, and January, 1851.¹²⁶ From the time of their arrival, these "pilgrims" experienced little difficulty in building their new homes. The Wakefield experiment in empire building had definitely proven itself.

Canterbury was the answer to Edward Gibbon Wakefield's dreams--a transplanting of a segment of English society, for the settlement consisted of rich and poor, noble and common, skilled and unskilled, educated and uneducated.¹²⁷ Over this achievement, Wakefield could be proud and satisfied. On the other hand, 1850 marked the end to an era, for the New Zealand Company turned in its charter to the Government.¹²⁸ This ended the last of Wakefield's many colonization companies.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Ibid.

¹²⁶Reeves, pp. 234-236.

¹²⁷C. H. B. E., VII, II, 90.

¹²⁸Ibid.

Otago and Canterbury today stand as the best examples of settlements founded according to Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization." While the Canterbury settlement was larger than Otago, both stand as monuments to the man who conceived and directed their colonization. Both settlements have retained their mid-nineteenth century British accent and flavor.¹²⁹ Dundedin, the center of Otago, has a Scottish atmosphere about it, while Christchurch, the major town in Canterbury,¹³⁰ reflects an English background, and has remained predominantly Anglican in religion.¹³¹

Out of the two major Wakefieldian settlements in New Zealand, Otago and Canterbury, one common understanding emerges--the Wakefield scheme, had it been followed in all its details, probably would have failed. Because these two settlements were made by following the broad lines of the Wakefield theory, i.e. a "sufficient price," local self-government, and the selection of emigrants; while ignoring the details of each, and implementing the major concepts on a local basis, "systematic colonization" succeeded in New Zealand.

¹²⁹Oliver, p. 70.

¹³⁰Christchurch, the center of the Canterbury settlement, was named after John Robert Godley's college--Christ Church, Oxford. The city was laid out in 1848, but the colony was not officially founded until 1850.

¹³¹Oliver, p. 70.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

As a youth, Edward Gibbon Wakefield failed to live up to what may be considered as reasonable expectations. He had grown up in an intellectual atmosphere tempered by humanitarian Quaker beliefs but he failed to follow the teachings of such an upbringing. Instead, he chose a wayward life. Had he continued this manner of living, his life would not be worth studying.

In 1826, Wakefield involved himself in a madcap scheme to abduct Ellen Turner and marry her. This, he believed, would open the doors of Parliament to him for Miss Turner was the heiress to her father's rather considerable fortune. After the abduction and marriage, the newly-wed couple fled to Calais on the continent, but shortly thereafter, Ellen was persuaded by an uncle to return to the family fold. Following the separation, Wakefield returned from France to England where, along with his brother William and his stepmother Frances, he was brought to trial for Ellen's abduction. Edward and William were both sentenced to prison terms, with Frances also being convicted but spared a prison sentence.

While serving his sentence in Newgate Prison, Wakefield became interested in the question of penal reform, which, in turn, led him to the study of the transportation of criminals to overseas penal colonies. It was an easy further step from this study of transportation to the consideration of British colonial policy, which he examined with fervor prior to leaving Newgate.

During the course of his study of British colonial policy, Wakefield developed the idea of a unified plan to assure successful colonization. In it he considered the use of land, the employment of labor, and the investment of capital. To him, these three elements constituted the basic ingredients for successful colonization. He used the words "systematic colonization" to describe his new theory.

The Wakefield theory encompassed three broad areas: economic, social, and political. His economic thought was directed toward providing the establishment of a balanced scheme with available labor and land supported by needed capital. A controlling factor, which tended to bulk very large in Wakefield's thinking was the need to charge a "sufficient price" for the land to be used. The revenue from this "sufficient price" sale was, in turn, to be used to underwrite an emigration fund that would cover the costs of transporting pauper emigrants from Great Britain to the colony. Such emigrants were to serve as laborers for several years, or until they amassed enough wealth to purchase land of their own. The money they paid for their land, the

revenue from others who purchased land immediately, plus the taxes levied on the land went into the emigration fund to assure the bringing of more pauper laborers to the colony.

