England Elsewhere: Edward Gibbon Wakefield and an Imperial Utopian Dream

Michael Radzevicius

Table of Contents

Abstract

British colonial reformer Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796-1862) is most widely known in scholarly literature for the role that he played in the planning, promotion, and establishment of the British colonies of South Australia and New Zealand. Always a controversial historical figure, Wakefield's career as an advocate of British imperial expansion is a subject that continues to challenge modern scholars. Some view him as a contemptible, deluded capitalist visionary who had little practical impact upon the political landscape of his day. Others argue that his advocacy of a regulated, 'systematic' form of colonization provided the impetus for the rapid increase in British emigration to Australia and New Zealand in the 1830s and 1840s. What is common to almost all of the scholarship on Wakefield's life and works, however, is the view that his plans to colonize South Australia and New Zealand were attempts to create an ideal, utopian colonial society. The utopian qualities of Wakefield's works have been especially recognized in the historical literature of New Zealand. In general, however, his works have been assessed in the context of colonial and imperial history, rather than as an important contribution to Western utopian literature. With its modern genesis in Thomas More's *Utopia* of 1516, the canon of Western utopian literature is large and has received extensive scholarly interest and investigation. Although utopian thinking is a multifarious literary and theoretical tradition open to diverse interpretations, there is nonetheless a readily identifiable canon of texts and authors that scholars have categorised as being 'utopian.' Wakefield's works are generally excluded from this canon and it is this gap in the intellectual history of the Western utopian tradition that this thesis addresses.

Plagiarism Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to Michael Radzevicius and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Date: Signature:

Acknowledgements

INTRODUCTION

This thesis conducts an examination of the works of the British colonial reformer and author Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796-1862) with a view to assessing his importance as a utopian thinker. Wakefield was a pivotal figure in the British colonization of South Australia and New Zealand. While his role in these processes has been discussed at length by historians of the colonial era, Wakefield's place in the modern history of ideas, and in particular utopian theory, has received much less attention. Scholars have addressed the biographical details of Wakefield's life, acknowledging his contributions, both theoretical and practical, to the British imperial project. A similar amount of attention has been paid to his critiques and proposals of reform in relation to British and European political economy. However, a concise and focused reading of Wakefield's major works in relation to their status as utopian texts has not been conducted. Such a gap is to the detriment of the scholarly assessment of Britain's imperial and colonial projects, and reveals an omission in the utopian scholarly literature of a forceful and provocative thinker. A close reading of Wakefield's major works reveals the distinct outlines and surprisingly expressed utopian motivations that underpinned the British colonization of South Australia and New Zealand. The dual aim of this thesis is thus to address certain lacunae in the contemporary scholarship of Western utopian thought, whilst also broadening the historical and theoretical scope of British imperial and colonial history.

This thesis conducts a critical literary assessment of Wakefield's contribution as a publicist of political and economic reform and a proponent of actual colonial ventures expressed in the unmistakable idiom of utopian thought. Indeed, Wakefield's work appeared at an early point in the more familiar tradition of British and French nineteenth-century utopian writings and practical experimentation. It follows that the primary research task for this thesis has been to consult a substantial but sharply defined corpus of primary literature, including relevant documents from Wakefield's contemporaries, as well as a critical analysis and assessment of the scholarly literature pertaining to Wakefield's place in the history of ideas.

Wakefield began writing anonymous newspaper articles on the subject of

British imperial expansion in South Australia during his three year internment in Newgate Prison, a punishment he received for illegally absconding to France with his teenage wife Ellen Turner. His first book length publication on this topic appeared in 1829, the final year of his incarceration. This publication, entitled *A Letter From Sydney, The Principal Town of Australasia*, was compiled from a series of letters Wakefield wrote to the London newspaper *The Morning Chronicle* during 1829. The book was initially published anonymously due to the fact that Wakefield had only recently completed his prison term. *A Letter from Sydney* can be best classified as a work of colonial promotional literature whose basis is almost completely fictional. As we shall see in the close reading of *A Letter from Sydney* in Chapter 5, Wakefield identified some of the sources he used to inform the book's detailed portrayal of colonial life in early New South Wales. Nevertheless, *A Letter from Sydney* is largely a work of imaginative speculation, and I will argue that the text forms the basis for all of Wakefield's subsequent utopian projections.

The next major work of Wakefield's, published in 1834, is the promotional tract *The New British Province of South Australia; Or A Description of the Country, Illustrated by Charts and Views; With an Account of the Principles, Objects, Plan, and Prospects of the Colony.* This work is a more didactic and less speculative work than *A Letter from Sydney* but its contents provides even stronger evidence to support Wakefield's enthusiastic utopianism. In 1837, only three years after the publication of *The New British Province of South Australia*, Wakefield published *The British colonization of New Zealand: being an account of the principles, objects, and plans of the New Zealand Association: together with particulars concerning the position, extent, soil and climate, natural productions, and native inhabitants of New Zealand.* This publication, bearing a marked resemblance to *The New British Province of South Australia*, was primarily intended as a marketing tool to encourage both the British government and potential colonists for an expansion of British colonial interests in New Zealand. *The British colonization of New Zealand* nonetheless draws upon utopian speculation, and its discussion of the racial amalgamation of Maori people with British colonists is particularly notable in relation to Wakefield's overall utopian

program.

Although these two publications are notable for the didactic flavour of their specific colonial advocacy, Wakefield also published a semi-fictional work in 1849 entitled *A View of the Art of Colonization, In Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist.* This work, as indicated in its title, consists of a series of letters between a fictional British politician and a similarly fictional prospective colonist. Although it does not add anything of considerable originality to the program for utopian colonial expansion that Wakefield described in his previous works, sections of this work remain notable for their reinforcement of Wakefield's utopian typology. *A View of the Art of Colonization* is also significant because it was the last major publication of Wakefield's that was published during his lifetime.

The next significant work addressed in this thesis, *The Founders of Canterbury*, is a series of letters Wakefield wrote between 1847 and 1850. They were compiled and edited by Wakefield's son Jerningham after Wakefield's death in 1862, and published in 1868. As the title suggests, this is a compilation of Wakefield's correspondence on the subject of the colonization of Canterbury in New Zealand. This correspondence is an invaluable source documenting the minutiae of Wakefield's plans and the stress he placed on structural detail and meticulous organization in his plans for colonization. Although all of the works mentioned above were published separately in various editions, it was not until 1968 that his major works were published in a single volume and readily available for comprehensive assessment. M.F. Lloyd Prichard's edition of *The Collected Works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield* is thus one of the major sources for the present analysis. Reference is also made to the earlier editions of Wakefield's works since they contain useful bibliographical information and an insight into the awareness and critical reception of Wakefield as a political thinker. The 1914 edition of *A View of the Art of Colonization,* for example, was published by Oxford University Press and contains an early scholarly introduction, written by James Collier, to Wakefield's life and works.

This thesis also discusses works of Wakefield's contemporaries in order to demonstrate aspects of the wider economic, political and intellectual contexts of his

thinking. This analysis will illustrate that, while his advocacy was distinctive and in some respects strikingly original as well as controversial, Wakefield was not alone in developing manifestly utopian proposals for colonizing South Australia and New Zealand. Works by fellow colonial promoters such as Robert Torrens, Charles Napier, Robert Gouger, John Stephens and Thomas Cholmondeley will be addressed in relation to the colonization of both South Australia and New Zealand, along with supporting documentation from other less prominent colonial figures. Evidence of the support Wakefield's plans received from notable contemporaneous figures such as Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill will be discussed, along with Karl Marx's famous denunciation of Wakefield's theories in *Capital*.

A significant amount of the secondary literature on Wakefield is biographical. Four book length biographies of Wakefield's life were published between 1898 and 1961: Garnett (1898), Harrop (1928), O'Connor (1928) and Bloomfield (1961). More recently, Philip Temple (2002) wrote a comprehensive biography of the life of the entire Wakefield family between the years 1791 and 1879. Although Temple's work does address certain utopian elements within Wakefield's works, none of these biographies seriously entertain the utopian nature of Wakefield's thought.

Notable non-biographical critiques of Wakefield's ideas have been published by scholars such as Semmel (1961), Shaw (1969), Adams (1977), Belich (2002, 2009), Bell (2007), Fairburn (1989), Grant (2005), Jaensch (ed., 1986), Pike (1952, 1957) and Richards (1993, 2004). Pike and Grant do address some of the utopian qualities of Wakefield's ideas, but they do so only in the relatively narrow context of British colonial discourse in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Importantly, however, they do not address Wakefield's works in relation to other utopian thinkers in the diverse and richly researched utopian literary tradition. This is not to say that they deny Wakefield's utopianism; Pike, for example, wrote an article on the utopian dreams that underpinned the settlement of Adelaide in South Australia. Other figures, such as Duncan Bell, address the broader utopian intentions of British imperialists in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Some scholars have indeed denied that Wakefield should be considered to be a utopian at all (Mills, 1914; Olssen, 1997).

Although these scholars do address some aspects of Wakefield's utopianism (*A Letter from Sydney* is most commonly cited as the prototypical example of Wakefield's vision for an ideal colony), what is missing in all of these analyses is a thorough and detailed contextualization of Wakefield's works within, and as a contemporaneous contribution to, the European tradition of utopian thought associated with such nineteenth-century authors as Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Etienne Cabet and Henri de Saint-Simon, amongst others. This is the task that this thesis aims to accomplish.

An analytical and critical interpretation of the full range of Wakefield's publications provides an insight not only into a neglected dimension of Wakefield's utopian thought but also illuminates a neglected aspect of British imperial thinking in the early to mid-nineteenth century. That Wakefield was not accorded widespread popular esteem by his contemporaries may itself suggest that he was an original voice on issues as diverse as domestic agriculture and colonial policy. A fuller appreciation of the utopian aspects of his works therefore contributes to two intellectual streams within contemporary scholarship, amplifying the intellectual history of the British empire and extending the intellectual scope of the Western utopian tradition.

Chapter One begins with an appraisal and summary of Wakefield's life and works, as well as an assessment of the critical scholarly reception that has been given to Wakefield's career as an author, politician and colonial reformer. In Chapter One, Wakefield's life and works will be contextualized in relation to the changes in attitude towards emigration that were occurring in Britain in the 1820s and 1830s. A discussion of the basis for Wakefield's promotion of the theory of systematic colonization as the ideal means for Britain to expand its colonial empire establishes the foundation for the central theme of this study, whilst also outlining the context and scope for the thesis as a whole.

Chapter Two will then conduct a review of the extensive scholarly literature that discusses the ideas, form and content of Western utopianism as an accepted theoretical framework. This will provide an overview of the ways in which scholars have defined and debated the meaning of utopia in Western political thought since

Thomas More invented the word and published *Utopia* in 1516. This overview will be followed by an assessment of the ideational criteria and literary genres that have been advanced to identify and distinguish utopian ideas and utopian themes within political literature. It will be argued that a critical reading of the scholarship on Western utopian literature, in which Wakefield is typically omitted from debates concerning the scope of Western utopian literature in the nineteenth century, is open to reconsideration and offers the opportunity for a reevaluation of Wakefield's place in that tradition. Wakefield's works have often been mentioned in the literature of British colonial and imperial history, but his works have not been adequately examined by scholars of the Western utopian tradition.

Chapter Three expands the historical and literary overview of Chapter Two by focusing on the scholarly analysis of Western utopian literary works and utopian political action in the nineteenth century. Given that the nineteenth century was the most fertile period of utopian literary production, considerable attention must be paid to the critical reception this period has received in scholarly literature. A review of the major themes of nineteenth-century utopianism will establish the literary markers and theoretical parameters that will help delineate an approach to Wakefield's works as contributions to utopian literature.

Following the theoretical basis established in Chapters Two and Three, Chapters Four, Five and Six will conduct a close textual exposition of Wakefield's major published works. Given that Wakefield's works have mainly been assessed by scholars in regards to their contribution to British colonial and economic history, Chapter Four examines the theory of systematic colonization, a theory generally interpreted as being a purely economic recommendation for imperial colonial expansion. This theory was undoubtedly the cornerstone of Wakefield's plans for British imperial expansion, but it clearly also formed the basis for a much broader, more ambitious, comprehensive scheme of social and political formation. Thus it is crucial to establish both the scope and detail of the framework that Wakefield propounded for the creation of an ideal system of British colonies. I argue that the theory of systematic colonization was not simply intended to be a method by which a

thriving colonial economy could be established, but that it was an *idealized* method intended to create a thriving (and, indeed, perfect) colonial society. Establishing the imaginative basis of Wakefield's colonial system provides a new interpretative perspective upon the remarkably detailed plans to colonize South Australia and New Zealand. These plans are articulated in the unmistakable enthusiasm and the very language of utopian social perfection.

Chapters Five and Six will conduct a critical exposition of the most significant works Wakefield published on the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand. Chapter Five will examine the very first book length publication Wakefield wrote on the subject of British colonization, *A Letter from Sydney*. An analysis of the utopian elements within *A Letter from Sydney* will be followed by an assessment of the major work Wakefield wrote on the subject of colonization in South Australia, *The New British Province of South Australia* (1834). This text is a work of colonial promotional literature and was used by Wakefield and his fellow colonial promoters to advance the cause of British imperial expansion by establishing a colony in South Australia. Its importance for present purposes lies in its practical detailing and elaboration of the theoretical blueprints Wakefield established in *A Letter from Sydney*. Chapter Five concludes by conducting an overview of the works of other colonial promoters with whom Wakefield advocated the colonization of South Australia. This demonstrates that Wakefield's works were situated within a broader colonial discourse whose authors all shared utopian ambitions for British imperial expansion in South Australia.

As Chapter Six will demonstrate, despite some practical and technical alterations, Wakefield's plans for the utopian colonization of New Zealand were similar to those he promoted for South Australia. This chapter advances the assessment of Wakefield's utopianism with a reading of the two most significant (and extensive) works Wakefield published on the British colonization of New Zealand: *The British Colonization of New Zealand: Being an Account of the Principles, Objects and Plans of the New Zealand Association* (1837) and *The Founders of Canterbury* (1868). The correspondence contained within *The Founders of Canterbury* provides further insights into the practical, and utopian, machinations of Wakefield's thinking.

These documents provide a detailed account of his plan for the colonization of Canterbury, but also reveal further evidence of the imaginative utopian dreams that underpinned all of Wakefield's colonial schemes. Chapter Six concludes with an assessment of the broader utopian discourse that was published both within New Zealand and Britain during the early years of New Zealand's official annexation to Britain, further demonstrating that Wakefield's works were part of a wider British utopian imperialist discourse. Chapters Five and Six thus establish the basis for a more expansive interpretative and comparative scope for incorporating Wakefield's utopian theorizing into the broader Western utopian tradition.

Chapter Seven concludes this study with a challenge to the scholarship of Western utopian thought in relation to the recognition it accords to Wakefield's works. This chapter is more directly theoretical than the previous chapters, but maintains a focus on Wakefield's body of work in order to contextualize the case in favour of his utopianism. Must a model of a utopian society be truly 'new' in the sense of it being radically original in order for this model to be deemed legitimately utopian? It is beyond dispute that the creation of perfect colonies has been an element of utopian schemes from the earliest literary examples of utopian theorizing. Is it consistent, therefore, that Wakefield's plans to create perfect colonial models of British society should be ruled out of consideration? If utopian thought is necessarily conceptualised as some kind of radical change to an existing social order, does that inevitably preclude the role of pragmatism or moral idealism in design and operation? It is indisputable that these have also been explicit concerns throughout the history of utopian thought, for example in the explicitly experimental and evolutionary schemes of Fourier and his followers. Finally, must programs for social change of an earlier era, and the cultural forms and moral ideals that inform them, conform to later or contemporary ethical standards in order to be regarded as legitimately utopian? Such a stricture, at the very least, would seem to be open to charges of anachronism.

Our analysis of Wakefield's life and works begins with a critical survey and assessment of the scholarly reception of Wakefield's career as a colonial reformer and author.

Chapter One
Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the British Settler Empire

Wakefield's life and works

British colonial reformer Edward Gibbon Wakefield (1796-1862) is one of the most prominent figures in the colonial histories of South Australia and New Zealand.[1] A consistently controversial figure, Wakefield is most widely known in scholarly literature for the role he played in the British colonization of South Australia and New Zealand, his writings on colonial and economic reform, and for his role in the publication of the Durham report (1839) on self government in Upper and Lower Canada.[2] Scholars have debated many aspects of Wakefield's work, from his intellectual originality and the extent to which he managed to exert significant political influence during his lifetime, to the role he played in influencing patterns of international British migration in the 1830s and 1840s.

Wakefield was born in London in 1796 into a 'Quaker family in which there was a long tradition of public service and practical philanthropy' (Mills, 1929, p. viii). His grandmother was the philanthropist and author Priscilla Wakefield who was responsible for 'the introduction of savings banks' in Britain and his father, Edward Wakefield, was an author, land agent and philanthropist whose political contacts included James Mill and Francis Place (Temple, 2002, p. 10). He attended Westminster and Edinburgh High School (Temple, 2002, pp. 33-34) but his schooling

---

[1] Wakefield's life has been the subject of four book length biographies, published between 1898 and 1961. These are: Garnett, R., *Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand,* T. Fisher Unwin: London, 1898; Harrop, A.J., *The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield*, George Allen & Unwin: London, 1928; O'Connor, Irma, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Man Himself*, Selwyn & Blount Ltd.: London, 1928; Bloomfield, Paul, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield: builder of the British Commonwealth*, Longmans: London, 1961. Philip Temple has described these works as exaggerated 'hagiographies written in the days when [Wakefield] was seen as a founder of empire or commonwealth' (Temple, 2002, p. 1). Temple's work, *A Sort of Conscience: The Wakefields* (2002) is a comprehensive critical biography of Wakefield and his family. Temple begins his analysis in 1791 and concludes with the death of Wakefield's son Edward Jerningham Wakefield in 1879.

[2] Wakefield was also involved in plans to colonize certain parts of Canada in the mid to late 1830s. In 1838 Wakefield became involved with the North American Colonial Association of Ireland, a body that had been established in September 1835 but by 1838 had become 'derelict' (Macdonnell, 1924-1925, pp. 2-3). Wakefield's son Edward Jerningham Wakefield wrote in 1868 that his father was also a supporter of 'an Irish colonization of Canada on a gigantic scale' and that the Irish colonization of Canada 'had long been a favourite project' of Wakefield's (Wakefield, Edward Jerningham, 1868 (1973), p. vii). Although Wakefield's negotiations for the systematic colonization of Canada by the North American Colonial Association of Ireland 'were conducted, like so many others in which Wakefield played a part, almost entirely by private interview, a fact which makes their progress very difficult to trace' (Macdonnell, 1924-1925, p. 9) his involvement with such colonial associations demonstrates his dedication to the expansion of the British settler empire.

ended in Edinburgh in 1812. In 1814 he served as an attaché to William Hill, the 'British envoy to the court of Turin' (Temple, 2002, p. 34) and married his first wife Eliza Anne Frances Pattle in 1816. Pattle died in 1820 and in 1823 Wakefield moved to Paris where he served as the secretary to the British embassy (Prichard, 1968, p. 10).

Wakefield's career as a political economist and colonial promoter did not have an auspicious beginning. He was imprisoned in 1826 for three years after he abducted and married Ellen Turner, a fifteen year-old schoolgirl. Whilst the details of the so-called 'Turner incident' have been the subject of no small amount of historical interest and debate,[3] what is certain is that Wakefield's imprisonment provided the catalyst for his career as an advocate for the reform of Britain's system of colonial administration. His jail term provided him the opportunity to write the newspaper articles that would eventually constitute his first book length publication, *A Letter from Sydney* (1829). Despite its title, *A Letter from Sydney* was based on accounts of colonial life that Wakefield studied whilst he was imprisoned rather than from personal experience, since he was not actually transported to New South Wales.

Following his release from prison in 1829, Wakefield embarked upon a career as an advocate for the reform and expansion of Britain's colonial empire. The most prolific years of Wakefield's life were the 1830s and 1840s. During these two decades Wakefield published the bulk of his work and it was also in this time that he was involved in the plans to colonize South Australia and New Zealand. Whilst Wakefield is widely acknowledged as an influential figure in the efforts that led to the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand,[4] a considerable proportion of his

---

[3] Scholars have analyzed the possible incentives Wakefield had to abduct Turner, and most have argued that financial and political advantage were central to his motives. Paul Moon, for example, has argued that 'Wakefield had been a minor official in the British Government's employ, but the tedium of his job led him to aspire to enter Parliament. To bankroll this ambition, he took the extraordinary measure of abducting the fifteen-year-old daughter of a wealthy family in the hope of securing a ransom to give him the required capital for his campaign' (Moon, 2006, p. 148). Douglas Pike wrote fleetingly of Wakefield's imprisonment in his extensive history of South Australia *Paradise of Dissent*, arguing that Wakefield was 'sentenced in 1827 to three years imprisonment for his indiscretions' (Pike, 1957, p. 75). Ged Martin offers a much more scathing account of Wakefield's actions when he writes that 'Wakefield wove a romance around the abduction, but behind his charm and magnetism there probably lay a hint of menace … Ellen Turner was subjected to a chilling ordeal of psychological torment, motivated by greed and lacking a scintilla of romance' (Martin, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), 1997, p. 28).

[4] South Australia and New Zealand were established as colonies of Great Britain in 1836 and 1840, respectively. South Australia was founded as a province of Great Britain through the passing of the *South Australian Act* in 1834 (although it was not officially colonized until 1836) and New Zealand was created as a Crown colony of Great Britain through a Royal Charter in 1840. Wakefield's role in

promotional activities were published anonymously, or performed in ways that were not publicly prominent. Bernard Semmel, for example, has argued that during the campaign to colonize South Australia 'Wakefield was himself unable – because of his sojourn at Newgate prison – to assume an open political role, but was always behind the scenes, with his rather considerable powers of persuasion' (Semmel, 1961, p. 519).

Wakefield was involved in numerous other colonial and political projects besides the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand during the 1830s and 1840s, but it is for his role in the creation of these two colonies that he is most renowned in colonial and British imperial history.[5] He published an edition of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, was involved in writing the Durham report on responsible government in Canada, and attempted to implement the use of systematic colonization in Canada.[6] Wakefield served as a member of parliament in Lower Canada in 1842-43

---

the colonization of both colonies was both promotional and practical. He was involved in negotiations with the British government concerning the ways in which the colonies would be established as sites of official British imperial expansion, and was also heavily involved in promoting the schemes to the British public. Wakefield never actually visited South Australia, but he was directly involved in the colonization of New Zealand and eventually moved there in 1853. Scholars have debated the extent of Wakefield's influence in the colonial history of both South Australia and New Zealand. Keith Sinclair, for example, has argued that 'Wakefield has been credited, even by reputable historians, with the chief, if not the sole responsibility for the annexation of New Zealand' (Sinclair, 1961, p. 43). Mark Francis, conversely, has argued that 'when discussing Wakefield, New Zealand historians often abandon any effort to establish an historical basis for their views because they wrongly imagine that his influence was ubiquitous' (Francis, 2000, p. 171). In Francis's estimation most scholars of New Zealand history have attributed to Wakefield too much intellectual and political influence. Francis argues that 'compared to other colonial radicals Wakefield was less original as a writer or a theorist' and that 'unlike competing radicals, he had little influence with the major English politicians of his era' (Francis, 2000, p. 171). Such disputes are important in providing us with a fuller understanding of New Zealand and South Australian history but are not crucial to the subject of this thesis.

[5] Numerous histories of the British colonization of South Australia and New Zealand have been written. Prominent publications on this subject include: Mills, R. C., *The Colonization of Australia (1829-42): the Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building*, Sidgwick & Jackson Ltd: London, 1915; Pike, Douglas, *Paradise of Dissent: South Australia 1829-1857*, Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd: London, 1957; Price, Grenfell A., *The foundation and settlement of South Australia, 1829-1845: a study of the colonization movement, based on the records of the South Australian Government and on other authoritative documents*, Preece: Adelaide, South Australia, 1924; Richards, Eric (ed.), *The Flinders History of South Australia: Social History*, Wakefield Press: South Australia, 1986. Works discussing New Zealand's early colonial history include Tapp, E. J., *Early New Zealand: a dependency of New South Wales, 1788-1841*, Melbourne University Press: Victoria, 1958; Belich, James, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 1996 (2001); Morton, Harry and Johnston Morton, Carol, *The farthest corner: New Zealand, a twice discovered land*, Century Hutchinson: Auckland, 1988.

[6] Wakefield's edition of *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations* was published in four volumes, beginning in 1835 and ending in 1839. Wakefield did not finish the publication of Smith's work. For details of Wakefield's publication of Smith's work see Prichard, 1968, pp. 33-34; for details of his involvement in the North American Colonial Association of Ireland see Macdonnell, 1924-1925; for information regarding his role in the writing of the Durham report on responsible

and as a member of the New Zealand House of Representatives from 1853 until 1854[7] when ill health forced him to retire from public life. Although the last seven years of his life were spent in relative anonymity, Wakefield's interest in colonial reform and British imperial expansion continued for thirty-three years and 'until his death in 1862 Wakefield busied himself with the task of regenerating colonies and colonial policy' (Mills, 1929, p. xi).

Critical reception

Wakefield's contribution to the intellectual history of nineteenth-century British imperialism has received a number of different critical reactions over time. His political writings were sufficiently well known and significant enough during his lifetime for both Jeremy Bentham and J. S. Mill to support them, and for Karl Marx to devote an entire chapter of *Capital* to denouncing Wakefield and 'The Modern Theory of Colonization.' Although Wakefield's writings on the theory of colonization that became known as 'systematic colonization' were published prior to the beginning of Marx's own career, Marx considered Wakefield to be an economist of considerable aptitude whose ideas remained sufficiently current and influential to be worthy of critique. Not surprisingly, Marx was vehemently opposed to the political outcomes that Wakefield's economic theories were intended to engender. For Marx the 'sufficient price for the land' in Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization was a 'euphemistic circumlocution for the ransom which the labourer pays to the capitalist for leave to retire from the wage labour market to the land' (Marx, 1966, p. 759).[8]

Despite Marx's denunciations of the political implications of Wakefield's thought, both Jeremy Bentham and J.S. Mill were supporters of Wakefield and the colonization of South Australia. Bentham's influence on Wakefield's thought is

---

government in Canada see Wrong, E. M., *Charles Buller and responsible government*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926; for information regarding other Canadian colonization projects Wakefield was involved in see Manning, Helen Taft, 'E. G. Wakefield and the Beauharnois Canal', *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 48, Issue 1, 1967, pp. 1-25.

[7] For analysis of Wakefield's political career in New Zealand, see Stuart, Peter, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield in New Zealand: His Political Career, 1853-4*, Price Milburn for Victoria University of Wellington: Wellington, 1971.

[8] Scholars such as Lionel Robbins have argued that Marx's interpretation of Wakefield's theorizing was mistaken and that 'Marx's account of [the sufficient price theory] involved serious misrepresentation.' According to Robbins, Marx's claim that Wakefield's scheme necessitated 'the annihilation of self-earned private property, in other words the expropriation of the labourer' was fundamentally incorrect and that 'it is a pure travesty to suggest that, once the labourers had become proprietors through their self-earned savings, their property was to be taken away. In spite of [Wakefield's] "justification" of slavery, it is entirely untrue to say that, for Wakefield, it was the only natural system and that "the sufficient price" – whether it was a good thing or a bad thing – was for him just a *pis aller* because he had to deal with free men' (Robbins, 1958, p. 162).

particularly notable and Bernard Semmel described Wakefield as 'the chief formulator of … [the] Benthamite "ideology" of colonialism' (Semmel, 1961, p. 514). Bentham himself wrote a proposal for the colonization of South Australia entitled *Colonization Society proposal, being a proposal for the formation of a Joint Stock Company by the name of the Colonization Company on an entirely new principle intituled the vicinity-maximizing or dispersion-preventing principle* (1831).

Bentham had previously been opposed to British imperialism but in 1831 he altered his opinion and argued in favour of the establishment of a British colony in South Australia.[9] As J.R. Poynter informs us: 'in 1831, a few months before his death, Bentham returned to the subject of colonization, drafting an unfinished and as yet unpublished treatise on the Colonization Society proposals which led in 1836 to the settlement of South Australia' (Poynter, in Kamenka (ed.), 1987, p. 61).[10] Douglas Pike has similarly argued that 'Bentham richly deserves a place among the founders of South Australia' (Pike, 1957, p. 57).

Bentham was not only a supporter of the scheme to colonize South Australia, he also had a utopian vision for the colony. Besides pointing to some of the more practical political reasons as to why Bentham was in favour of colonizing South Australia, Pike also demonstrates why Bentham's plans for South Australia can be construed to be utopian. As Pike notes, 'Bentham was enthusiastic about the benefits to be expected by the English unemployed and by the shareholders' in South Australia primarily because 'a colony without cost to the mother country impressed him; it might escape patronage, and all other interferences by Downing Street.' Most relevant

---

[9]For further information on Bentham's views regarding the economic and political expediency of British and European colonial expansion, see Bentham, Jeremy, *Collected Works: Colonies, commerce, and constitutional law: Rid yourselves of Ultramaria and other writings on Spain and Spanish America*, edited by Philip Schofield, Clarendon Press: Oxford; Oxford University Press: New York, 1995. Jennifer Pitts has argued that Bentham's support for imperial expansion must be read with caution and has contended that 'Bentham was ultimately not a supporter of British imperialism' and that he 'did not regard utilitarianism as legitimating the sort of despotic colonial rule that characterized the hopes of many of his successors' (Pitts, 2003, p. 201). For further information see Pitts, Jennifer, 'Legislator of the World? A Rereading of Bentham on Colonies', *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No. 2. (Apr.), 2003, pp. 200-234.

[10] Scholars have argued that evidence of Bentham's influence on Wakefield's thought can be found throughout Wakefield's career as a colonial reformer. According to L.C. Webb, the intellectual origins of the Canterbury settlement in New Zealand were a combination of John Robert Godley's 'High Church and (in a sense) radical Toryism)' and the Benthamite constructs of Wakefield's own theorizing. Webb argues that was greatly indebted to Bentham and that 'the Wakefield plan of colonization, with its over-simplified view of human nature and of society, and its assumption that human actions and social tendencies can be regulated by the application of a few psychological stimuli, is unmistakably Benthamite' (Webb, in Hight and Straubel (eds.), 1957, p. 142). Whether or not Bentham was indebted to Wakefield or vice versa is not crucial to our analysis. What is most important is the fact that they both shared similar utopian goals for the creation of South Australia.

to our analysis is the quotation Pike uses from Bentham's manuscript, in which Bentham wrote that South Australia 'should be called Felicia or Felicitania or, best of all, Liberia – "a single word which spoke volumes"' (Pike, 1957, p. 57). As we shall see, such utopian aspirations have been noted by other scholars of both South Australian and New Zealand history, but more widely have been ignored by scholars of Western utopian literature.

J.S. Mill was also 'a devoted supporter of [Wakefield's] colonial theories' (Temple, 2002, p. 131) and argued that Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization was crucial to both the successful resolution of Britain's domestic problems, and for the creation of exemplary colonial societies. As Duncan Bell argues, Mill was 'an early convert' to Wakefield's colonization theories and during the 1830s Mill 'proselytized on behalf of state-sponsored "systematic colonization"' (Bell, 2010, p. 37). Mill was a member of the South Australian Association, founded in 1834, and openly supported the schemes of Wakefield and the colonial reform movement.[11] Direct evidence of Mill's support for Wakefield's plans to colonize South Australia can be found in a review Mill wrote of Wakefield's promotional tract *The New British Province of South Australia* (1834).[12] Mill wrote that 'we conclude by most strongly recommending this little tract to the perusal of all who are interested, either as citizens, in the means of relieving the industry of their country from the evils of an over-crowded society, or as individuals, in withdrawing themselves personally from those evils' (Mill, 1834 (1986), p. 742). Thus even though Wakefield's ideas might have made 'limited inroads on the [broader field of] economic theory' (Kittrell, 1973, p. 87) during the 1830s and 1840s, his works are nonetheless worthy of attention since they elicited extensive levels of support (and condemnation, in the case of Marx) from

---

[11] Although he was an advocate of British imperial expansion for the majority of his career as an author and political theorist, it is important to note that, later in his life, Mill's support for the moral and political legitimacy of the British Empire waned. In Katherine Smits's estimation, 'in the 1830s and 40s Mill was an enthusiastic advocate of colonization schemes for South Australia and New Zealand', yet 'his correspondence during the 1860s suggests that Mill feared that settler violence compromised the progressive promise of imperialism, and challenged the utilitarian benefits of self-rule' (Smits, 2008, p. 3). Duncan Bell has argued that Mill's views on imperialism consisted of three readily identifiable stages. According to Bell, Mill's writings on colonization demonstrate 'a movement from the particular to the universal, from arguments justifying colonization primarily in terms of the benefits that it generated for the British state (and especially the working classes) to arguments that stressed the value of colonization (and especially British colonization) for the world as a whole' (Bell, 2010, p. 36). Bell argues that the third and final stage of Mill's views on imperial expansion can be characterized as a period of 'melancholic colonialism', a position that was 'was marked by anxiety, even despondency, about the direction of [colonial] history, but it ultimately refused to reject the ideal, suggesting that the worst excesses could be mitigated, if not eradicated entirely' (Bell, 2010, p. 37).

[12] Mill's review was originally published in *The Examiner* newspaper on the 20th July, 1834.

some of the most influential intellectual figures in nineteenth century Western political thought.

Criticism of Wakefield's life and works from sources not contemporaneous with him begins in 1898 with Richard Garnett's biographical account of Wakefield's role in the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand.[13] Wakefield's early biographers and commentators are generally supportive of his role in the expansion of the British empire and present a romanticized view of his career as a colonial reformer. According to such accounts, Wakefield was 'a builder of the Empire, even a master-builder' (Garnett, 1898, p. xix); a 'dreamer of dreams, founder of colonies and builder of Britain beyond the seas' (O'Connor, 1928, p. 17). As late as 1961 Paul Bloomfield argued that Wakefield was a 'strange, far-sighted man of enormous mental and physical energies … the founder of an Empire and the builder of the Commonwealth' (Bloomfield, 1961, p. x). Indeed R.C. Mills claimed that Wakefield 'created not thought only, but, like an old Greek philosopher, a school of thinkers and statesmen' (Mills, 1915, p. xvii). Mills went so far as to argue that 'Wakefield had not only one of the most original, but one of the most elastic and teachable intellects of his time, and there are few political inventors to whom historians would ascribe so large a measure of practical success' (Mills, 1915, p. xviii). In a similar vein, A. J. Harrop questioned whether there was 'any statesman of the nineteenth century who may reasonably be said to have performed greater services for the British Empire in all its branches than Edward Gibbon Wakefield' (Harrop, 1928, p. 206). In her discussion of Wakefield's involvement in Canadian colonial politics between 1839 and 1842, Ursilla Macdonnell argued that whilst 'it is impossible to make a hero of Wakefield … he [nonetheless] had one of the greatest political minds of his time … was credited by many people with actual authorship of the [Durham] Report[14] … [and had]

---

[13] Garnett's work is entitled *Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Colonization of South Australia and New Zealand.*

[14] Niall Ferguson has argued that the Durham report, co-authored by Wakefield, Lord Durham and Charles Buller in 1837 and published in 1839, 'has good claim to be the book that saved the Empire.' According to Ferguson, Wakefield, Buller and Durham argued that 'those who governed the white colonies should be accountable to representative assemblies of the colonists, and not simply to the agents of a distant royal authority' (Ferguson, 2003, pp.112-113). In Ferguson's estimation the Durham report defused the potentially revolutionary situation in Upper and Lower Canada and influenced the British government to change its attitude towards colonial self government. Cain and Hopkins have similarly argued that 'the great catalyst for change' in the British government's views towards colonial self government was the 'Canadian rebellion of 1837-8, which inspired the famous Durham Report of 1840.' However, Cain and Hopkins do not attribute the Durham report with as much responsibility for

founded the flourishing colonies of South Australia and New Zealand' (Macdonnell, 1925, p. 23).[15]

From the 1960s onwards certain scholars began to disagree with such accounts of Wakefield's role in the colonial histories of South Australia and New Zealand. Numerous critiques of Wakefield's intellectual originality have been published, along with criticism of his moral culpability in the history of the dispossession of indigenous populations in South Australia and New Zealand. For example, Peter Burroughs argued that Richard Garnett's 1898 biography of Wakefield contained 'exaggeration so typical of Wakefield's biographers' that it presented an almost completely inaccurate representation of Wakefield's career as a politician in New Zealand (Burroughs, 1973, p. xxvii). Other scholars have argued that Wakefield was an unoriginal political thinker and, because of the impact the 'Turner incident' had upon his public standing, have suggested that he was unable to exert significant influence during his lifetime. Keith Sinclair, for example, argued that because Wakefield was 'not a profound thinker, and [was] unable to act as a public figure, he became a great publicist, with a genius for talking people into doing for him what he was debarred from doing himself' (Sinclair, 1961, p. 47). Ged Martin similarly contended that Wakefield 'failed to establish influence over most of the major British politicians of the era' (Martin, in Friends of the Turnbull Library, 1997, p. 37). Some commentators have also argued that Wakefield's role in the colonization of New Zealand caused the indigenous population of New Zealand to lose 'their lands, their laws, their language, their livelihood, their very reason for being' (Ngatata Love, in Friends of the Turnbull Library, 1997, p. 5). Such views represent the most critical appraisals of Wakefield's life and works. [16]

---

mitigating colonial revolution as Ferguson. They argue that 'Durham proposed only a very limited form of local control: in his plan, Britain would have retained the final say not only in foreign affairs but also in the disposal of colonial lands and in tariff policy, both of which local politicians were eager to control. Had Durham's views prevailed, the colonies could have expected little more than what Wakefield termed "municipal self-government", and tension between London and the periphery would have grown more acute' (Cain and Hopkins, 1993, pp. 235-236).