The key to the understanding of the social ideas of Wakefield's theory is found in his thoughts on how pauper emigrants from Britain should be selected. These people were to be chosen carefully, with emphasis placed upon the recruitment of young married couples because they possessed the potential to increase the colony's population through reproduction. Hence, the colonial population would increase through both immigration and birth. Wakefield's social thoughts also recognized the need to recruit emigrants from all walks of life--from the nobility as well as from the lowest levels of the community, exclusive of those with criminal backgrounds. This would result, so Wakefield believed, in the transferring of a cross-section of English society to the colonies, and would create "Little Englands" wherever the British established colonies.

The third aspect of Wakefield's thought, that which contained his ideas on political organization, is a natural outgrowth of his desire to see the creation of a number of "Little Englands" overseas. Such political organizations in the colonies would deserve, and the colonists would demand, the birthright of all Englishmen--that right of representative government. Wakefield envisaged the colonies as autonomous and on local matters, self-governing political units

within a loose imperial framework, legislated for on matters of other than purely local concern by the Imperial Parliament in London. The laws enacted by this Imperial Parliament were to be adjusted by the various colonial governments to meet the peculiar local needs of each colony, which he felt would vary according to circumstances and location. The colonial governments were to be presided over by a Royal Governor, who would possess viceregal powers and exercise them in the name of the reigning monarch. The routine work of colonial government, however, was to be carried on by officials appointed by the Governor, in the name of the Crown, who would be responsible to the colonial parliaments or assemblies for their decisions.

Wakefield's colonial theory was not entirely new. He systematized the ideas of earlier thinkers into a unified concept of empire. He went further than most, however, as he believed the elements required to support successful colonization--land, labor, and capital--were considered as related to the economic, social, and political requirements of the workings of society. What he did was to produce a comprehensive theory of colonization.

Wakefield's theory of colonization had two major weaknesses. It was too utopian and idealistic. However, when applied in a general and practical manner, as it was in South Australia and perhaps even more definitely so in New Zealand, it proved workable and reasonably effective. Secondly, Wakefield never made clear and specific what he believed to

be a "sufficient price" in a way to make it applicable to underdeveloped colonial lands. His failure to develop a clear-cut formula to be used in determining such a price, and his insistence that it had to be determined through a process of trial-and-error, are shortcomings. Wakefield's desire to take into consideration the size of the population, the demand for land, and the size of the labor force available in each situation, are understandable--but it is still true that he never came to real "grips" with this part of his theory and that his failure to do so contributed to much of the misunderstanding of his aims.

Despite the above shortcomings, Wakefield's ideas regarding "systematic colonization" had a profound effect upon the development of the British Empire in the Nineteenth Century. They served as a catalyst for the reform of colonial policy which took place in the 1840's and 1850's and did much to stimulate the development of the idea of colonial self-government--which led to the idea of Dominion status in the late Nineteenth Century and the ultimate evolution of the Twentieth Century Commonwealth of Nations.

While the theory of "systematic colonization" itself may not have been completely successful, and while Wakefield did not achieve the results he sought, it is clear that his writings and activities were deeply responsible for the revival of interest in colonization in Great Britain during the middle of the Nineteenth Century. Besides the major role he had in the settlement of South Australia and New

Zealand, his ideas concerning the political structure of the British Empire assisted in the evolution of today's Commonwealth of Nations in such an important way as to merit for Wakefield the title of "Architect of the Commonwealth of Nations."

One additional thought regarding Wakefield is worth mention. In attempting to support his contentions about the proper disposal of colonial waste land, Wakefield often referred to the westward expansion of the United States. In doing so, he may have identified the frontier as one of the most important determining factors in the development of life in new nations. The westward movement of people in the United States had its counterpart in the frontier movements in Canada, Australia, and South Africa. While settling the interior areas of these countries, the colonists forgot that they had once been a part of the complex, socio-economic community of Western Europe and became, instead, a people primarily concerned with conquering the wilderness areas as new homelands where their horizons were narrowed by the peculiar local nature of their experiences. It was not until the interior lands had been conquered that the descendants of the earliest colonial settlers would again turn their eyes toward the sea and become an international and commercially minded people.¹

¹Supra, p. 64.