[15] Wakefield's influence upon advocates of British imperial expansion can be found in works published as late as 1916, when Wyatt Tilby wrote an article in the *Edinburgh Review* arguing that systematic colonization based upon Wakefield's colonial theorizing should be reinstated as official British emigration policy. For further information see Tilby, Wyatt A., 'Systematic Colonization', *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 223, April 1916, p. 456.

[16] The amount of scholarly literature that has addressed the impact of European imperial expansion on indigenous populations around the world is substantial. Marc Ferro has argued that during their efforts to expand their respective colonial empires, Wakefield, along with other figures involved in European imperial expansion in the nineteenth century such as Thomas Robert Bugeaud and Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza, 'planted their flag precisely in the name of human rights, of equality, of the Habeas Corpus and

Recently, scholars such as Duncan Bell have sought to neither condemn, nor exaggerate, the details of Wakefield's career as a colonial reformer and political economist. For Bell, Wakefield was 'a rogue political economist who exerted a profound influence over mid-nineteenth-century colonial discourse' (Bell, 2010, p. 38). D.K. Fieldhouse has similarly argued for a more balanced approach to Wakefield's contribution to British imperial history:

> Surely the fact that Karl Marx devoted the whole of Chapter 33 in Volume I of *Capital* to Wakefield, and that many other contemporaries took his theories seriously, suggests that, whatever their practical limitations, they represented a significant theoretical contribution to the debate over the relevance of colonization to the development of European capitalism. (Fieldhouse, 1999, p. 476)

Such accounts show us that there have been significant changes in the critical reception Wakefield's works have received over time. These changes demonstrate that even though Wakefield's works and ideas are well documented and feature prominently within the historical literature of British colonial development in the early to mid nineteenth century, his works can still provide engaging and challenging questions to modern scholars.

Changing views towards emigration

Wakefield's promotion of large scale British emigration and colonial expansion occurred in the context of a wider shift in British political attitudes towards emigration and the concept of a British settler empire. His views on emigration and colonization evolved as a response to the perceived need for a large scale and

---

of liberty, without necessarily realising that they were violating the very principles of their actions' (Ferro, 1994, p. 79). In relation to the European colonization of Australia Norbert Finzsch has argued that 'white/indigenous interaction and subsequent white settlement are virtually simultaneous with processes of invasion and displacement of indigenous populations' (Finzsch, 2005, p. 99). Such assessments of the impacts of European imperial expansion on indigenous populations are clearly important to our understanding of the colonial histories of South Australia and New Zealand, but it is not the intention of this thesis to reinterpret the scholarly literature that addresses this particular subject. For further examination of the intellectual history and legacy of European settlement, colonization and postcolonialism in Australia and New Zealand, see Banivanua Mar and Edmonds (eds.), *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke; New York, 2010; Keown, Michelle, *Pacific Islands writing: the postcolonial literatures of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Oceania,* Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2007; Nacci, Dominique, *Australian anti-colonialism*, Playground: Canberra, 2002; O'Donoghue, Lowitja, *Australian postcolonial dilemmas*, Institute of Postcolonial Studies: North Melbourne, 2002.

permanent resolution to the problems Britain faced from urban overcrowding, unemployment and potentially revolutionary unrest. As J.M. Main has argued 'the increasing interest in emigration from Britain to overseas colonies stemmed from concern at the startling growth in the population of the British Isles, from what seemed the inevitable and increasing impoverishment of the people, and the rapid increase, in England and Wales, of the poor rates' (Main, in Jaensch (ed.), 1986, pp. 1-2). Wakefield's promotion of emigration as a means to solve the potentially revolutionary problems that overpopulation posed for Britain in the 1820s was but one component of a larger pro-emigration discourse that lasted for a significant portion of the nineteenth century. As Eric Richards argues, 'advocates from Wilmot Horton through to Bentham, Wakefield to Cecil Rhodes and Milner to many of the later philanthropists believed passionately that emigration would solve pauperism in the home country' (Richards, 2004, p. 290).

The problems Britain was facing in the early nineteenth century from its growing number of urban and rural poor were considered urgent and there were extensive debates surrounding the necessity and efficacy of emigration as a possible solution. As Richards notes, 'the political and economic debate over British emigration in the 1820s and 1830s revolved about the question of evacuating the poor and disorderly from British society at a time of great turmoil' (Richards, 1993, p. 255). James Belich also contends that there was a 'tidal shift in mass attitudes to [British] emigration [from 1815 onwards] that cannot be attributed to one or two particular writers.' According to Belich, the 'revolution in colonial thought' that is normally attributed to Wakefield and the beginning of his colonial career in 1830 'actually dated from 1815.' Belich argues that 'Wakefield was riding the wave of public opinion, not creating it' and he suggests that 'in 1815-20, there was a surge in British emigration corresponding with the first Anglo booms in Canada and the American West. This escapes the attention of historians because it was modest relative to later flows and because of the paucity of statistics before 1820' (Belich, 2009, pp. 147-148). Whether or not Wakefield was solely responsible for such a 'revolution in colonial thought' is not overly significant to the argument of this thesis. Robert D. Grant observed that Wakefield's 'ideas were consonant with a wider re-appraisal of emigration and colonization [in Britain], which have been seen by some modern writers as key to a mid nineteenth-century recasting of British imperialist

theory away from simple profit and resource-extraction towards relationships of more mutual benefit between imperium and colony' (Grant, 2005, p. 48). It is therefore not surprising that Wakefield was responding to the social and economic crises of his times, and as will be documented in this thesis, Wakefield's work on systematic colonization was an important component of the history of British emigration and imperial expansion.

Related to the debates surrounding the necessity of emigration to Britain's domestic and imperial fortunes was the issue of colonial self-government. Wakefield believed colonial self-government to be a crucial component of the success of any British colonial experiment:

> ... "local self-government" shall be real and unmistakeable, not a show of it in words, with all sorts of restrictions and outside interferences that would destroy the reality. Nothing but the real thing will be accepted …with the real thing as to government, we shall be able to do wonders in colonization; without it, nothing. The granting of a real unadulterated Penn or Baltimore Charter would greatly strike the public imagination and make even Lord Grey popular.[17] (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of May 1849, p. 53)

How the colonies Wakefield sought to create would function as component parts of the British Empire was a crucial question for Wakefield's speculation as well as for government policy. Clearly, in light of Britain's experience in North America as well as in the subsequent convict colonies in Australia, the question of colonial self-government was a vexed and complicated one. Wakefield paints an image of himself and his fellow colonial promoters as being pitted against an indifferent and obstreperous British Colonial Office bent on stifling and altering their plans.[18]

---

[17] Details of the governmental charter Wakefield sought for Canterbury included 'Powers of local government truly resembling in extent and completeness those given by the charters of Penn and Baltimore … Responsibility of the Executive to a Representative Legislature, to be secured … All imperial subjects – such as foreign relations, relations with other colonies, trade with the mother-country – to be excluded from interference by the local government … Full regulations for guarding the interests of the mother-country with respect to waste lands and emigration … Separation of the Settlement from the New Zealand Company, provided the conditions be such as fully satisfy the Company … All expense of colonization and government, excepting only defence from foreign aggression, to be borne by the colony; and imperial troops, if ever required by the Colony for local purposes, to be paid for by the Colony, as now by India' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of May 1849, pp. 54-55).

[18] Some scholars have suggested that Wakefield and the colonial reform movement as a whole greatly exaggerated the Colonial Office's reluctance to support their schemes. As Jenny Booth has argued, 'Wakefield and his supporters … asserted that South Australia was established only after a continuing battle with an intransigent Colonial Office which, they insisted, "requires reform more than any other department of Government."' Booth argues that Wakefield's belief that the Colonial Office was

According to Wakefield the British Colonial Office was 'one of the most conservative bodies in the kingdom, whose object, *inter alia*, is to prevent this Colony [in this instance, Canterbury] from becoming a democratic republic, which is what our present system is preparing every one of our larger colonies to be' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of May 1849, p. 60).

Wakefield argued that the existent Australian colonies were opposed to receiving governmental and constitutional instruction from London. In a letter to the other dominant figure involved in the colonization of the Canterbury colony in New Zealand, John Robert Godley, Wakefield writes that 'you see with what indignation and scorn the Australians receive plans of constitutions drawn up here by people who cannot know their wants and inclinations'(Wakefield, 1868, letter of June 1849, p. 64). Wakefield used such opposition to demonstrate why Canterbury, and British settler colonies in general, should be allowed self-government. The extent to which this question was a contentious one is indicated when he writes that 'the new plan is a monster on the face of it – a most effectual provision for hot water or constituted anarchy for some years, to end in making these colonies democratic republics' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of June 1849, p. 64). Wakefield did not, however, look to establish the colonies of South Australia[19] and New Zealand as completely self-governing entities outside the aegis of British imperialism. As Pike points out, 'Wakefield had no desire for colonial independence, though he argued that the denial of self-government was the surest way to force colonies into revolt and separation'

---

opposed to the expansion of the British Empire was overblown. In her estimation, 'from the viewpoint of the government it appears that the strategic and economic advantages inherent in the establishment of a free settlement in Australia were sufficiently attractive to offset the difficulties' (Booth, 2004, pp. 157-158).

[19] Speculating on the form of government South Australia should possess, Wakefield conceded that 'it is impossible to conjecture with precision' what the constitution of South Australia's own government would ultimately contain after it had been colonized, but he nonetheless argued that 'we may presume that, in form, it will resemble the British constitution; and that, in substance, it will enable the colonists to legislate for themselves on all questions of a local description' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 133). In his plans for self government in South Australia, Wakefield argued that 'when the colonial population shall amount to 50,000 souls, and when the colony shall undertake to pay off the debt charged on its revenue, and to defray the whole cost of its local government in future, then his Majesty's subjects in the province of South Australia are to receive a constitution of local government' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 133). In the South Australian Act of 1834, which led to the actual colonization of South Australia in 1836, 'the United Kingdom government's powers remained paramount.' As Dickey and Howell inform us, in South Australia 'the Crown would retain its ancient right of vetoing any colonial ordinance it considered contrary to Imperial interests .... [A]uthority was divided between a governor answering to the Colonial Office and a resident commissioner responsible to a board of Commissioners' (Dickey and Howell, 1986, p. 8).

(Pike, 1957, p. 81).[20] Whilst details of the arguments that occurred between colonial promoters like Wakefield and the British government on the subject of colonial self government are important in understanding the practical details of Wakefield's plans for British imperial expansion, and for our understanding of the broader history of British imperialism, this thesis does not conduct an extensive analysis of such questions. The changing views of the British government towards its empire have been addressed at length by scholars such as Ward (1976) and Pitts (2005). However, one area of scholarly analysis that is crucial to our understanding of Wakefield's thought is to be found in discussions surrounding his role in developing and promoting the theory of 'systematic colonization,' an elaborate plan for large scale British emigration and colonial expansion.

The theory of systematic colonization

As noted above, Wakefield was not alone in promoting emigration and colonial expansion as an effective solution for Britain's domestic problems. However his advocacy of 'systematic colonization' as the ideal means to solve Britain's domestic and colonial problems was notable for both the vigour with which he promoted its usage, and for his synthesis of previously enumerated emigration theories into a coherent (if potentially unworkable in practice) theory of emigration. The underlying principles of systematic colonization are simple. Land was to be sold to British capitalists at a 'sufficient price' and the proceeds from these land sales were to be used to establish the preliminary infrastructure of the colony and subsidise the transport of labourers to the colonies. Whilst capitalists were in some instances themselves to be emigrants to the colony, absentee proprietorship was countenanced in Wakefield's schemes.[21]

Once the labourers reached the colonies, the price of land was to be kept 'sufficiently' high so that labourers could only afford to buy land after several years

---

[20] A practical example of the way in which Wakefield envisaged the government of the colonies to function is to be found in his discussion of Canterbury's charter for self government, where he argued that 'the settlers should make all laws and carry on all government, save only laws and government relating to imperial subjects, which subject should be strictly defined by the charter' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of May 1849, p. 51). Wakefield described the form of self government that he sought to obtain for Canterbury in broad outline: 'the colonists would be authorised to establish aristocratic and monarchical institutions – subordinate, indeed, as respects imperial allegiance, but effective on the spot as institutions similar to our own at home' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), p. 60).

[21] In the land sales that preceded the colonization of Wellington in New Zealand, for example, 'the bulk of the land-orders were sold to absentee speculators who expected to make a large profit by selling their sections when the population increased, or draw an income from them through agents who would let them to later arrivals in the settlement' (Turnbull, 1959, p. 13).

of employment and personal saving.[22] Eventually the initial labourers would become capitalists themselves, enabling them to buy their own land. A proportion of the proceeds from the labourers' purchase of land would then be used to bring more labourers out from Britain and to replenish the supply of labour in the colony. Again crucially, the colonial authorities would ensure that the amounts of capital and labour in the colonies would be maintained in proportion to one another.

Considerable scholarly attention has been paid to whether or not Wakefield was solely responsible for the creation of this theory of 'systematic colonization.' Douglas Pike, for example, has argued that Wakefield was not actually responsible for the creation of a 'new' theory regarding the nature or 'art' of systematic colonization and that 'the theory of systematic colonization did not spring fully formed from the head of one parent' (Pike, 1957, p. 74). As James Belich also affirms, 'scholars have long pointed out that Wakefield had his precursors, notably Robert Wilmot Horton, parliamentary under-secretary of state for the colonies, 1822-8' (Belich, 2009, pp. 146-147).

In the literature that discusses the other authors involved in the development of the theory of systematic colonization, the most prominent figures are Robert Gourlay,[23] Robert Wilmot-Horton,[24] and certain figures directly involved in the

---

[22] One of the main reasons Wakefield's theories did not receive either instantaneous or widespread support initially was the simple fact that he never enumerated one, overarching 'sufficient price' for the sale of colonial land. Wakefield never specified a precise figure for the sufficient price of land because in his view 'there is no price that would be suitable for the colonies generally: the price must needs vary according to peculiar natural and other circumstances in each colony' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), pp. 346-347). As James Collier also points out, 'Wakefield always refused to name the amount that he would consider a sufficient price, because it necessarily varied from colony to colony' (Collier, 1914, pp. xi-xii). This refusal led to accusations that Wakefield's theory was both economically inconsistent and impractical, even though Wakefield himself does seem to have made it clear that the calculation of the 'sufficient price' was contingent on the circumstances in which it was to be utilized.

[23] Robert Gourlay (1778-1863) was a Scottish reformer whose schemes for the colonization of Canada closely resembled Wakefield's plans for South Australia and New Zealand. His most notable work on the subject of colonization and British emigration is *A Statistical Account of Upper Canada* (1822). For Gourlay's biographical details see Milani, Lois Darroch, *Robert Gourlay, gadfly; the biography of Robert (Fleming) Gourlay, 1778-1863, forerunner of the rebellion in upper Canada, 1837*, Ampersand Press: Thornhill, Ontario, 1971.

[24] Robert Wilmot-Horton (1784-1841) was British under secretary for war and colonies from 1821 to 1828. For discussion of Wilmot Horton's life and works see Jones, E. G., 'Sir R. J. Wilmot Horton, bart., politician and pamphleteer', Masters thesis, Bristol University, 1936; Johnston, H. J. M., *British emigration policy, 1815–30: 'shovelling out paupers'*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972; Winch, Donald, *Classical Political Economy and Colonies*, Bell: London, 1965; Ghosh, R. N., 'Malthus on emigration and colonization: letters to Wilmot Horton', *Economica*, vol. 30, 1963, pp. 45–61; Poynter, J. R., *Society and pauperism: English ideas on poor relief, 1795-1834*, Melbourne University Press: Carlton, Victoria, 1969; Pike, Douglas, 'Wilmot Horton and the National Colonization Society', *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 7, 1955-7, pp. 205-10.

colonization of South Australia, such as Robert Torrens.[25] Gourlay, Wilmot-Horton and Torrens all advocated schemes of mass emigration, and all of their plans predated Wakefield's. Robert Gourlay, for example, 'in *A Statistical Account of Upper Canada* (1822), suggested that waste land in colonies should be sold and not given away and the proceeds devoted to assist immigration' (Prichard, 1968, p. 14). In Gourlay's plan, the British government would regulate the sale of colonial land to fund the emigration of paupers to its colonies. As Robert Grant points out, Gourlay was opposed to absentee landowners controlling the regulation of colonial land sales, and he argued that 'land in any new country could have little value … until it was private property and occupied by its owner' (Grant, 2005, p. 51). Gourlay, like Wakefield, displayed utopian ambitions for his plans to induce emigration to Canada. He sought to commence 'a work worthy of the greatest nation on earth – worthy of an age bursting forth into light, and literature, and liberty' (Gourlay, 1822, p. iv). Gourlay was looking to not only provide Britain with relief from its excessive number of 'poor inhabitants' but also to improve the government of Upper Canada itself, whilst simultaneously adding to the strength and wealth of the British Empire. Gourlay believed that a systematic plan of emigration was needed in order to effectively and permanently alter the ways in which Upper Canada was administered: 'emigration is one way by which distress may be mitigated; but a specific plan is wanted for rendering it practicable on a great scale, which will not put the country to expense. My plan is to accomplish this even with a *profit* to the country' (Gourlay, 1822, p. xlix, emphasis in original).

Wilmot-Horton is best known for his advocacy of pauper emigration. His schemes were a precursor to Wakefield's schemes, but they differed from Wakefield's plans in regard to their economic basis and the different views each author took on the social composition of Britain's colonies.[26] Whilst Wakefield supported Horton's plan

---

[25]Robert Torrens (1780-1864) was a central figure in the planning and implementation of the colonization of South Australia. Torrens was a prolific political economist and his influence and importance in the creation of South Australia is recognized by numerous scholars. For discussion of Torrens's life and works see Hutchinson, T.W., 'Robert Torrens and Classical Economics', *The Economic History Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1958, pp. 316-321; Robbins, Lionel, *Robert Torrens and the Evolution of Classical Economics*, Macmillan: London, 1958; Meenai, S.A., 'Robert Torrens - 1780-1864', *Economica*, New Series, Vol. 23, No. 89 (Feb.), 1956, pp. 49-61. For further reading see Torrens, Robert, *Collected works of Robert Torrens*, edited by Vivo, Giancarlo. 8 volumes, Thoemmes: Bristol, 2000.

[26] As Patricia Burns informs us, 'in 1823 a plan of colonization, drawn up by Wilmot-Horton, had been published in the *Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Employment of the Poor in*

for its focus on the role of system and order in British schemes of colonization, he nonetheless 'disapproved of state assistance and strongly rejected the idea that a pauper could become a leaser of property' (Burns, 1989, p. 26). Horton's schemes were rejected by Wakefield as simplistic and coarse since, according to Wakefield, they were simply intended to relocate paupers from one troubled location to another. Colonies founded in such ways could not meet Wakefield's idealistic expectations since 'he believed in the British class structure, and did not think that paupers would make either the best emigrants or good landowners' (Burns, 1989, p. 26). Belich has also argued that, whilst Wilmot-Horton reduced 'British restrictions on emigration' and was instrumental in increasing the public popularity of British emigration in the 1830s and 1840s, Wakefield's ideas were nonetheless distinct from Horton's: 'Wakefield maintained that Horton hampered emigration by continuing its damaging association with pauperism' (Belich, 2009, pp. 146-147).

Robert Torrens's role in the development of the theory of systematic colonization has also received scholarly notice. As Kittrell points out, 'Torrens, among others, had advocated land sales prior to Wakefield' (Kittrell, 1973, p. 89). Torrens was actively involved in promoting a form of systematic colonization and, according to T.W. Hutchinson, 'in the [eighteen] thirties and forties [Torrens] had been second only to Wakefield in advancing the political cause and theoretical rationale of colonization' (Hutchinson, 1958, p. 316). Lionel Robbins has similarly argued that whilst Torrens's career as a colonial promoter 'must take second place to Gibbon Wakefield', it is important for us to note that 'Torrens' activities in this field antedate Gibbon Wakefield's' (Robbins, 1958, p. 144). Booth also contends that 'in 1827 Colonel Robert Torrens pointed out in a speech on a motion to reinstate the House of Commons Select Committee into Emigration that:

> a well regulated system of colonization would ... apply the redundant labour and capital of the United Kingdom to the redundant land of the colonies; it would restore the proportions on which prosperity and happiness depend ... the productivity of labour in the new countries would be able in a very short period

---

Ireland' (Burns, 1989, p. 25). Horton argued that the Poor Rates should be 'mortgaged to secure loans to pay for the emigration of paupers to one of Britain's colonies' and in both 1823 and 1825 'he persuaded the government to try this scheme' and settle Irish paupers in 'waste land' in Canada. According to Burns these two schemes of Horton's were successful and demonstrated that 'state-assisted emigration could work – as long as the planning and execution were systematic and practical' (Burns, 1989, p. 25). J.M. Main has argued that Horton's schemes were not continued because he could not 'could solve the difficulty of devising a plan for "a permanent and continuous system of emigration"' (Main, in Jaensch (ed.), 1986, p. 2).

to replace, with a surplus, the capital advanced for transportation.[27]

Torrens's primary aim in this speech was to convince the British government of the economic benefits of large scale emigration to Australia. The scheme he proposed in 1827 was different to Wakefield's, however, since he was advocating the large scale, government sponsored emigration of poor labourers.

> …those persons who cannot obtain employment at home, and who are desirous of bettering their condition by removing to the colonies, shall have a free passage found them; shall have lands granted to them; shall have houses built for them; and shall be supplied with agricultural implements, with seed, with stock, and with provisions and clothing for the first year' (Torrens, 1827 (1962) p. 38).

Torrens does discuss the possibility of the British government selling land in its colonies, suggesting that 'under proper management, the sale of crown lands in the colonies might be made a considerable source of revenue' (Torrens, 1827 (1962), p. 52). As Booth points out, Torrens 'appears to be arguing here in favour of the establishment of new colonies rather than the removal of emigrants to existing settlements and his view predates Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization' (Booth, 2004, p. 78). However, whilst Torrens's advocacy of a form of systematic colonization predated Wakefield's own theory, a scholarly consensus remains that Wakefield's writings represent the strongest and most influential synthesis of all of the literature that dealt with the subject of large scale, systematic British emigration in the 1820s and 1830s. Robbins, for example, argues that whilst Torrens's discussion of 'a "well-regulated system" of emigration … may have provided some justification for believing that his work in this field was entitled to be regarded as anticipating the systematic colonization movement of the thirties … in the main Charles Buller's description of the emigration agitation of the twenties and earlier as a series of schemes for "shovelling out … paupers" was not unjustified' (Robbins, 1958, pp. 153-54).[28]

Wakefield's work is, at the very least, noteworthy because it represented both a synthesis and an extension of the earlier efforts of Gourlay, Wilmot-Horton and

---

[27] Torrens, *Hansard*, new series, vol.16, 15 February 1827, p. 493, quoted in Booth, 2004, p. 78.
[28] Buller, *Speech of Charles Buller, Esq., on Systematic Colonization*, reprinted as appendix to Wakefield, *The Art of Colonization*, 1849, pp. 457-500, quoted in Robbins, 1958, pp. 153-54.

Torrens. R.C. Mills, for example, asserted that 'of the chief factors of the Wakefield theory … not one was new; Wakefield's claim to originality rests upon the fact that he combined them into a unified theory and impressed them with the stamp of his powerful mind' (Mills, 1914, p. xi). Some scholars have suggested that Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization *was* historically unique and that it served as an influential catalyst for the expansion of the British colonial empire in the 1830s and 1840s. Eric Richards has argued that there was 'no precise precursor to Wakefield's brilliantly simple solution of using colonial land sales revenue to pay directly the costs of a colonial passage' (Richards, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.) 1997, p. 96). Richards noted that, prior to the gold rush of the 1850s, 'the Wakefieldian emigrations … [provided] the vital spark to populate the antipodes' (Richards, 1997, p. 101). Booth has similarly suggested that 'until Edward Gibbon Wakefield suggested a nexus between payment for land and the provision of assisted passages, the British government had no formula to bring about a sizeable increase in the Australian population' (Booth, 2004, p. 162). In Duncan Bell's estimation, Wakefield was 'at the heart' of the British 'reorientation' towards colonies as being 'sites of economic productivity, social amelioration, and civilizational potential' (Bell, 2010, p. 38). These studies add weight to the views of Buckley and Wheelwright, who argued in favour of the originality of Wakefield's theory, noting that in the 1830s:

> The price of [colonial] land was deliberately kept high enough to prevent small holding and subsistence farming, on the advice of the prominent British theoretician of colonial capitalism, E. G. Wakefield … the adoption of this policy is probably unique in the history of colonial capitalism, as was the extent and rate of privatisation of the land' (Buckley and Wheelwright, 1988, pp. 3-4).

Some scholars, such as Peter Burroughs, have even suggested that 'the whole topic of colonization is dominated in the second quarter of the nineteenth century by the views and activities of Edward Gibbon Wakefield' (Burroughs, 1973, p. v). Such a view is supported by Edward Beasley's claim that in the 1830s and 1840s the British government had 'imposed [Wakefield's plans] upon many of the newer colonies of settlement' and that during this period of imperial expansion Wakefield's plans 'were the land policy of the British Empire' (Beasley, 2005, p. 8). Marjory Harper summarises Wakefield's role in the development of systematic colonization as follows:

Edward Gibbon Wakefield, leading advocate of the new policy [of systematic colonization], vehemently opposed "shovelling out the paupers", and the National Colonization Society, founded in 1830 to promote his views, devised a scheme whereby revenue from land sales in the Antipodean colonies would be used by those colonies to finance the passage of eligible settlers. For three decades Wakefield's theories influenced official attitudes towards Empire settlement without compromising the State's non-interventionist stance on emigration. (Harper, in Porter (ed.), 2004, p. 76)

There is a clear interpretative consensus for the significance of Wakefield's role in the development of the theory of systematic colonization. Indeed, even if 'Wakefield's contributions to the subject of systematic colonization were [only] a synoptic vision and an adroit publicity' (Pike, 1957, p. 77), his writings can still be regarded as a historically significant, and prominent, example of colonial theory.

Approach and scope

Before we begin our analysis proper, it is necessary to clarify and establish the approach and scope of this work. This thesis conducts a comparative analysis of the utopian qualities of Wakefield's colonial promotional publications in relation to the established primary and secondary literature of early nineteenth century Western utopian thought. As such, this thesis does not address the specific details of the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand, the colonial projects Wakefield is most prominently associated with in historical literature. Scholars have researched many aspects of the history of South Australia and New Zealand and have examined their specific colonial histories, the history of indigenous and European relations in each colony,[29] and the role that these colonies assume in the broader history of the British Empire.[30] It is beyond the scope of this thesis to address every aspect of the

---

[29] For analysis of the history of European and indigenous relations in early South Australian history see Foster, Robert, Hosking, Rick and Nettlebeck, Amanda, *Fatal Collisions: the South Australian Frontier and the Violence of Memory*, Wakefield Press: Kent Town, South Australia, 2001; Foster, Robert, 'An Imaginary Dominion: the Representation and Treatment of Aborigines in South Australia, 1834-1911', Ph.D Thesis, University of Adelaide, Department of History, 1994. For similar analysis of the history of the interaction between indigenous Maoris and Europeans in New Zealand both prior to and after British colonization see Belich, James, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 1996 (2001), pp. 117-204; Salmond, Anne, *Between worlds : early exchanges between Maori and Europeans, 1773-1815*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 1997; Moon, Paul, *Fatal Frontiers: A New History of New Zealand in the Decade before the Treaty*, Penguin: Auckland, 2006; and Adams, Peter, *Fatal Necessity: British Intervention in New Zealand 1830-1847*, Auckland University Press; Oxford University Press: Auckland, 1977.

[30] Alan Lester, for example, has discussed the role that settler colonies such as New Zealand and South Africa played in 'invent[ing] and populariz[ing]a new conception of trans-imperial' British identity in the mid to late nineteenth century. According to Lester, the political and social discourse of settler

generally accepted scholarly histories of these colonies, but the details of such historical literature will be addressed when necessary.

Our analysis of Wakefield's utopian ideas is conducted through a close reading of the major publications he wrote on the subject of British colonial expansion. The publications most relevant to this study are Wakefield's three book length texts, *A Letter from Sydney* (1829), *England & America* (1833), and *A View of the Art of Colonization* (1849), along with his proposals for the colonization of South Australia (1834) and New Zealand (1837). A series of letters that Wakefield wrote regarding the colonization of the Canterbury settlement in New Zealand (1868) also inform our analysis.[31]

Most of Wakefield's writing is concerned with economic reform and policies concerning the expansion of the British settler empire, both formally through the creation of settler colonies, and informally through the expansion of trade and international commercial development. However it is important to distinguish *A Letter from Sydney* and *A View of the Art of Colonization* as works of political imagination, at least partially fictional. Ged Martin, for example, has argued that both of these texts were in fact 'written as fiction' (Martin, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), 1997, p. 32). Even though his fictional speculation undoubtedly envisaged practical, commercial ends, Wakefield was an author motivated by romantic visions of an ideal society. Expressions of Wakefield's utopian ideals can be found throughout his works and we will conduct our analysis with reference to the entire corpus of Wakefield's published works.

We will begin our analysis by examining the history of Western utopian thought and establishing the various scholarly interpretations that have been made regarding the form, content and function of Western utopian literature. We will then contextualize Wakefield's writings with an assessment of the major works and ideas of the most prominent utopian authors from the early to mid nineteenth century. This contextualization will be followed by a close reading of Wakefield's works,

---

colonies 'connected with, and helped to inform, shifts in the hegemonic political discourse of Britain' and thus changed conceptions of British identity within both Britain itself, and the broader British Empire. See Lester, Alan, 'British Settler Discourse and the Circuits of Empire', *History Workshop Journal*, No. 54 (Autumn), 2002, pp. 24-48. John Ward also argues that by the 1840s 'the idea of an empire of settlement as the destiny of imperial Britain had certainly captured political and popular notice' (Ward, 1976, p. 233).

[31] It should be noted that this compilation of letters was published after Wakefield's death and that all of the letters contained therein were written between 1847 and 1850. As such, we will reference this work as Wakefield, 1868 (1973). The publication date of each letter will also included.

conducted chronologically from his initial plans to colonize South Australia (beginning in 1829) through to his final efforts in the late 1840s to create the purely Anglican colony of Canterbury in New Zealand. Reference will also be made to the works of other British colonial promoters contemporaneous with Wakefield in order to demonstrate that Wakefield was a prominent exponent of a wider body of literature that shared a utopian view of British colonial expansion.

Chapter Two

Theories and Definitions of Utopia

The utopian elements of Wakefield's colonial theorizing have been discussed by various scholars. Some commentators have claimed that Wakefield was a fundamentally pragmatic political thinker, dedicated only to the practical implementation of his colonial plans (Mills, 1914, p. xi; Olssen, 1997, p. 61). Others argue that Wakefield was essentially a deluded planner of impractical utopian colonial communities whose plans were completely incommensurable with the realities of British imperial expansion (Martin, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), 1997, p. 20). In order to understand the specific ways in which Wakefield can be considered to be a utopian thinker, we must first address the scholarly interpretations of the form, content and political purpose of Western utopian literature.

Western utopian literature: a long tradition

The history of utopian thought in Western literature and politics is extensive and multifarious. Plato's *Republic* is considered to be one of the earliest examples of Western utopian thought, thus establishing Western utopian thought as a tradition that is over 2000 years old. As Joyce Hertzler pointed out, 'there is a common impression that Plato was the first to picture a perfect future of whom we have record in literature, and that his 'Republic' was the first Utopia or ideal commonwealth' (Hertzler, 1922, p. 7) However, as Hertzler also observes, depending on one's definition of what constitutes a utopian text or idea, Plato was not the first author to conceive of an ideal state or polis:

> Among other people and in another literature which antedated that of Greece by several centuries we find numerous expressions by men, who, as social critics and social architects, were the equals if not the peers of Plato. We refer to the Hebrew prophets, men of marked individuality and originality; men of rare ability in appraising their times, in suggesting lines of social reconstruction, and in depicting the perfect future. (Hertzler, 1922, p. 7)

Susan Bruce has also argued that 'Biblical precedents [to Plato] existed in the story of Moses taking his people to the promised land' and that 'another type of model of an ideal world was to be found in the dialogues of the Greek satirist Lucian'

(Bruce, 2008, pp. xi-xii).[32] Biblical visions of a promised land and texts such as Plato's *Republic* can be construed as early examples of Western utopian thinking, but modern conceptions of what constitutes utopian literature begin with Thomas More's invention of the term 'utopia' in 1516.

Thomas More's foundational text *Utopia* (1516) has been the subject of extensive scholarly debate. Attempts to reach a definitive understanding of the meaning and intention of More's text have proved contentious. Many have questioned whether More's text can be reduced to any one, definitive interpretation, given the layers of complexity and contradiction within *Utopia*. For example Bruce has argued that '*Utopia* preserves, even to its last lines, an ambivalence which never resolves' and that 'it would be an ill-informed reader who would propose that *Utopia* is presented as a serious or straightforward representation of a better world' (Bruce, 2008, pp. xxv-xxvi). Krishan Kumar has similarly argued that questions regarding whether 'More seriously [thought] that England – or any other country – could become Utopia' or whether 'Utopia [was] in no way intended as a programmatic statement, but more in the nature of a *jeu d'esprit*' will never have a definitive answer since 'More covered his tracks so cleverly that we shall never know for certain' (Kumar, 1991, p. 2). Despite such arguments over the meaning and essential purpose of More's text, scholars have used the generic and compositional basis of More's work as something of a blueprint for the entire utopian genre, regardless of the myriad varieties and manifestations of utopian literature that have subsequently emerged. James Redmond argues that More's '*Utopia* shares the main characteristics of the genre, whether classical or modern: there is the assumption that human nature would improve enormously under the right circumstances of education and environment, and there is the nostalgic looking back to a period when innocence, sincerity, and guileless integrity had not been lost.' Redmond contends that 'More's image of Christian communism became the most important model for later writers of utopias, although few of his imitators presented their golden worlds with such complex irony' (Redmond, 1970, p. xxvii).