APPENDIX A¹

OUTLINE
of a
SYSTEM OF COLONIZATION

Article I

It is suggested,
That a payment in money of ___ [no price given] per
acre be required for all future grants of land without
exception.

Article II

That all land now granted, and to be granted,
throughout the colony, be declared liable to a tax of ___
[no per cent given] per cent, upon the actual rent.

Article III

That the proceeds of the tax upon rent, and of sales,
form an Emigration Fund, to be employed in the conveyance of
British Labourers to the colony free of cost.

Article IV

That those to whom the administration of the Fund
shall be entrusted, be empowered to raise money on that
security, as money is raised on the security of parish and
county rates in England.

Article V

That the supply of Labourers be as nearly as possible
proportioned to the demand for Labour at each settlement; so
that Capitalists shall never suffer from an urgent want of
Labourers, and that Labourers shall never want well-paid
employment.

¹Wakefield, A Letter From Sydney, pp. 100-104.
Appendix A, in its entirety, is a direct quotation.

Article VI

That, in the selection of Emigrants, an absolute preference be given to young persons, and that no excess of males be conveyed to the colony free of cost.

Article VII

That Colonists providing a passage for emigrant Labourers, being young persons and equal numbers of both sexes, be entitled to a payment in money from the Emigration Fund, equal to the actual contract price of a passage for so many labouring persons.

Article VIII

That Grants be absolute in fee, without any condition whatsoever, and obtainable by deputy.

Article IX

That any surplus of the proceeds of the tax upon rent and of sales, over what is required for Emigration, be employed in relief of other taxes, and for the general purposes of Colonial Government.

APPENDIX B¹

Seven objections to selling land by auction.

1. "Auction fails altogether in its objects unless, by means of competition, it produces for some land a higher price than the upset price."

2. "In order that auction should be effectual, time must be given for the growth of competition: a sale by auction, whether in this country or in a colony, would be absurd without ample notice by advertisement."

3. ". . . intending purchasers take great pains, and incur no little trouble and cost, in selecting the spots of land, which, for some reason or other, generally on account of their peculiar suitability to the settlers purpose, they prefer to other spots."

4. ". . . the settler is apt to bid beyond his means; and when the lot is knocked down to him, he is incapable of using it."

5. "Under the auction plan, the honest industrious settler is liable to be plundered by jobbing and roguery of various sorts."

6. "Competition at auction-sales gives rise to unneighbourly and vindictive feelings among the settlers."

7. ". . . the plan of auction is very unpopular in the colonies, excepting of course amongst the harpy class, who by means of it prey on the class of true colonists."

¹Wakefield, Art of Colonization, pp. 357-361.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Adams, Ephraim Douglass. British Interests and Activities in Texas, 1838-1846. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1910.

An interesting account of one phase of early Texas history but not particularly valuable for a study of Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization," although he had more than a casual interest in Texas.

Adams, James Truslow. Empire on the Seven Seas: The British Empire, 1784-1939. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1940.

A general account of the development of the British Empire in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but contains nothing of particular note on Wakefield or his theory.

Australia. Australian News and Information Bureau, Department of the Interior. Australia: Official Handbook. Canberra: Australian Government, 1964.

An interesting compilation of facts and figures concerning present-day Australia. Contains a number of valuable pictures and reprints of Australian life, past and present.

Barnard, Marjorie. A History of Australia. London: Angus and Robertson, 1962.

A fine over-all history of Australia. The author has some interesting views on the settlement of Australia.

Battye, James Sykes. Western Australia. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

Contains nothing of value on Wakefield or the settling of South Australia, but is valuable to the student of Australian colonial history because it gives a brilliant insight into the many and varied problems faced by the early colonists in Australia.