After More, the most prominent utopian texts published prior to the nineteenth century were Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* and Tommaso Campanella's *City of the*

---

[32] The utopian aspects of various ancient communities have been addressed in Schmidt, Brent James, *Utopian communities of the ancient world: idealistic experiments of Pythagoras, the Essenes, Pachomius, and Proclus*, Edwin Mellen Press: Lewiston, NY, 2009.

Sun.[33] Well known utopian authors from the nineteenth century, effectively constituting a modern utopian canon, include Charles Fourier, Henri de Saint Simon, Robert Owen, August Comte, Etienne Cabet, Samuel Butler, Edward Bellamy, and William Morris. In the twentieth century the generic boundaries of utopian literature became increasingly diffuse, with the emergence of dystopian literature and various other genres of utopian thought, including feminist and ecological utopian works.[34] Science fiction is another prominent modern genre of utopian literature and notable utopian science fiction texts include Ursula LeGuin's *The Dispossessed* (1974) and Kim Stanley Robinson's *Mars* trilogy (1992-1996).[35]

The 'utopian' authors whose works constitute the modern conception of a Western utopian tradition rarely considered themselves to be utopians. Their

---

[33] More published *Utopia* in 1516, Campanella published *City of the Sun* in 1623and Bacon published *New Atlantis* in 1624. Many other utopian texts were also published before the nineteenth century, and there were a large number of utopian texts published in France in the eighteenth century. Works such as Louis Sebastian Mercier's *L'An 2440* (1770) are significant texts in the history of utopian thought and their role in the evolution of what scholars now categorise as the Western utopian 'tradition' is important. Despite this, the genre of utopian literature (along with concepts regarding the practical implementation of utopian ideas) did not undergo significant intellectual progress or development until the nineteenth century. The nineteenth century utopian tradition still draws significant influence from More's seminal work, but the texts and ideas disseminated in this period are not only more numerous than preceding centuries, but differ in several significant ways from the literary form, and the ideas, that More discussed in *Utopia*. Kumar makes the point that despite their own beliefs in the differences between their expressions of utopia and those of older thinkers like Thomas More, nineteenth century utopian authors were members of the intellectual tradition that More started in 1516. For Kumar, whilst the nineteenth century utopians 'became impatient with the traditional utopian form of More' and suggested that 'what was needed were not wishful visions of perfection but scientific accounts of historical development, together with some precise indication of what need to be done to usher in the new order as effectively and painlessly as possible', all of the nineteenth century versions of utopia remained 'in almost every way except in form, as utopian as the old' (Kumar, 1987, p. 48).

[34] Famous examples of dystopian literature include George Orwell's *1984* (1948) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932). Feminist utopias from different eras in the twentieth century include Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* (1915) and Marge Piercy's *Woman on the Edge of Time* (1976). Ernest Callenbach's *Ecotopia: The Notebooks and Reports of William Weston* (1975) is a famous work of ecological utopianism. Other, pre-modern female authors of utopian works include Christine de Pizan, who published her work *The Book of the City of the Ladies* in 1405. Some scholars have argued that the Western utopian tradition has been overly focused upon male authors. Alessa Johns, for example, has conducted a study of eighteenth century utopias that were written by women as a response to what she sees as a bias in the scholarship. For further details see Johns, Alessa, *Women's utopias of the eighteenth century*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana, 2003. Other scholarly works that discuss feminism and utopia include Bartkowski, Frances, *Feminist Utopias*, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, 1989 and Lucy Sargisson's *Contemporary Feminist Utopianism*, Routledge: New York, 1996.

[35] The utopian qualities of science fiction literature have been addressed by numerous commentators. Lewis Mumford, for example, has argued that science fiction is a 'modern form of utopia' that 'relates all ideal possibilities to technological innovations' (Mumford, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 23). Northrop Frye has argued that there are parallels between the systems of social control found in science fiction literature and those of earlier utopian models of order and regimentation: 'the utopias of science fiction are generally controlled by scientists, who course are another form of priestly elite' (Frye, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 35). For an approximate timeline and 'chart [of] the various stages' of science fiction literature as they developed from the late nineteenth century through to the late twentieth century, see Jameson (2007), pp. 93-94.

categorization as 'utopians' has been a retrospective process. J.C. Davis suggests that it has only been in modern, contemporary scholarship that the existence of a Western utopian tradition has been conceptualized. In consequence, 'practitioners [of utopianism have] not always [been] aware of those utopian writers who have preceded them.' As a result, 'until very recently utopians have not seen themselves as transmitting, extending or transforming a tradition of thought.' In Davis's estimation, intellectual traditions such as classical republicanism differ from utopianism because contributors to that tradition have been aware of their historical predecessors (Davis, 1981, pp. 2-3). By contrast, the utopian label has often been regarded as an epithet, as it was to Owen, Fourier, Saint-Simon *et al*, and as it has continued to be in contemporary scholarly commentary as well as public discourse. Perhaps the most important factor in explaining why Owen, Fourier and Saint-Simon *et al* became known as 'utopian socialists' is to be found in Marx and Engels' discussion of those thinkers in *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) and in Engels' pamphlet *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific* (1880). As David Leopold contends, 'it is easy enough to list the individuals that Marx and Engels classify as utopian socialists … Charles Fourier, Robert Owen and Henri de Saint-Simon' (Leopold, 2005, p. 444). David Lovell has also pointed out that 'the terms "utopia" and "utopian" have long been used in predominantly negative or dismissive ways … this is due partly to Karl Marx and his followers, who appropriated the pejorative connotations of these terms to criticize socialist competitors as ineffectual dreamers' (Lovell, 2004, p. 629). [36]

For Davis there is no such thing as a readily quantifiable utopian tradition: 'utopian thought itself is not a tradition … this is because of the nature both of utopian thought and of many of those who practice it. Its practitioners are not always aware of those utopian writers who have preceded them' (Davis, 1981, p. 3). Frank and Fritzie Manuel (1966 and 1979), however, 'write as if there is a utopian tradition' and differ from Davis in their argument that there is a coherent and readily identified tradition of utopian literature. As Sargent points out, 'the Manuels' usage of tradition is accepted by most utopian scholars. It runs from mythic materials such as the Golden Age and the Earthly Paradise through related genres such as the Cockaigne and the Noble Savage into the more formal presentations of utopia such as More's *Utopia* (1516), Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888) and H.G. Wells's *A Modern Utopia*

---

[36] For a concise analysis of the relationship between Marxism and the Western utopian tradition, see Lovell, David, 'Marx's Utopian Legacy', in *The European Legacy*, Vol. 9, No. 5, 2004, pp. 629-640.

(1905)' (Sargent, 1982, p. 684). A significant problem with identifying a utopian text or tradition is that 'the basis of all the works and the scholarship is a pun and a short book (More's *Utopia*) which still elicits widely divergent interpretations' (Sargent, 1982, p. 684). For many scholars 'utopia has come to mean the non-existent good place,' with the more recent distinction of dystopian literature and its variants in novels such as George Orwell's *1984* (1948) and Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) (Sargent, 1982, p. 685).

Sargent disagrees with the definitions of utopia offered by both J.C. Davis and Frank and Fritzie Manuel. According to Sargent the Manuel's 1979 text *Utopian Thought in the Western World* omits many important 'minor works [of utopian literature]' and is intellectually problematic because the Manuels contend that 'a utopia is whatever they want to call a utopia.' Davis's typology of utopia is similarly problematic, according to Sargent, because 'he has defined utopia so narrowly that he must throw out most of the traditions the Manuels discuss.' Sargent contends that Davis's historical focus is flawed since 'he has defined utopia to fit the period which interests him' and that he subsequently 'gets caught in the trap the Manuels avoid; he has to discuss works that don't fit his definition because, even though they violate his definition, he recognizes that they are utopias' (Sargent, 1982, pp. 683-684). In Sargent's view 'for that time [period] his definition is nearly, but not quite, correct, but it fits very few of the many other works from different times and places that are usually labelled utopias whose authors, without any doubt, intended them to be utopias' (Sargent, 1982, p. 683). Sargent clearly favours the multifaceted nature of utopian thought and in a later publication he argues that 'since the social dreaming I call utopianism can take many forms, in doing so I include fiction, non-fiction, and material whose status is unclear' (Sargent, 2001, p. 1).

Dorothy Donnelly has also traced the different ways in which utopia has been interpreted and defined by scholars in the last hundred years. Her assessment covers works written in the early twentieth century by scholars such as Lewis Mumford (1923) and Joyce O. Hertzler (1926), through to authors such as Karl Mannheim (1940), Frank Manuel (1967), Northrop Frye (1967) and, more recently, Timothy Kenyon (1989) and Krishan Kumar (1991). Donnelly suggests that whilst scholarly interpretations of utopia have differed depending on the eras in which they were written, the diverse interpretations provided by these authors are nonetheless all useful

because they show us 'the variety of approaches [that have been] taken in defining utopia' (Donnelly, 1998, p. 7). In her estimation, most scholars have defined utopia 'in clearly contradictory ways' since, in their 'tendency to focus on similarities – in this instance on the fact of the conceptualisation of the "good life" – commentators frequently ignore basic … irreconcilable differences.' Donnelly argues that all utopias 'have in common several basic propositions: they deal with ideas about the possibility of transforming and improving life in this world; they are not founded on supernatural truths; and they are not brought about by revelation or divine intervention' (Donnelly, 1998, p. 7). Donnelly analyzes the conceptions of order that have been discussed in a wide range of sources, from the works of Plato, Egyptian cosmology, Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, Shakespeare and Spenser, through to modern critics such as Rudolf Arnheim, Paul Kuntz and Simone Weil. Her review of this literature suggests that order is a central theme in all utopian literature and that 'a pervasive striving for order seems to be inherent in the human mind' (Donnelly, 1998, p. 11).

Whilst Donnelly is primarily concerned with understanding how the concept of order was understood within classical utopianism, this does not exclude the use of certain aspects of her analysis in this study. For example, she argued that 'the demise of the classical utopia coincides with the decline in the view that order is fixed, stable, and unchanging' (Donnelly, 1998, p. 13) and that conceptions of order started to change radically after the publication of Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* in 1624. Regulation and order are essential markers of most utopian thought and scholars from J.C. Davis to Roland Barthes have claimed that one of the primary hallmarks of utopian thought is an excessive attention to both detail and order. In his discussion of the utopianism of Charles Fourier and the Marquis de Sade, Barthes argues that their work illustrates

> … the same attempt to establish in every detail a human internship sufficient unto itself, the same determination to identify happiness with a completed and organised space, the same eagerness to define beings by their functions and to regulate the entry into play of those functioning classes according to a detailed scenario, the same attention to instituting an economy of the passions, in short, the same "harmony" and the same utopia. (Barthes, 1997, p. 17)

Wakefield's works have not been discussed alongside the works of other utopian authors in part because his works do not exemplify this extreme – one might say obsessive – degree of detail, imaginative play or structural closure. Wakefield's

works are different in terms of their style and generic composition, and they deal with subject matter such as property and social class, treated from perspectives not considered 'utopian' by many scholars. However, as we have seen above the question of what constitutes 'utopian' thought or a 'utopian' text is complicated and multifarious. In some senses it is impossible to offer an encompassing definition of utopia. As Krishan Kumar suggests, 'utopia is a variegated project, the meeting place of many purposes and many disciplines of thought' (Kumar, 1991, p. vii). Nevertheless, within the scholarly literature that documents and analyzes the intellectual trajectory of Western utopian thought, some relatively stable categories have been accepted that focus our conceptual understanding of utopian thought. Scholars have made decisions regarding which texts, written in different historical periods, are deemed to be 'utopian' and have reached a degree of consensus on a Western utopian canon. It is the omission of Wakefield's works from this intellectual history that this thesis addresses.

Generic distinctions

Whilst some scholars readily concede that there is 'a variety which militates against simple identification of utopianism with aspects of class, freedom, the city, degrees of serious or psychological states' (Davis, 1981, p. 371), others have suggested that there are distinguishing characteristics and criteria that define utopian literature as a specific genre of political and literary expression. Although it may be difficult to impose an overall system of classification onto the seemingly limitless varieties of utopian literature, generic classifications provide us with a kind of template for assessing utopian literature systematically and within a coherent intellectual and theoretical framework. For example, Glenn Negley and J. Max Patrick find 'three characteristics which distinguish the utopia from other forms of literature or speculation.'

1. It is fictional.
2. It describes a particular state or community.
3. Its theme is the political structure of that fictional state or community.
   (Negley and Patrick, 1952, p. 3)

In their estimation, the fictional basis of utopian literature is one of its most important generic traits, since 'the use of the fiction of an imagined or mythical state is indeed a characteristic mark of utopian writing.' They argue that the fictional basis

of utopian texts 'eliminates from utopian literature all speculation the form of which indicates that it should properly be designated political philosophy or political theory' (Negley and Patrick, 1952, p. 3).

Davis argues that utopian literature can be divided into approximately five distinct modes of 'ideal society literature.' According to Davis the five 'available modes' of utopian literature are: 'utopia, millennium, arcadia, cockaygne and perfect moral commonwealth' (Davis, 1981, p. 6).[37] Whilst such subdivisions are useful in order to understand the different ways in which utopian thought has been manifested over time, these categories are fluid. As Davis points out: 'in practice … the modes may interlock or overlap in the thought of individuals,' and he uses these five categories as 'no more than heuristic devices' (Davis, 1981, p. 6). The typology that Davis offers helps us to clarify specifically 'utopian thinking' as 'but one type of a form, the ideal society' (Davis, 1981, p. 19). He suggests that, on the one hand, 'all visualisers of ideal societies are concerned to maximise harmony and contentment and to minimise conflict and misery; to produce a perfected society where social cohesion and the common good are not imperilled by individual appetite.' However, Davis

---

[37] The Land of Cockaygne tradition is mostly concerned with satisfying material desires; in the predominantly medieval tales of the bountiful, sexually promiscuous land of Cockaygne 'there were satisfactions enough to satiate the grossest appetite' (Davis, 1981, p. 21). In Arcadian literature, 'nature is generously benevolent rather than hostile to man, but at the same time men's desires, in particular sociological ones, are assumed to be moderate.' Davis argues that 'the arcadian tradition is much more radical than the utopian. It not only rejects … the institutions of an acquisitive society, but it rejects all institutions whatsoever and so highlights the institutional preoccupations of the utopian' (Davis, 1981, p. 24). Northrop Frye has similarly argued that Arcadian thought 'puts an emphasis on the integration of man with his physical environment … The utopia is a city, and it expresses rather the human ascendancy over nature … [whereas] in the pastoral, man is at peace with nature, which implies that he is also at peace with his own nature' (Frye, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 41). According to Davis 'perfect moral commonwealth' literature 'accepted existing social arrangements and political institutions' and sought to make society 'harmonic by the moral reformation of every individual in society, and hence of every class and group' (Davis, 1981, p. 27). Authors of such literature not only believed that 'the emphasis [for social regeneration] was upon duty, loyalty, charity and virtue practised by each individual as a precondition of society's regeneration.' Most importantly, Davis argues that proponents of this literature believed that 'only the new man can produce the new society; or rather, the old society made good' (Davis, 1981, p. 31). Millennial utopian literature focuses 'on the process, the coming of a new dispensation, rather than on the detailed description of the new social order' (Davis, 1981, p. 34). For such authors, the perfect millennial society was to be created by 'God, the literal *deus ex machina*' and thus [this genre] does not have 'the "blueprint" quality of the utopia' (Davis, 1981, p. 34). Krishan Kumar has also argued that the utopian literary form is not only capable of being distinguished from all other forms of political speculation, it is distinct from other kinds of ideal-society literature. However, whilst Kumar does assert that 'utopia is indeed distinct and different from other types of ideal society', he also makes the point that 'we can note what may be thought to be the 'elemental' contribution of the principal varieties of the ideal society to the utopian idea.' In Kumar's view, the utopian genre is not necessarily 'constructed directly out of these elements' of the other genres of ideal-society thought, but it is still infused with 'certain sentiments, images and themes' from these different genres. According to Kumar, the Land of Cockaygne genre 'contributes the element of desire … Paradise and the Golden Age contribute the element of harmony … the millennium contributes the element of hope … [and] the ideal city contributes the element of design' (Kumar, 1991, pp. 17-19).

adopts Herbert Marcuse's terminology of 'material and sociological scarcities' in order to distinguish 'utopias' from other forms of political and ideal society literature. The collective problems that arise from both the actual distribution, along with the perception of the distribution, of material and social satisfactions are the main issues that, in Davis's estimation, utopian texts confront. Davis recognises that 'this "collective problem", a paucity of satisfactions weakly co-ordinated with the desires and aspirations of a community of individuals, is one fundamental cause of conflict and social tension … [therefore] an ideal society must be based on some attitude, implicit or explicit, to the "collective problem" (Davis, 1981, p. 19).

For Davis, utopian authors are more pragmatic than authors whose works are based in the 'millennium, arcadia, cockaygne and perfect moral commonwealth' variants because utopian authors do not 'assume drastic changes in nature or man.' The critical distinction here is that utopian authors accept the fact that the problems within human organisation stem from the inevitability of 'limited satisfactions exposed to unlimited wants.' Thus they seek 'to control the social problems that the collective problem can lead to – crime, instability, poverty, rioting, war, exploitation and vice' (Davis, 1981, p. 37). In this way utopian literature can be distinguished from the other kinds of ideal society literature by one defining characteristic: 'in utopia, it is neither man nor nature that is idealised, but organisation.' Thus, utopian authors look to "solve" the collective problem collectively, that is by the reorganisation of society and its institutions, by education, by laws and by sanctions … [their] prime aim is not happiness, that private mystery, but order, that social necessity' (Davis, 1981, p. 38).

Davis makes the important distinction that utopian authors are united not by common political ambitions or goals but by a common mode of expression: 'utopian writing is not a tradition … rather, it is a mode or type of ideal society, and what utopian writers have in common is not common membership of a tradition but their subjection to a common mode' (Davis, 1981, p. 4). For Davis, 'utopia as outlined here has barely changed in the last four and a half centuries.' Whilst 'details have varied' and 'modes of transport, dress, communications, economic organization, technology, leisure pursuits' have been historically contingent, nonetheless 'the structure by which the deficiencies of man and of nature are contained remains comprised of the same elements – institutional, legal, educational and bureaucratic devices and their

sanctions' (Davis, 1981, p. 5). Thus, for Davis 'as a mode of visualising an ideal society utopia has remained relatively constant.' What distinguishes utopia from all other types of ideal-society literature and, in Kumar's terms, 'from other forms of social and political theory', is its literary type: 'utopia distinguishes itself … by being in the first place a piece of fiction' (Kumar, 1991, p. 20). This clear distinction from other forms of political speculation is a useful means of understanding Wakefield's thought in relation to the texts and ideas of the canon of Western utopian thought. The distinction Kumar makes is, however, nuanced. Thus 'utopia is primarily a vehicle of social and political speculation rather than an exercise of the literary imagination in and for itself.' With a rather generous estimate of the role of social and political speculation, Kumar says that such an intention is 'true of most works of literature', but in the case of utopian literature 'the difference perhaps has more to do with emphasis and a more deliberate and direct political intent' (Kumar, 1991, p. 24). His argument is perhaps best summarised when he writes that 'utopia, then, is first and foremost a work of imaginative fiction in which, unlike other such works, the central subject is the good society.' The fundamentally fictional basis of utopian thought is what separates utopia not only from other forms of social and political theory, but from the other genres of ideal society literature: 'fictive elements no doubt have their part to play in these modes [the other ideal society genres] but in none of them is narrative fiction, as in the utopia, the defining form' (Kumar, 1991, p. 27).

Susan Bruce concurs with Davis's generic categorization of utopian literature, arguing that 'Davis's definition is very astute … [it] admirably clarifies the degree to which the utopia insists on "human" solutions to "human" problems.' However Bruce also argues that 'an emphasis on the utopian *idealization* of social organization can also mislead: the degree to which social organization – or indeed anything else – is "idealised" in utopias is often far from transparent' (Bruce, 2008, p. xiii-xiv, emphasis in original). Bruce even questions the 'utopian' qualities of texts such as More's *Utopia* and Henry Neville's *Isle of Pines* (1668), arguing that 'the question of how "ideal" a utopian community is really intended to be recurs frequently in our reading of utopian narratives' (Bruce, 2008, p. xiv). Frank Manuel has also argued for a flexible approach to determining what constitutes a utopian text, noting that

> there have been many attempts to divide the inchoate body of utopias into polar types: the soft and the hard, the static and the dynamic, the sensate and

the spiritual, the aristocratic and the plebeian, the utopia of escape and the utopia of realisation, the collectivist and individualistic utopias. Such typologies all have their uses, and their very multiplicity suggests that utopian types can be as varied as life itself. (Manuel, 1973, p. viii)

Other authors such as Matthew Beaumont have argued that in the nineteenth century 'a utopian impulse palpitates in "non-literary" as well as "literary texts" of the time, so that "any attempts to define the boundaries of utopia by purely literary criteria speedily ends up in absurdity'"(Beaumont, 2005, p. 2; Kumar, 1987, p. 26, quoted in Beaumont, 2005).

Such debates demonstrate the diversity of scholarly views regarding the ways in which the Western utopian 'tradition' can be conceptualized. The relationship between utopian thought and practical political action is another area of scholarly investigation that has proved difficult to clarify definitively. This is especially important for our understanding of Wakefield's works, since one charge that could be laid against his works being considered utopian is their overly practical or 'realistic' focus.

Utopia and practical politics

The nexus between utopian thought and practical political action is a persistent topic of discussion in the scholarly literature of utopianism, as indeed it has been within utopian discourse itself. As Fredric Jameson points out, 'the relationship between Utopian and the political, as well as questions about practical-political value of utopian thinking and the identification between socialism and Utopia, very much continue to be unresolved topics today' (Jameson, 2007, pp. xi-xii). In their attempts to define utopian thought, some scholars, including Fritz and Frankie Manuel, have 'deliberately separated utopian theory and invention from attempts to put them into practice' (Manuel and Manuel, 1979, p. 8). This enabled them to focus their work on texts that were, in their estimation, works of utopian imagination. In a somewhat different key, Kumar argues that the '"practical"' use of utopia is to overstep the immediate reality to depict a condition whose clear desirability draws us on, like a magnet' (Kumar, 1991, pp. 2-3). He suggests that utopian thought is simultaneously engaged in both impractical and practical political speculation. Thus utopia 'is more than a social or political tract aiming at reform, however comprehensive.' Bearing in mind Wakefield's efforts to create two new British colonies in South Australia and New Zealand, it is important to note Kumar's claim that utopia is 'never simple

dreaming. It always has one foot in reality.' In this view, 'utopia's value lies not in its relation to present practice but in its relation to a possible future' (Kumar, 1991, p. 3). Sargisson and Sargent have also commented on the relationship between utopia and practical politics.

> There exists within scholarship on utopias some tension between two interpretations of utopia. Both stem from the ambiguous etymology of the word. The scholarly Thomas More created a neologism and phonetic pun that combines three Greek words: *topos* (place), *eu* (good) and *ou* (no, or not). This creates an eternal tension in the concept of utopia because utopias are at once good places and no places. And so one interpretation focuses on the concrete utopia – the idea that utopia is an aspiration, something to be pursued and realised. Another places utopia always just over the horizon. (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p.157)

However, as Sargisson and Sargent point out, 'there are many variations and nuances on these two interpretations and most scholars combine them in some way.' The conception of utopia that concentrates on practical efforts to 'realise' some kind of utopian ideal 'is the more straightforward.' This kind of 'concrete' utopian thinking 'leads people to experiment, to found communities, to change their lifestyle and to try to make their dreams come true' (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p.157). In their discussion of the 'other' kind of utopian thinking, Sargisson and Sargent argue that 'utopia as a noplace is more complicated':

> On the one hand, this view informs anti-utopians, like Karl Popper, who believe that attempts to realise utopia will create an authoritarian or totalitarian world. This is informed by an idea of utopia as perfect. A perfect world, it follows, is unchallengeable. There is no room for dissent in such a place. To dissent would be irrational, mad, even, and so the dissenter would require treatment or elimination. … Our previous research has indicated that this view of utopia as perfection-seeking is a mistaken one (Sargent 1994; Goodwin 1980; Sargisson, 1996, 2000). Many contemporary scholars take a more nuanced view of utopia as the desire for something better, rather than something perfect (Levitas 1990); Moylan 1986, 2000). This means that utopia remains just around the corner, just over the horizon. The utopian ship sails ever onwards. (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004 pp.157-158)

These broader interpretations of what constitutes utopian thought resonate with the arguments in this thesis. Donnelly, for example, agrees with the broad definition that Ruth Levitas provides in *The Concept of Utopia*, namely that 'utopia is "the expression of the desire for a better way of being"' (Levitas, 1990, p. 8, quoted in

Donnelly, 1998, p. 13). In Donnelly's reading of Levitas, 'instead of relying on strict definitions focused on function, form, or content, Levitas correctly argues for a definition of utopia that allows form, function, and content to vary markedly and to change over time' (Donnelly, 1998, p. 12). Both Donnelly and Levitas argue that the hallmark of utopian thought is 'the expression of the desire for a better way of being.' This desire is 'broad-ranging [and] inclusive' and allows utopian thought to be interpreted and constituted in multiple ways. Although their work is somewhat dated, Negley and Patrick make a similar point: 'the fictional state of utopia should be an idealised vision of the existing state [in which it was written], for only thus could men gain from the utopian vision a hint of the direction of progress beyond their own present society' (Negley and Patrick, 1952, p. 4). Their point is a simple but sensible one. Any utopian speculation will be reflective of the era in which it was written and thus 'one would naturally expect a utopia written in the twentieth century to differ essentially from one written in the seventeenth century' (Negley and Patrick, 1952, p. 4). Utopia has meant different things in different eras and what constitutes a utopian venture or a utopian text is necessarily dependent on the era in which it was written.

This multifaceted and historical character of utopian thinking is widely recognised, with the language and emphasis of individual scholars adding to the variety. Martin Plattel observes that 'the utopian story, as a process of transcendence, thus is a historical phenomenon, one whose form and content vary according to the situation from which it arises and which it transcends' (Plattel, 1972, p. 27). Manuel and Manuel accept that 'every utopia, rooted as it is in time and place, is bound to reproduce the stage scenery of its particular world as well as its preoccupation with contemporary social problems' (Manuel and Manuel, 1979, p. 23). Lewis Mumford argued that utopias represent, for a given community, a selection of the most ideal configurations of all possible alternatives at a particular time: 'with the aid of ideals, a community may select, among a multitude of possibilities, those which are consonant with its own nature or that promise to further human development' (Mumford, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 7). Utopias from different eras are not only specific to their time and place; their content and political characteristics change as the societies which produce them change. For Mumford, 'an ideal pattern is the ideological equivalent of a physical container: it keeps extraneous change within the bounds of human purpose' (Mumford, 1973, p. 7). Thus the utopias of each era will provide different 'containers'

that are to be used to shape and define the efforts that are made to either create an ideal society, or to improve existent social structures and conditions. This is relevant to Wakefield's status as a utopian because, as we shall see, he sought to create an ideal society that was a perfected replica of the British society of the 1830s. Indeed despite the above claims made by scholars regarding the multifarious and varied definitions of Western utopian thought, the utopian qualities of Wakefield's works, and the literature of the British Empire in general, have for the most part been ignored in the scholarship of Western utopian thought. In particular, scholars of early nineteenth century Western utopian thought have not included Wakefield's works within their categorical limits of what constitutes the 'canon' of nineteenth century utopian literature. Enumerating the specific dimensions of nineteenth century Western utopian thought is thus crucial to further contextualizing and understanding the utopian qualities of Wakefield's work.

Chapter Three

Utopia in the Nineteenth Century

Although a vast and varied amount of utopian literature was published in the nineteenth century, scholars have come to some degree of consensus regarding which authors and thematic concepts are perhaps more definitively 'utopian' than others. This is not to say that there is universal agreement amongst scholars regarding the ways in which different utopian authors and different streams of political thought can be considered to be, or not be, utopian. However, certain authors and certain concepts have come to constitute something of a nineteenth century utopian canon, and this chapter will analyze the criteria by which scholars have debated and discussed the works of early nineteenth century utopian authors.

We will argue that despite certain important conceptual distinctions between Wakefield's plans for colonial expansion and the plans for social reorganization advocated by the most prominent utopian authors of the early nineteenth century, his plans should be included in scholarly discussions of Western utopian thought. Wakefield's most utopian work, *A Letter from Sydney* (1829), was published in the same year as Charles Fourier's 'most accessible work' *Le Nouveau Monde industriel et societaire* (Spencer, 1981, p. 16), prior to Etienne Cabet's most notable publication *Voyage en Icarie* (1840), and only a relatively short time after Robert Owen's influential and important early work *A New View of Society* (1813). This establishes Wakefield as a figure whose works are contemporaneous with some of the most well documented and intellectually significant works of nineteenth century Western utopian thought, and shows us that the utopian dimensions of his work are not as surprising as they might first seem.

Nineteenth century utopias

The nineteenth century is a crucial era in the history of utopian thought. As James Redmond has argued, after the period in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries when Thomas More, Francis Bacon and Tommaso Campanella wrote their utopias, 'the nineteenth century [became] the second major period of production in the [utopian] genre' (Redmond, 1970, p. xxxv). The most prominent utopian thinkers of the early to mid-nineteenth century are the French authors Charles Fourier (1772-

1837),[38] Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825),[39] Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865),[40] Auguste Comte (1798-1857)[41] and Etienne Cabet (1788-1856), [42] along with the influential Welsh author and political reformer Robert Owen (1771-1858).[43] All of these authors promoted schemes for the reorganization of the social, economic and political structure of nineteenth century European society, and most of them sought to implement their plans on large, if not global, scales. [44] Whilst each advocated a distinctive type of social reformation, these authors shared social, political and economic concerns that have led scholars to characterize their works as 'utopian.' Similarities shared by these authors include a generally communal or socialist approach to social reorganization. In their visions of an ideal society, these authors emphasized, firstly, the importance of order and regulation in social reorganization, and all were advocates (in some way) of the role that technology and machinery could

---

[38] For general biographical details of Fourier's life, see Beecher, Jonathan, *Charles Fourier: the visionary and his world*, University of California Press: Berkeley, 1986; Spencer, M. C., Charles *Fourier*, Twayne Publishers: Boston, 1981, pp. 13-18.

[39] For discussion of Saint-Simon's life and works see Iggers, George G., *The cult of authority: the political philosophy of the Saint-Simonians, a chapter in the intellectual history of totalitarianism*, Nijhoff: The Hague, 1958; Manuel, Frank, *The New World of Henri Saint-Simon*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1956; Saint-Simon, Henri de, *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon : an exposition ; first year, 1828-1829;* Translated with notes and an introduction by Georg G. Iggers, New York: Schocken Books, 1958 (1972).

[40] Studies of Proudhon's life and works include: Hyams, Edward, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon: his revolutionary life, mind and works*, J. Murray: London, 1979; Ritter, Alan, *The political thought of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1969; Hoffman, Robert, *Revolutionary justice : the social and political theory of P.J. Proudhon*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana, 1972; Hampden, Jackson, J., *Marx, Proudhon and Europeon socialism*, English Universities Press: London, 1958; Fontanel, Jacques, Bensahel, Liliane, Coissard, Steven, and Echinard, Yann, 'French Utopian Economists of the Nineteenth Century', *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 19 (5), October 2008, pp. 339-350.

[41] Studies of Comte's life and works include: Pickering, Mary, *Auguste Comte : an intellectual biography*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; New York , 1993; Standley, Arline Reilein, *Auguste Comte*, Twayne Publishers: Boston, 1981; Gane, Mike, *Auguste Comte*, Routledge: London; New York , 2006.

[42] Etienne Cabet is best known in historical literature for his utopian novel *Voyage to Icaria* (1840), his role in the creation of several failed attempts to create an ideal 'Icarian' community in the United States of America, and for his career as a radical political figure in early to mid nineteenth century France. For details of Cabet's career as a radical political figure in France and for scholarly analysis of the Icarian communities in America, see: Sutton, 'Introduction', in Cabet, *Travels in Icaria,* 2003, pp. vii-xlvii. According to Sutton, the attempts made by Cabet and his followers in the United States to create an ideal Icarian colony were 'the most enduring, if not the most persistent, commitment to nonreligious communalism in the United States' (Sutton, 2003, p. xlv).

[43] Although Proudhon and Comte do feature in discussions of the history of utopian thought, Fourier, Cabet, Saint-Simon and Owen are the most significant figures of early nineteenth century utopian thought. As such, our analysis will focus on the ideas and concerns that these four authors addressed in their works.

[44] The practical political impact that the utopians of the early nineteenth century had upon their respective societies has also been discussed by scholars. Sidney Pollard, for example, has argued that Owen's 'efforts to influence governments and constitution-makers … [were] scarcely taken seriously' during Owen's lifetime (Pollard, 1971, p. vii).

play in human society. They also countenanced a conception of perfectionist social change, and advocated the installation of a completely 'new' form of social organization. As Redmond argues, whilst 'the field [of nineteenth century utopian thought] is enormous … nineteenth-century utopias had some general qualities in common; they were socialist, in that they all pictured some kind of egalitarian society, and they were progressive, in that they looked to increased industrial efficiency as the great new hope for mankind' (Redmond, 1970, p. xxxv). The role that religion would assume in their visions of a reconstructed society was an important area where they tended to differ, rather than agree with one another.

As noted in Chapter Two, none of these authors used the term 'utopian' to describe their own work. John Harrison, for example, has argued that Robert Owen 'and his followers were always sensitive to charges of being impractical visionaries' (Harrison, 1969, p. 46).[45] Similarly, Henri de Saint-Simon argued that his plan to alter the constitution of the European political community was not 'one of those impracticable theories, one of those chimerical speculations whose only value is to employ the pens of authors' (Saint-Simon, 1964, p. 42). According to Claeys the primary reason why the early nineteenth-century utopian socialists have been referred to as 'utopians' is because they 'aimed to transform society slowly and peacefully, by the example of superior experimental communities, appealing thereby to the higher ethical interests of all members of society, including the owning classes.' These authors have been regarded as utopian because they 'envisioned a dramatic improvement in human relations, including the abolition of war, of exploitative systems of trade, and of the domination of man over woman, white over non-white, and of the powerful over the weak' (Claeys, 1997, p. xxiv).

Whilst Owen, Fourier, Cabet and Saint-Simon feature most prominently in scholarly analysis of early nineteenth century utopian thinking, utopian literature in the nineteenth century was an extensive and variegated field of intellectual and

---

[45] For a concise discussion of some of the debates that have surrounded Owen's status as a utopian and a socialist, see Harrison, *Quest for the New Moral World*, 1969, pp. 45-47. Sidney Pollard also argues that to dub Owen a 'utopian' is 'particularly inappropriate', since he was 'concerned exclusively with problems of his own time in a severely practical manner' (Pollard, 1971, p. viii). In Owen's own discussions of the practicability of his schemes, there is no indication that he considered himself to be a 'utopian.' He argued that his essays on the formation of character were: 'not brought forward as mere matter of speculation, to amuse the idle visionary who *thinks* in his closet, and never *acts* in the world; but to create universal activity, pervade society with a knowledge of its true interests, and direct the public mind to the most important object to which it can be directed, - to a national proceeding for rationally forming the character of that immense mass of population which is now allowed to be so formed as to fill the world with crimes' (Owen, 1813 (1966), p. 21).

political endeavour. A discussion of the depth and breadth of the many utopian texts published in this period[46] is not practicable. For the purpose of establishing a conceptual context for Wakefield's contribution to this tradition, the present discussion will be restricted to a thematic analysis of its most influential thinkers.

Utopia and Socialism

Utopian thought in the early decades of the nineteenth century is almost (but not entirely) exclusively synonymous with the development of socialist thought. This particular aspect of the works of Owen, Fourier, Cabet, *et al* is a major point of differentiation between their plans for social change and Wakefield's. Debates surrounding the precise definitions of socialist thought have been extensive, and were as widespread in nineteenth-century intellectual and political movements as they have been in modern scholarly literature.[47] It suffices for our purposes to say that the 'utopian socialists' were generally united in their criticism of the deleterious effects of early capitalist industrial development on the working classes of Europe. As Claeys points out, 'as class divisions widened in the early nineteenth century … socialism rejected republican attempts to restrict property ownership by agrarian laws, and instead urged a full community of goods as the only solution to … the "social question"' (Claeys, 1997, p. xxiv).