Belcher, Ernest Albert Crassky. Migration Within the Empire. London: W. Collins Sons and Company, Ltd., 1924.

A very fine study of the causes, results, and influence of the many migrations that have taken place within the British Empire.

Bloomfield, Paul. Edward Gibbon Wakefield: Builder of the British Commonwealth. London: Longmans, Green and Company, Ltd., 1961.

The most recent and best biography of Wakefield, although poorly written. Its greatest weakness is the lack of a thorough treatment of the development of Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization." It is, however, a thorough study of Wakefield's life, and in particular, his relationship with the Colonial Office.

Broderick, George Charles. The History of England From Addington's Administration to the Close of William IV's Reign (1801-1837). London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1928.

A thorough treatment of the domestic affairs of Great Britain in the first forty years of the nineteenth century.

Cameron, William J. New Zealand. The second publication in The Modern Nations in Historical Perspective, edited by Robin Winks. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall (Spectrum Books), 1965.

A short history of New Zealand, with an emphasis on New Zealand's position in the modern world.

Carrington, Charles Edmund. The British Overseas: Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers. Cambridge: University Press, 1950.

An outstanding over-all coverage of the development of the British Empire. This volume gives a thorough treatment of Wakefield and the Colonial Reformers. An objective and thorough study of British Imperialism.

Casey, Maie. An Australian Story, 1637-1907. London: Michael Joseph, 1962.

A concise study of the social history and development of Australia. It gives the reader a "feel" for the Australian people.

Cecil, Algerton. British Foreign Secretaries 1907-1916, Studies in Personality and Policy. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1927.

Thorough and well done, but not of any great value for a student of Wakefield's theory and its application in South Australia and New Zealand.

Clark, Charles Manning H. A History of Australia From the Earliest Times to the Age of Macquarie. London: Melbourne University Press, 1962.

While this work does not cover the settlement of South Australia, or deal with the movement for colonial reform, it is valuable for the background in early Australian history it covers. It conveys to the reader the spirit of the early penal colonies and the problems generally faced by all of the early settlers, convicts or freemen.

. A Short History of Australia. New York: The New American Library (Mentor Books), 1963.

A concise and highly provocative synthesis of Australian history.

Coleman, Peter. Australian Civilization. London: Angus and Robertson, 1962.

Depicts the gradual development of Australian society from a sin-ridden penal community to a modern, progressive, forward-looking national state.

Crawford, R. M. Australia. London: Hutchinson and Company, Ltd., 1960.

A general but sound treatment with an interesting interpretation. The author is somewhat anti-Wakefield.

Currey, C. Herbert. British Colonial Policy, 1783-1915. London: Oxford University Press, 1916.

An interesting and provocative synthesis of a complex subject. The work merits serious consideration.

Egerton, Hugh Edward. A Short History of British Colonial Policy. London: Methuen and Company, 1897.

An old but outstanding study. The author is quite favorable to the colonial reform movement and expresses his sympathy for them.

Elton, Godfrey (Lord). Imperial Commonwealth. London: Collins, 1945.

A fascinating study with international overtones. It deserves more attention than it has heretofore received.

Epps, William. Land Systems of Australia. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Company, 1894.

An old but timeless study of the various land schemes suggested or tried in Australia. This work contains an interesting treatment of Wakefield and his land system.

Fay, Charles Ryle. Huskisson and His Age. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1951.

A fine study of Great Britain in the early nineteenth century. It contains some interesting ideas and reasons for the revival of the interest in overseas colonies.

Garnett, Richard. Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1898.

The first major study of Wakefield's life and colonial activities. It is now somewhat outdated, but remains a vital source of information for much of Wakefield's activities. It is, unfortunately, not readily available but must be thoroughly studied for almost any serious study pertaining to Wakefield and his ideas.

Grattan, C. Hartley. Australia. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1947.

A short history of Australia with no major weaknesses nor any outstanding features. It does give a brief amount of space to the settlement of South Australia.

. Introducing Australia. New York: The John Day Company, 1942.

A brief study of and introduction to Australia and Australian civilization.

Greenwood, Gordon (ed.). Australia: A Social and Political History. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1955.

Perhaps the finest social history to date on Australia. A "must" for almost any study concerning Australia.

Greswell, William Parr. The Growth and Administration of the British Colonies, 1837-1897. London: Blackie and Son, Ltd., 1898.

A sound but not particularly outstanding study of the constitutional development of the British Empire in the nineteenth century. It is quite outdated and has been replaced by numerous recent studies.

Greville, Charles C. F. The Greville Memoirs: (Second Part) A Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria From 1837 to 1852. Vol. I of 3. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1885.

A highly colored view of the Colonial Reformers, whom Greville detested. A valuable source but it must be used with care.

Halevy, Elie. The Age of Peel and Cobden; A History of the English People, 1841-1852. Translated by E. I. Watkin. New York: Peter Smith, 1948.

An outstanding treatment of the domestic issues in Great Britain during the days of agitation for colonial reform. Not much mention is made of Wakefield and the Colonial Reformers, but this work is essential for gaining an understanding of the period in which they lived.

. The Triumph of Reform, 1830-1841. Vol. III of A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century. Translated by E. I. Watkin. 6 vols. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961.

This volume is the most important of this set for a topic concerning colonial reform. The complete set, however, constitutes a monumental study of most facets of nineteenth century Britain.

Hall, Walter Phelps. A History of England and the British Empire. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1937.

A general study of the British Empire and its inseparable connections with England. Unique in its treatment of how colonial developments affected England, and how English developments affected the Empire.

Harrop, Angus John. The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928.

A biography of Wakefield written in a popular and sensational style. Somewhat superficial in its treatment of Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization," particularly when the author deals with the doctrine of the "sufficient price."

Hasluck, Alexandra. Unwilling Emigrants. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1959.

A needed study of the early emigrants from Great Britain who went to Australia, either as convicts or as paupers.

Innes, Arthur Donald. A History of England and the British Empire. 2d ed. 4 vols. London: Rivingtons, 1925-1927.

A lengthy study of the development of England and the British Empire. An interesting constitutional interpretation of the nineteenth century Empire.

Jenks, Edward. History of the Australasian Colonies. 2d ed. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1896.

An outdated but still useful study of the nineteenth century British activities in the South Pacific.

Jose, Arthur. Builders and Pioneers of Australia. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1928.

A survey of the men and women most responsible for the settlement of Australia. It conveys to the reader the spirit of the pioneers and the trials they faced and overcame.

Knaplund, Paul. Gladstone and Britain's Imperial Policy. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

This work shows how the principles and concepts sought by the Colonial Reformers influenced colonial policy in the latter half of the nineteenth century. A provocative study.

. James Stephen and the British Colonial System, 1813-1847. Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1953.

A study that shows the importance of the role James Stephen played when he served as Permanent Under-secretary of the Colonial Office. It brings out the firm entrenchment of the Church Missionary Society within the Colonial Office, and shows how this affected the attitude of the Colonial Office toward Wakefield and the Colonial Reformers.

Knorr, Klaus E. British Colonial Theories 1570-1850. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

The most comprehensive study to date on the various British theories of empire in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The one weakness of this work is the lack of a bibliography. Otherwise, it is unsurpassed.

Knowles, Lillian C. A. The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire. 2d ed. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1928.

A profound study of the economic structure and development of the British Empire. The treatment of Wakefield and his theory is sketchy, but accurate.

LaBorde, E. D. (ed.). Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands. 2d ed. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1952.

A compilation of a series of articles on the history and role of Australia, New Zealand, and various Pacific islands. Nothing of real value for one engaged in a study of Wakefield.

Lucas, Charles Prestwood. Australasia. Vol. VI of A Historical Geography of the British Colonies. 7 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1888-1920.

A needed and necessary reference for almost any study of Australian history. Somewhat popular in style, but highly useful.

Madgwick, R. B. Immigration Into Eastern Australia: 1788-1851. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1937.