One of the defining characteristics of Charles Fourier's thought, for example, is his opposition to commercial society: 'the "vices" of commerce remained [Fourier's] central preoccupation' throughout his life as a social critic (Beecher, 1986, p. 141). In Fourier's view, 'the activity of the merchant and the commercial middleman was the chief cause of poverty and all economic ills' (Beecher, 1986, p.

---

[46] For further analysis of other, less well known utopian literature and utopian ideas that were disseminated in England and France during the first half of the nineteenth century, see Claeys, 'Introduction', 1997, pp. xiii-xxxix; Corcoran, Paul (ed.), *Before Marx: socialism and communism in France, 1830-48*, Macmillan: London, 1983.

[47] As Keith Taylor has argued, 'looking back on socialism's history, one is struck not only by the remarkable variations in socialist theorizing, but by the equally remarkable variations in what have been regarded as the practical manifestations of socialism in action. No one can doubt that socialism has led to a very broad range of communitarian experiments, workingmen's associations of all kinds, revolutionary movements, political parties, trade unions, and many regimes - all claiming that in certain key respects they have exhibited the true meaning of socialism' (Taylor, 1982, p. 52). For Claeys 'the historiographic notion of "utopian socialism" … has now fallen into disrepute, and is no longer serviceable as an analytic category', primarily because of the practical view that the 'utopian socialists' took of their own work (Claeys, 1997, p. xxiv). This thesis does not aim to redefine or take issue with Claeys' estimation of utopian socialism. Nevertheless, even his disclaimer illustrates that the 'utopian socialists' play an important part in our historical understanding of utopian thought, offering conceptual points of reference for the schemes and purposes formulated by authors such as Wakefield in the early nineteenth century.

199) and it was this particular social and economic hierarchy that Fourier sought to eliminate.

Robert Owen, despite the fact that he was a factory owning capitalist,[48] was also critical of nascent industrial capitalism and the effects that this system had upon the 'character' of the working class.[49] As John Butt argues, 'in a society where the maximum profit was commonly confused with the greatest good, Owen provided the workers with a concept of their dignity as individuals and their worth to the community' (Butt, 1971, p. 14). Owen was especially concerned about the effects that the new industrial manufacturing systems of Britain were having not only on the bodies and lives of the factory workers, but on their characters. As Cole informs us, 'what appalled him about the new "manufacturing system" was not only its inhumanity, but also that it seemed to him to result in a perversion of the characters of those who were subjected to its rule' (Cole, 1927 (1966), p. ix). Owen was intent upon removing the causes of the distress suffered by the working classes since 'in his

---

[48] Owen 'became managing partner in the New Lanark' cotton mill in 1799 and was involved in the management of the mill until 1829 (Cole, 1927 (1966), p. ix). In A.J. Robertson's view Owen built himself a 'substantial fortune from very small beginnings in the space of forty years or so' (Robertson, in Pollard and Salt (eds.), 1971, p. 160).

[49] Whilst an exhaustive account of the nature of Owen's political thought is not possible here, scholars such as Gregory Claeys have argued that 'it has often been presumed incorrectly that there was little development in [Owen's] ideas [over the course of his life], and that his early works also encompass his mature systems' (Claeys, 1991, p. xxiii). According to Claeys, 'the evolution of Owen's thinking can be divided into four main periods: his early views of education and personality, up to about 1815; the period of his rejection of both the factory system and all forms of social organization besides his own, approximately from 1816 to 1820; the stage in which his economic ideas were most substantially refined, during the 1820s; and the maturing of his social system, which was to remain essentially unchanged after the late 1830s' systems' (Claeys, 1991, p. xxiii). Pollard also argues that Owen 'has often been accused … of being a man of a single idea, and that not very original' (Pollard, 1971, p. vii). Other scholars such as J.F.C. Harrison have also argued that 'speculation on the pedigree of Owen's ideas is not new.' In Harrison's estimation, 'whether he "borrowed" his ideas from Rousseau, Bentham and Godwin, or was influenced by contemporaries in Manchester, has been discussed in his biographies to somewhat inconclusive results.' Indeed, according to Harrison, 'a more profitable approach is to consider Owenism as part of the whole complex of ideas of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries' (Harrison, 1969, p. 4). However, as Pollard also points out, whilst Owen's intellectual career might have been primarily driven by the singular belief that 'men's characters are exclusively the products of their circumstances', he nonetheless remains an influential figure in early nineteenth century European thought because of his ability 'to look with new and critical eyes on much that was generally accepted in his age, and to propose novel solutions to its problems' (Pollard, 1971, p. viii). Owen was also influenced by Jeremy Bentham and was, like Wakefield, a personal friend of Bentham's. As James Treble has argued, Owen's plans for social and political change were greatly indebted to Bentham's own thought, especially since Owen believed that 'it was to be the government's lot to enable the individual to realise [Owen's] socialised version of Bentham's "hedonistic calculus' by active intervention in human affairs; for "that government … is the best, which in practice produces the greatest happiness to the greatest number"' (Treble, in Butt (ed.), 1971, p. 22; Owen quoted in Treble (1971), *The Life of Robert Owen Written by* Himself, Vol. 1, 1857, Fourth Essay, p. 308).

view, the employer had no right merely to treat his employees as a means to profit' (Cole, 1927 (1966), p. x).

Etienne Cabet[50] was also opposed to the exploitation and degradation of the working classes. His response to the problems of industrial society was to seek to implement '"the equality and fraternity of men, the freeing of women, the abolition of opulence and misery … [and] the creation of the community of goods"' (Cabet, *Le Populaire*, Sept. 11, 1842, quoted in Sutton, 2003, p. xix). Cabet, however, was not enamoured with the economic politics of either Fourier or Saint-Simon, arguing that 'he thought both men had concocted a "defective community" because neither one advocated elimination of private property and money' (Sutton, 2003, p. xi).

Despite their indictments of industrial commercial society, these authors were not opposed to industrial development as a means of producing goods and minimizing human labour. It was the social and moral effects of the economic hierarchies of early industrial development that they were opposed to, not the utility of mechanized labour. For example, Owen's opposition to the evils he saw within industrialisation did not mean that he sought to halt or reverse the process of industrial development. As James Treble points out, Owen argued 'that the process of industrialisation could not be reversed and that much good might yet be realised if only the manufacturers themselves would consent to some form of social control' (Treble, in Butt (ed.), 1971, p. 27). Cabet was in favour of industrial development only 'if the process were organised in a nonexploitative manner' (Sanford, 1977, pp. 472-473), but he was nonetheless in favour of the advantages that industrialisation could provide for social

---

[50] Cabet's thought was directly influenced by other figures from the utopian tradition. As Robert Sutton points out 'although countless individuals, past and present, influenced his conception of utopia … a few stand out: Thomas More, Louis Sebastien Mercier, and Robert Owen' (Sutton, 2003, p. x). Scholars such as Christopher Johnson have argued that Cabet is historically significant not because of his role in the development or progression of an intellectual tradition, but because of his role as a socialist promoter of the rights of the working class. According to Johnson 'while Cabet's communism may lay claim to a unique position in the history of nineteenth-century thought … it introduced no new themes into the currents of radical social theory' (Johnson, 1974, p. 18). The question of which of the 'utopian' authors knew one another during their own lifetimes, or were even aware of the intellectual tradition that they have been placed into by contemporary scholars, has also been addressed by various commentators. For example, Felix Markham argues that 'Saint-Simon and Fourier never had any contact with each other, and do not appear to have read each other's work, though there was much mutual influence among their followers' (Markham, 1964, p. xxxiii). This is not to say that such authors were always unaware of one another, or of earlier works by authors who have also been included in scholarly discussion of the utopian tradition; the influence of Robert Owen on the development of French utopian thought is important to remember, along with the fact that several of these figures did in fact know one another and were engaged in exchanges of ideas. For example, Robert Owen was acquainted with authors such as Etienne Cabet and as Chushichi Tsuzuki informs us, whilst Owen was in Paris in 1848 'he often visited Etienne Cabet … whose preaching of peaceful communism seemed very much in his own line' (Tsuzuki, in Pollard (ed.), 1971, p. 24).

development. As Elwitt Sanford argues, 'Cabet waxed positively lyrical over the great promise in the development of railroads, roads, and the production of commodities.' A passage from Cabet's utopian novel *Travels in Icaria* (1840) provides a particularly colourful example of the role that machinery assumed in his vision of an ideal social order:

> There are limitless numbers of machines, to such an extent that they replace two hundred million horses or three billion workers; and it is the machines that perform all the dangerous, tiring, unhealthy, dirty, or disgusting work; everything that causes disgust elsewhere is hidden here with the utmost care or surrounded with the greatest of cleanliness. Not only will you never see bloody carcasses in the streets, or even manure, but in the workshops you will never see a worker touch any revolting object. (Cabet, 2003, p. 83)

Like Owen and Cabet, Fourier did not argue that machinery should be abolished. Rather, he sought to create a 'new industrial world that relied on the collective organization of both work and living' (Jenkins, 2003, p. 85). As Beecher points out, Fourier 'vigorously denied that he wished to banish machines and factories altogether from his ideal community.' In Beecher's view, scholars have misinterpreted Fourier as a 'romantic reactionary … whose prescription for the ills of early industrialisation was to turn backward to an idealised rural arcadia.' Since Fourier 'developed his analysis of work at a time when factories, large concentrations of workers, and power machinery were still relatively marginal features of French economic life', Beecher argues that it is 'misleading to view Fourier's utopia as an exercise in nostalgia for the preindustrial past' (Beecher, 1986, pp. 288-290).[51] Whilst Fourier may have indeed 'envisaged pleasant places of rest in rural mansions of

---

[51] The utopians of the early nineteenth century were writing in the early stages of the history of industrial development and, as such, their thought does not necessarily account for all of the changes that industrialisation would elicit in European society. As Christopher Johnson argues in relation to the ways in which Cabet's work related to the social and economic changes France was experiencing in the early to mid nineteenth century, 'France during the July Monarchy was a society in transition; the forces of modernity, powerful and ineffaceable as they might be, were not yet triumphant.' Johnson contends that Cabet was responding to 'the anguish' that was being caused by the transition to industrialised production. As such, Johnson suggests that Cabet's utopian visualisation of an ideal society 'had to be in touch with both the moral and social universe that was being lost and the one coming into being.' For Johnson, the appeal of Cabet's scheme lay in the fact that 'it promised a plenitude founded upon advanced technology [whilst also presenting] images of community and economic morality, both nostalgic of an idealised artisan past' (Johnson, 1974, p. 15).

harmony and passion' (Higgs, 1979, p. 441), he did not seek a return to a quasi-feudal mode of agricultural production and social organization.[52]

Despite the nominally different programs that these authors offered regarding the most effective means to resolve the social and political problems caused by nascent industrial capitalism, the variously 'socialist' basis of most French utopian thought provides the sharpest contrast to Wakefield's colonization schemes. Wakefield was a strong advocate of commercial enterprise, the property market and 'capitalist' economic hierarchies. Yet this important difference should not obscure their consensus that the causes of the social problems of the early nineteenth century were economic and only capable of being resolved through processes of systematic reorganization. The different critiques offered by the French utopians and Wakefield himself regarding the specific details of those causes were clearly different, as were their proposed schemes for social and economic renewal, but both Wakefield and the utopian authors advocated plans that attempted to resolve the social and economic problems of nineteenth century Europe in a comprehensive and systematic fashion. Whilst the hopeful universality and spontaneity of the utopians' plans for social change were perhaps more extreme, Wakefield nonetheless proposed that systematic colonization was not only a means to create a perfected system of British colonies, but was also the best, perhaps the only, means of resolving Britain's domestic social and economic problems. Given that Wakefield's program of systematic colonization was not only an economic reorganization of British colonial policy but an economic reorganization that was specifically intended to create an ideal society, it can be argued that Wakefield and the utopian socialists of the nineteenth century viewed the reorganization of economic structures, and the adoption of a systematic approach to such reorganization, as being of crucial importance to social and political salvation. Moreover, the reformist, as opposed to revolutionary, approach to social change advocated by the other utopians was similar to Wakefield's own thinking.

Reform, not revolution

The majority of the utopian authors of the early nineteenth century were united in their promotion of gradual reform as the best means to create a perfected social order.

---

[52] Fourier's vision of 'Harmony' was much more complicated and philosophically sophisticated; to ascribe to Fourier a simplistic vision of bucolic serenity fails to account for the psychological depth and social complexity of his thought.

The details varied, but Cabet, Owen, Fourier and Saint-Simon[53] all advocated the gradual alteration of social institutions rather than violent revolution. Saint-Simon, for example, argued that 'reorganization cannot be achieved suddenly, at one stroke; for outworn institutions only gradually collapse, and better ones are only gradually built; they rise and fall slowly and insensibly' (Saint-Simon, 1814 (1964), p. 32). Owen was concerned about the potentially revolutionary nature of Britain's social problems and did not believe that violent revolution was an effective means of resolving them. As Chushichi Tsuzuki points out, 'Owen had a horror of violent revolution which [he thought] would lead only to another kind of irrational rule' (Tsuzuki, in Pollard (ed.), 1971, p. 15). In Owen's estimation a rapid alteration of social institutions and practices was not the best means to give '*happiness to every human being through all succeeding generations*' (Owen, 1816 (1966) p. 95, emphasis in original).[54] For example, in 1816, addressing the inhabitants of New Lanark, Owen argued that:

> … mankind cannot be improved or rendered reasonable by force … it is absolutely necessary to support the old systems and institutions under which

---

[53] In Michael Heffernan's estimation 'Saint-simonian ideas were complex, sometimes contradictory and have been variously interpreted as an early form of socialism, a radical brand of conservatism and a forerunner to modern totalitarianism' (Heffernan, 1989, p. 342). Felix Markham has argued that Saint-Simon's 'extravagance remains of quite a different character from the craziness of Fourier, or the mysticism which flourished in some circles of the freemasonry of the late eighteenth century' (Markham, 1964, p. xix). Markham suggests that 'by taking individual works in isolation, it would be easy to represent Saint-Simon as nothing more than a publicist, exploiting the feeling of the moment' (Markham, 1964, p. xix). However, Markham goes on to argue that Saint-Simon's discussions of 'the search for the unity of knowledge' in scientific thought, the 'problem of constructing an international community', and his plans for a 'reformed Christianity' were unequalled in the nineteenth century. Indeed for Markham 'no other political and social thinker of the nineteenth century surpasses him in originality of approach to these problems, or in boldness and breadth of view' (Markham, 1964, p. xx).

[54] Despite his opposition to revolutionary politics, Owen nonetheless argued 'that revolutions were inevitable' in the short term because the social problems of Europe could not be resolved in any other way. Owen maintained that although 'a revolution was a necessity', revolution itself could be a 'peaceful and rational' process, provided it was led by 'reason' and the 'benevolent leadership of the intellectuals, which would go beyond classes and parties' (Tsuzuki, in Pollard (ed.), 1971, p. 31). According to Treble, 'no coercive pressures were to be used to bring about this fundamental change; nor was the existing structure of class relationships to be disturbed by this new pattern of production and organisation' (Treble, in Butt (ed.), 1971, p. 30). In Owen's plan, the entire world would become a 'rational, intelligent, wise, sincere, and good' place since 'the sources of the "gross errors" and evils that had inhibited the growth of harmony between all classes were now known' (Treble, in Butt (ed.), 1971, p. 31). Tsuzuki also argues that whilst Owen might have not been an advocate of violent revolution, he was nonetheless not simply arguing for the reform of existent political institutions. Rather, as Tsuzuki suggests, Owen 'was not upholding the status quo in politics, for he was not a supporter of any particular social form.' In Tsuzuki's view, Owen 'believed that all the political forms tried in history – despotism, aristocracy and democracy – were based on the principles of repulsion and warring interests.' Thus, Owen 'sought to permeate the existing governments, whatever they might be, with his "Rational Socialism", his principles of solidarity of interests' (Tsuzuki, in Pollard (ed.), 1971, p. 35).

we now live, until another system and arrangement of society shall be proved by practice to be essentially superior … For it would be no mark of wisdom to desert an old house, whatever may be its imperfections, until a new one shall be ready to receive you, however superior to the old that new one may be when finished. (Owen, 1816 (1966) p. 118)

Owen's approach to eliciting political reform was thus focused on 'guiding the opinions of the great statesmen [rather] than influencing the vote of the electors' (Tsuzuki, in Pollard (ed.), 1971, p. 21).

Etienne Cabet was similarly in favour of progressive reform as the best means to elicit permanent and lasting social change. In the 1842 preface to the second edition of *Voyage to Icaria* Cabet argued that 'we are sincerely and personally convinced that this transformation cannot take place in an instant, as a result of violence and constraint, and that it can be only gradual and progressive, the result of persuasion, conviction, public opinion, and the national will' (Cabet, 1842, in Sutton (ed.), 2003, p.lix). Although Charles Fourier was not an advocate of violent revolution, his conception of the way in which his utopian order would be created differed from Owen, Cabet and Saint-Simon. Fourier argued that once his 'theories were accepted, society would be immediately transformed from 'civilization' into "harmony".' For Fourier 'there was no intermediate stage of gradual improvement or reform. The learning curve was vertical' (Pilbeam, 2000, p. 502). Fourier's conception of the 'instant transformation' of 'civilization into harmony' did not imply that he was an advocate of violent revolution; simply that for Fourier the change from the imperfect social organization to the perfect would be an instantaneous event.