A thorough treatment of the settlement of Eastern Australia. It covers the exciting period from the establishment of the first penal colony to the discovery of gold, and the resulting influx of vast numbers of people. It gives a fine insight into the problems confronting the early immigrants into Australia.

McLeod, A. L. The Pattern of Australian Culture. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1963.

A recent social history of Australia. It clearly defines the modern Australian society, and traces the origins from which it developed.

Miller, Harold. New Zealand. A part of Hutchinson's University Library British Empire History, edited by Sir Reginald Coupland. London: Hutchinson and Company, 1955.

A brief survey of the history of New Zealand and an attempt to place New Zealand in its position and role in the modern world. A brief but rewarding study.

Mills, Richard C. Colonization of Australia (1829-42): The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd., 1915.

The finest study to date of the application of Wakefield's theory of "systematic colonization" in South Australia. It is in need of extensive revision because of the wealth of new material now available on Wakefield, but until such a revision is made, or a new study is written, it will remain the classic work on the subject.

Morrell, W. P. British Colonial Policy in the Age of Peel and Russell. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930.

A fine study by an outstanding scholar. It is a thorough analysis of the problems confronting Great Britain in the mid-nineteenth century, and a story of her attempts to solve these problems. It encompasses not only the questions facing the Colonial Office, but gives a sound treatment of the problems of the period.

New Zealand. Department of Statistics. New Zealand Official Handbook 1964. Wellington, N. Z.: New Zealand Government, 1964.

An outstanding publication of the vital statistics of New Zealand. It contains a vast amount of information on present-day New Zealand, and gives a synoptic, but useful history of the country. One of the finest official publications available to the student of the Commonwealth of Nations.

O'Connor, Irma. Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Man Himself. London: Selwyn and Blount, 1928.

An interesting but popularly written account of Wakefield's life by his great-granddaughter. Valuable for the insight it provides into his character, but must be used with care because it is often defensive about Wakefield's early life and adventures.

Oliver, W. H. The Story of New Zealand. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.

A general but philosophical approach to Wakefield and the movement for colonial reform. An excellent and provocative study.

Robbins, Lionel. Robert Torrens and the Evolution of Classical Economics. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1958.

An interesting synthesis of Robert Torrens' role in the development and interpretation of the classical economists.

Robinson, [James] Howard. The Development of the British Empire. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922.

A general account of the development of the British Empire. It has an excellent bibliography.

Rodgers, J. D. Australia. 2d ed. revised by R. N. Kershaw. Vol. VI of A Historical Geography of the British Dominions. 6 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.

A sound treatment of the subject, but not of the same caliber as Lucas, Australasia.

Rose, J. Holland, A. P. Newton, and E. A. Benians (editors). The Cambridge History of the British Empire. 8 vols. Vol. II: The Growth of the New Empire 1783-1870. Vol. III: The Empire-Commonwealth (E. A. Benians, Sir James Butler, and C. E. Carrington, editors). Vol. VI: Canada and Newfoundland. Vol. VII, Part I: Australia; Part II: New Zealand. Cambridge: University Press, 1930-1959.

The monumental and unsurpassed study of the British Empire from its inception. Indispensable to any study concerning the British Empire. A series of essays written by outstanding scholars on each phase of the history of the Empire.

Schuyler, Robert Livingston. Parliament and the British Empire. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

A study of the relationship between Parliament and the component parts of the British Empire. Profound and provocative.

Seeley, Sir John Robert. The Expansion of England. London: MacMillan and Company, Ltd., 1925.

A Victorian interpretation of the British Empire. Provocative but must be used with great care because it is strongly nationalistic and slanted in favor of Great Britain.

. The Growth of British Policy. Cambridge: The University Press, 1922.

Another colored and nationalistic interpretation of the growth and development of the British Empire. It too must be used with care, but it does show the impact of the Colonial Reformers upon subsequent British colonial policy.

Shaw, A. G. L. The Story of Australia. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1960. (First published in 1954: New York, Roy Publishers, and 1962: Faber Paper Covered Editions.)

General but excellent coverage of Australian history. Nothing of particular note concerning Wakefield.

Sinclair, Keith. A History of New Zealand. London: Penguin Books, 1960.

A remarkable study of New Zealand history. Somewhat anti-Wakefield, but still a reasonable and philosophical interpretation.

Somervell, D. C. English Thought in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1929.

A fascinating survey of the course of nineteenth century English intellectual history. It provides a rich background into the thoughts and actions of the British people in the nineteenth century.

Temperley, Harold William Vazeille. Foundations of British Foreign Policy From Pitt (1792) to Salisbury (1902). Cambridge: The University Press, 1938.

Survey study of British foreign and colonial policy throughout the nineteenth century. It does an admirable job of placing the subject of this paper in a proper perspective.

Thomson, Robert P. National History of Australia, New Zealand and the Adjacent Islands. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1917.

Treats the subject much like many other references--sound, solid, and unimaginative.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon. A Letter From Sydney and Other Writings. Introduction and notes by R. C. Mills. (Everyman's Library, No. 828.) London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1929.

Wakefield's first and most provocative work. It sets forth the basic concepts of his theory and is the best known of his works. This study should be on the required reading list for every history, economics, and philosophy student.

. A View of the Art of Colonization, with Present Reference to the British Empire; In Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist. London: John W. Parker, 1849.

The last, most profound, and tightly reasoned argument for "systematic colonization" set forth by Wakefield. It is a triumph of logic, skillful writing, and unimpassioned eloquence.

. England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1834.

The second of the major works by Wakefield. It is an analysis of the social and political developments of both England and America, and a commentary upon what Wakefield believed to be wrong with both states.

Ward, John M. British Policy in the South Pacific. Sydney: Australian Publishing Co., Pty. Ltd., 1948.

A general study of British activities and policies in the Australasian and Southern Pacific areas. It is an excellent reference.

Warner, Oliver. William Wilberforce and His Times. London: B. T. Batsford, 1962.

The period covered is a little before the advent of the mid-nineteenth century imperialism, but the study gives an excellent background to Wakefield and the Colonial Reformers.

Williamson, James Alexander. A Short History of British Expansion. 2d ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930.

The title misleads the student. This is a truly remarkable work on the history, development, and evolution of the British Empire. While it is somewhat outdated, it is worth serious study.

_____. Builders of the Empire. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925.

A series of short studies on the lives of some of the great imperial statesmen Britain has produced.

_____. Great Britain and the Empire; A Discursive History. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1944.

An enlightening study of the relationships between the United Kingdom and the Dominions of the Commonwealth and Empire. A thorough constitutional analysis.

_____. The Foundation and Growth of the British Empire. 5th ed. revised. London: Macmillan, 1945.

A general but detailed history of the Empire from its beginning. Nothing of particular note about it, but it does contain a well-balanced treatment of the history of the Empire.

Wood, Anthony. Nineteenth Century Britain 1815-1914. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, Ltd., 1960.

An excellent survey of Britain during the Age of Reform. It is a general study, but of definite merit.

Woodward, Ernest Llewellyn. The Age of Reform, 1815-1870. 2d ed. Vol. 13 of The Oxford History of England. 14 vols. Edited by Sir George Clark. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962.

The best single volume work on nineteenth century Britain. It is detailed, well-written, and original. One of the finest on the period. It ranks with Halevy's work.

Wright, Arnold. The Romance of Colonisation, Being the Story of the Economic Development of the British Empire. London: A. Melrose, Ltd., 1923.

An interesting but romantic view of the economic expansion of the British Empire during the nineteenth century.

- Wrong, Edward Murray. Charles Buller and Responsible Government. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1926.
A well-written study of Charles Buller's role in the colonial reform movement. The volume also contains a copy of Wakefield's essay "Sir Charles Metcalfe in Canada," originally published in 1844.

Pamphlets

- Norman, John. Edward Gibbon Wakefield: A Political Reappraisal. Vol. VIII, No. 3. Fairfield, Conn.: New Frontiers of Fairfield University, 1963.
A very superficial treatment of an extremely complex and difficult question. A work in need of serious revision before it was printed. Includes a brief but sound bibliography, and contains extracts of several of Wakefield's writings that are difficult to obtain.
- Taylor, C. R. H. and James Berry (eds.). Fifteen Great Names in New Zealand History. Wellington: Bank of New South Wales, 1962.
A small but interesting publication. Significantly, Wakefield is not among the fifteen discussed in this pamphlet.
- Taylor, C. R. H. (ed.). Milestones: Some Events in New Zealand History. Wellington: Bank of New South Wales, 1962.
Depicts the highlights of New Zealand history. Several paragraphs are devoted to Wakefield and "systematic colonization."

Periodicals

- Annual Register, Appendix to the Chronicle, Law Cases and Narratives, LXIX (1827), 316-327.
- Review of Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand, by Richard Garnett, The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art, LXXXVI (December, 1898), 856-857.
- The Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal for January..... May 1828, XLVII (January, 1898), 100-118.
- Whibley, Charles. Review of Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand, by Richard Garnett, Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, CLXIV (December, 1898), 822-827.

Dictionary and Encyclopedia Articles

- "Edward Gibbon Wakefield," British Authors of the Nineteenth Century (1960), 641.
- Mills, Richard C. "Edward Gibbon Wakefield," The Australian Encyclopedia, II (1926), 630-631.
- Barker, George Fisher Russell. "John George Lambton," The Dictionary of National Biography, XI, 463-466.
- Carlyle, Edward Irving. "Edward Gibbon Wakefield," The Dictionary of National Biography, XX, 449-452.
- Courtney, William Prideaux. "Charles Buller," The Dictionary of National Biography, III, 246-248.
- Hewins, William Albert Samuel. "Robert Torrens," The Dictionary of National Biography, XIX, 993-995.
- Stephen, Leslie. "William Molesworth," The Dictionary of National Biography, XIII, 570-572.

Document Collections

- Bell, Kenneth N. and W. P. Morrell (ed.). Select Documents on British Colonial Policy 1830-1860. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1928.
The best single volume collection of documents related to the crucial period in British imperial history in the mid-nineteenth century.
- Bennett, George (ed.). The Concept of Empire: Burke to Attlee, 1774-1947. 2d ed. Vol. VI of The British Political Tradition. Edited by Allan Bullock and F. W. Deakin. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.
Broader in scope than Bell and Morrell's collection, but containing several excellent selections from Wakefield's writings.
- Clark, C. Manning. Select Documents in Australian History. Vol. I 1788-1850. 2 vols. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1955.
A compilation of many of the important Acts of Parliament concerning Australia, and a reprinting of many of the Statutes enacted by the various local governments in Australia.

Sources of Australian History. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

The selections illustrate the history of Australia from the continent's discovery to the Treaty of Versailles. It contains both political and social documents, and illuminates the growth of European civilization in Australia.

Douglas, David C. (General Editor). English Historical Documents. Vols. 11-12. 12 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

An outstanding contribution to the study of English and imperial history. Contains the most important and vital records and documents throughout the course of English history.

Stephenson, Carl and Frederick George Marcham (ed.). Sources of English Constitutional History. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.

A convenient source book for extracts of the most important documents relating to English and imperial history.

Swinburne, Gwendolen H. A Source Book of Australian History. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1919.

A valuable collection of documents concerning Australian history, but it has been largely replaced by Clark's three volumes of documents.

Public Documents

Great Britain. British Sessional Papers. House of Commons. Series 1, 1820-1884. 1836, XI; 1837, XLIII; 1839, XVII; 1841, IV; 1843, XXXII; 1852, XVIII. Edited by Edgar L. Erickson.

Great Britain. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (New Series). Vol. XXI.

Great Britain. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (2d series). Vols. XXIII-XXV.

Great Britain. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (3d series). Vols. I-LIII (1831), XLI (1838), XLVII (1839).

Great Britain. Statutes at Large. 4-5 William IV (1830-37).