Despite such differences, both the utopians and Wakefield argued in favour of progressive changes to the social order. The reformist methods envisaged by Wakefield and the utopians, together with the fact that they all sought to create an 'ideal society', would seem to support Wakefield's inclusion in the fraternity of utopian thinkers. Prominent scholars of utopian thought such as Krishan Kumar have suggested that progressive socialist utopias were not the only form of utopian thought in the nineteenth century. In Kumar's view nineteenth century socialism 'competed with other ideologies, such as utilitarianism and liberalism, which had their high complement of utopianism.' Gregory Claeys has discussed certain 'non-socialist utopian' works published in Britain between 1815 and 1848, arguing that 'the critique of modernity in the first decades of the nineteenth century also assumed non-socialist

forms' (Claeys, 1997, p. xxvi).[55] According to Claeys 'conservative opponents of both democracy and laissez-faire sought refuge in images of a more virtuous, stable past … [and] the feudal period became increasingly popular' (Claeys, 1997, p. xxvi). However, despite these initial claims in favour of a broader view of nineteenth century utopian thought, scholars such as Kumar go on to argue for a narrower view. Despite the fact that utopian ideas informed other ideologies in the nineteenth century, he argues that 'it seems true to say that socialism was the nineteenth-century utopia, the truly modern utopia, *par excellence*.' While acknowledging that socialism was a multifaceted concept with many different variations and interpretations, Kumar concludes that 'the essential [utopian] argument [of the nineteenth century, and later into the twentieth] … was about socialism: whether writers used the utopian form to dispute and promote varieties of socialism among themselves, as with Bellamy, Morris and Wells; or whether they used it to attack socialism in one or other of its manifestations, as with Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell' (Kumar, 1987, p. 49).

Kumar's viewpoint provides a clear illustration of why Wakefield's utopian texts have scarcely been noticed by scholars in the field. The capitalist framework, as well as the social conservatism of Wakefield's plans for colonization, distinguishes his work from the socialist plans of Owen, Fourier *et al*. However, it can be argued that his reformist capitalist approach to social change differs from a utopian socialist plan only in regard to the economic structures of his otherwise systematic conception of an 'ideal society.' It is the argument of this thesis that despite their different social aims and political structures, Wakefield, no less than the 'utopian socialists' envisioned an ideal, harmonious, bountiful and above all regulated social order.

Religion and utopia

Another major area of concern, religion, was a point on which the utopians not only differed from Wakefield, but differed amongst themselves. Wakefield's views on this point were definitely not as radical as some of the utopians.[56] His plans to create a

---

[55] Works that Claeys discusses include Robert Southey's *Colloquies of Society* (1829) and Thomas Carlyle's *Past and Present* (1843). Claeys also countenances the utopian tendencies demonstrated in John Stuart Mill's political philosophy, arguing that 'even liberalism was capable of moving in a distinctly utopian direction, and of doubting the optimistic vision of an unlimited commercial society' (Claeys, 1997, p. xxvi).

[56] The question of free religious association in South Australia was an important and controversial aspect of the colony's early planning. Hilliard and Hunt argue that 'South Australia was planned at a time when English society was deeply divided between supporters of the established Church of England and those who dissented from its claim to be the church of the nation, in alliance with the civil power'. In Hilliard and Hunt's view, because of the discrimination and the 'civil disadvantages and

purely Anglican colony in Canterbury demonstrate that religion had a different and much less complicated role in Wakefield's thought. This is not surprising, given that Wakefield's colonies were created either in conjunction or in direct negotiation with the British government. An anti-religious position would have seriously hindered his plans for the successful British colonization of South Australia and New Zealand.

The utopians of the early nineteenth century, however, had quite different views regarding the moral and social role religion would assume in their ideal societies. Owen, for example, was completely opposed to organized religion and, as John Butt has argued, 'for much of his life Robert Owen regarded established religion as a singularly vicious opponent' (Butt, 1971, p. 10).[57] Owen was a controversial figure in early nineteenth century British politics because 'the success of Owen's communal system of living was bound up with the destruction of organised religion, "this Moloch" which had brought so much misery to society' (Treble, in Butt (ed.), 1971, p. 31). For Owen, 'the world had therefore only "to dismiss all its erroneous religious notions" and to assume an attitude of universal tolerance towards all beliefs for the millennium to be realised' (Treble, 1971, p. 31).

Fourier's views regarding the influence that the social environment had upon the character and behaviour of human beings is, in Carl Guarneri's estimation, also not readily reconciled to Christianity. According to Guarneri, 'Fourier had never gone so far as to endorse Robert Owen's dictum that the character of man is formed entirely by circumstances; but as a utopian reconstructor of society he implied a very similar belief.' For Fourier, 'social problems and wrongdoing were merely the products of an unnatural society channelling innately good human nature in the wrong direction' (Guarneri, 1982, pp. 586-587). As Guarneri points out, 'in implicitly

---

humiliations' they received from the Church of England, dissenters in Britain had strong motivations to not only emigrate to South Australia, but to advocate for complete freedom of religious association in the new colony. Thus 'those who were most active in the founding of South Australia comprised an alliance of Dissenters, reforming Whigs and secular "Benthamite" radicals'. However, whilst 'Dissenters were enthusiastic and vociferous, they were not a majority on either the committee of the South Australian Association or the Board of Colonization Commissioners' (Hilliard and Hunt, in Richards (ed.), 1986, p. 195). Indeed, even though the South Australian Association 'wanted to found a British colony without an established church and without state endowments or grants for religious purposes … [this] principle was breached even before the colony was founded' and 'the South Australian Act of 1834 contained a "chaplaincy clause", added in the House of Lords, which empowered the Crown to appoint "Chaplains and Clergymen of the Established Church of England or Scotland" in the new province' (Hilliard and Hunt, in Richards (ed.), 1986, p. 197). Such debates demonstrate that even a relatively conservative religious view such as Wakefield's was deemed to be radical by established church leaders in 1830s Britain.

[57] Butt also points out that Owen was not 'an atheist' but rather was a 'deist and remained so even in his spiritualism' (Butt, 1971, p. 10).

denying the impact of sin Fourier also repudiated the Christian notion that all reform must begin with the spiritual regeneration of the individual, then proceed outward' (Guarneri, 1982, p. 587). However as Pilbeam also observes, in Fourier's plans

> the Almighty was as bound by the rules of universal order as were humans. Fourier's deity had a back seat in his perfect community; architectural plans of phalanges contained lavish illustrations of communal buildings, but no church. Fourier's deity was also an impersonal concept and had little function other than to reveal to Fourier how society should be organized. (Pilbeam, 2000, pp. 499-500)

As Stedman-Jones and Patterson point out, for Fourier 'nothing was more tedious than the Christian afterlife, whose only pastime would be the eternal face-to-face contemplation of the glory of God' (Stedman-Jones and Patterson, 1996, p. xxii). Pilbeam also notes that 'Fourier had no interest in Christ, or a personal God, and despised the tedium of the Christian heaven.' For Fourier, 'the spiritual impulse [of religion] was simply the need to know the rules of social organization' (Pilbeam, 2000, p. 503).

In Saint-Simon's plans for utopian social reconstruction, religion was dealt with in various ways at different times in his career. Scholars such as Felix Markham have argued that in Saint-Simon's theorizing 'a complete scientific explanation of experience [would] constitute a new religion, and restore a stable condition of society, in which the scientists fulfil the function performed by priests in the medieval civilization' (Markham, 1964, p. xxiv). Against Markham, K. Panter-Brick argued that 'Saint-Simon, in his writings in the positive sciences, declared scientific knowledge to have dethroned theology, whereas in his "New Christianity" it is merely that scientists and industrialists are to dethrone the priests so that the Christian ethic may be given better effect' (Panter-Brick, 1954, p. 174). George Iggers has also argued that 'in a last phase, Saint-Simon in the *New Christianity* called for a religion based upon brotherly love and concerned with achieving bliss on earth'(Iggers, 1958 (1972), pp. xxi-xxii). Frank Manuel has suggested that Saint-Simon's advocacy of a 'new Christianity' was based in part upon political expediency and that 'instead of appearing as the enemy of Christianity, his system would proclaim itself as the true Christianity' (Manuel, 1956, p.349). Manuel contends that Saint-Simon was but one

of 'a whole group of nineteenth-century reformers caught [who] caught hold of the idea that attacking Christianity by name was a waste of moral capital.'

Contrarily to Owen and Fourier, Christian religion played a significant role in Etienne Cabet's social philosophy. He advocated a form of messianic Christian communism. As Pilbeam informs us, whilst 'the imaginary utopian community described by Cabet's *Voyage en Icarie* … was not Christian … Christian imagery constantly recurs' in both *Voyage en Icarie* and in Cabet's other works, to the extent that 'Cabet compared the way in which the idea of community would be preached to the aristocracy in Icarie to Jesus's approach to converting people to Christianity' (Pilbeam, 2000, p. 500). In 1842 Cabet claimed that 'the community of goods and Christianity were one and the same. Christ was the "great communist" who condemned private property and wealth. When Christ referred to the kingdom of God on earth, he meant a community without property or money' (Cabet, *Le Populaire*, Sept. 11, 1842, quoted in Sutton, 2003, p. xix). The relationship between Cabet's utopian communism and religion is made explicit by Pilbeam when she argues that Cabet believed that 'Icarian communism was not a "new" Christianity … but the true Christianity' (Pilbeam, 2000, p. 499).

The divergent views that the utopians of the early nineteenth century had on religion demonstrates that despite their shared desire to create a perfected social world, the details of this ideal differed from thinker to thinker. This underscores how utopian thought is a multifaceted and varied field that defies narrow or rigid classifications. In this wider perspective, Wakefield's works can be considered to be utopian on their own terms as well as in comparison to the more familiar utopian authors of the early nineteenth century. One area in which Wakefield and the utopian authors overlap quite extensively is in their prioritisation of regulation and order.

Plans: the stamp of utopia

Whilst all of the utopian authors of the early nineteenth century offered 'negative'[58] critiques of their contemporaneous economic structures and social conditions, they

---

[58] The political and epistemological differences between negative critiques of society and positive plans for its reconstruction have been addressed by contemporary scholars such as Fredric Jameson. Jameson argues that utopian thought today is less concerned with offering a positive ideal of a society that is to be strived *for* as it is with providing a negative critique of existent, and potentially existent, social systems. Jameson does not construct utopia as a positive ideal which should be aimed for; rather, as Rob Seguin points out, Jameson imagines utopia as a negative intellectual force. Seguin suggests that for Jameson 'Utopia is chiefly to be conceived of negatively, that is, the effort to imagine a reality wholly Other from our own ultimately returns us to the limits of our own imaginations, forcing us to

also offered structured and regimented 'positive' plans for change and social reorganization. These elaborate plans are perhaps the most distinctive, and consistent, feature of utopian literature. It is this aspect of the thought of Owen, Fourier *et al* that bears the most compelling comparison to Wakefield's. Fourier, for example, based his critique of European civilization upon his opposition to 'the wastefulness and inefficiency of civilized methods of production and consumption.' However Fourier did not simply offer a critique of existent economic and industrial systems, nor did he simply look to turn the world into a harmonious agricultural paradise through the creation of his 'Phalanxes.'[59] Rather, as Carl Guarneri points out, Fourier's 'plan for social reorganization through these small model communities was only one segment of a vast, intricate, and sometimes bizarre philosophical system' (Guarneri, 1982, p. 582). The importance of both planning and regimentation in Fourier's vision of a reconstructed social order was paramount; as Pilbeam points out, 'the regimentation of orders of different varieties form the skeleton of all of his books', and for Fourier 'history, the passions, and the phalansterian economy were composed of elaborate structures' (Pilbeam, 2000, p. 502). Similarly for Robert Owen, the causes of distress in industrial society could only be removed through a system of highly regulated education that focused upon the development of the 'character' of human beings. Owen argued that *'the character of man is, without a single exception, always formed for him'* and, as James Treble informs us:

> Owen … did not confine himself to pointing out those defects in existing institutions which could be speedily remedied by the *fiat* of the legislature; he accepted that the impact of such reforms on the environment of the 'poor and labouring classes' would be small until far-reaching steps had been taken to shape the characters of their members. This was to be done through the establishment of a national system of education. (Treble, in Butt (ed.), 1971, pp. 22-23)

For Owen 'education was to be the philosopher's stone which would transform the existing behavioural patterns of society and produce a race of 'rational' beings' (Treble, 1971, pp. 22-23). In the *First Essay on the Formation of Character* (1813), Owen argues that the 'the governing powers of all countries should establish

confront just how strongly our conceptual frames are structured by the social formation (or mode of production, to use the Marxist term Jameson prefers) in which we are mired' (Seguin, 2006, p. 544).

[59] The principles through which these Phalanxes were to be created were also intended to engender 'sweeping changes in religion, government, and social life' (Guarneri, 1982, p. 582).

rational plans for the education and general formation of the characters of their subjects' (Owen, 1813 (1966), p. 20).[60]

Saint-Simon was also strongly in favour of elaborately administered regulation. As Felix Markham informs us, 'with his hierarchical and organic view of society, Saint-Simon was bound to conceive his "industrial system" as a planned economy' (Markham, 1964, p. xxvi). According to Markham Saint-Simon 'looked forward to a society which was nothing better than a reconstructed caste system.' In *The Reorganization of the European Community* (1814), Saint-Simon offered this account of the importance of institutional regulation for social cohesion: 'lack of institutions leads to the destruction of all society; outworn institutions prolong the ignorance and the prejudices of the times which produced them' (Saint-Simon, 1814 (1964), p. 29).

Contemporary scholars have acknowledged the emphasis that utopian authors have placed upon order and regulation. Kumar has characterised 'Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, Comte, Spencer [and] Marx' as the 'great system-builders of the [nineteenth] century', and the importance of regulation and systematic organization to all of these thinkers is difficult to refute (Kumar, 1987, p. 48). Jose Luis Ramos-Gorostiza has similarly argued that utopian thought in the nineteenth century is characterised by its 'meticulous elaborations of the organisation of a future society, [and] ideal constructions of a contented humanity free of tribulations' (Gorostiza, 2009, p. 10). A similar account of the importance of regulation in utopian thought comes from Lewis Mumford, who argued that the prioritisation of regulation and order has been a defining hallmark of utopian thought, from Plato's *Republic* onwards. According to Mumford:

> isolation, stratification, fixation, regimentation, standardisation, militarisation – one or more of these attributes enter into the conception of the utopian city, as expounded by the Greeks. And these same features remain, in open or disguised form, even in the supposedly more democratic utopias of the nineteenth century. (Mumford, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 9)

---

[60] As John Butt has argued, 'that a controlled environment was the formative influence on character was the spring-board of Owen's total philosophy' (Butt, 1971, p. 13). Although Owen's belief in the power of education was central to his political platform, Claeys has argued that 'Owen never implied that any character could be "given" to every individual, only that groups could be educated to share certain characteristics in common' (Claeys, 1991, p. xxiv).

The importance of regulation and order in Wakefield's plans is apparent from the simple fact that his plan for British colonial expansion was called 'systematic colonization.' Despite differences in the manner in which order and regulation were to operate in Wakefield's colonial societies, the regulatory basis of Wakefield's plans for the construction of a perfected version of Britain strongly resembles the regulatory basis of other utopian authors of the early nineteenth century. The repeated references Wakefield makes to Greek systems of colonization suggest that he did have a classical, regulated form of colonial expansion in mind when he was planning the colonies of South Australia and New Zealand.[61] As Sinclair points out, Wakefield's colonial vision was intended to be regulated in almost every aspect of its creation: 'in Wakefield's Utopia, land policy would control the expansion of the frontier and regulate class relationships … The new colonial society would consist of a vertical section of English society, excluding the lowest stratum' (Sinclair, 1961, p. 46). This shows us that Wakefield's works share important conceptual similarities with the ideas and concepts raised in the publications of the most prominent early nineteenth century utopian authors.

The British Empire and utopia

Although scholars of nineteenth century Western utopian literature have not discussed the similarities that Wakefield's works share with Owen, Fourier, Cabet *et al*, scholars of British colonial and imperial history have not ignored the utopian themes that permeate certain facets of nineteenth century British imperial literature. George Mariz, for example, has discussed the imperial utopian vision of the politician and colonial reformer Sydney Olivier (1859-1943). Mariz argues that Olivier was an exponent of the practical utopian 'revival at Oxford in the 1870s and 80s which stressed the reform of political and economic life through positive legislation and social work' (Mariz, 1987, p. 64). According to Mariz, Olivier had a utopian vision not only for the reform of Britain's individual colonies,[62] but for the reform of its entire imperial administration. Robert Grant has also addressed the utopian qualities

---

[61] In *The New British Province of South Australia* (1834) Wakefield writes that the colonization of South Australia would be 'the first attempt since the time of the ancient Greeks to Colonize systematically' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 136); in *A View of the Art of Colonization* (1849) he argues that 'the ancient Greeks were themselves colonists, the occupiers of a new territory, in which for a time every freeman could obtain as much land as he desired' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 325).

[62] Olivier was mostly involved in colonial administration in the Caribbean. As Mariz points out, 'in 1890 he became colonial secretary to British Honduras … and served successively in Belize, the Leeward Islands and Jamaica where he served as colonial secretary and governor' (Mariz, 1987, p. 65).

of colonial promotional literature such as Wakefield's, arguing that Wakefield and his fellow colonial reformers reshaped 'Britain's colonial landscapes into artful ideals of social harmony' (Grant, 2005, p. 100).

One recently published scholarly study that addresses the utopian qualities of British imperial expansion in the nineteenth century is Duncan Bell's *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900* (2007). Bell discusses the thought of figures such as J. B. Seeley, J.A. Hobson and Goldwin Smith, all of whom, despite their political differences, advocated an internationally federated 'Greater Britain' that 'could be seen as forming an organic unity' (Bell, 2007, pp. 19 and 101). Bell observes that such 'advocates of a global polity were often chastised for being utopian fantasists, their ideas detached from any secure anchorage in British political experience'. The fact that advocates of Greater Britain 'were generally unwilling to provide detailed plans for a federal Greater Britain, preferring instead to talk in elusive terms about reorienting public consciousness, was seen to confirm their crude idealism' (Bell, 2007, p. 19).

Proponents of Greater Britain nonetheless denied that their ambitions were utopian, declaring that 'the federation of the English speaking elements of the empire was not ... "of the character of a Utopian dream, but of the nature of an eminently practical and vital question"' (Anon, *Westminster Review*, vol. 128, 1887, p. 485, quoted in Bell, 2007, p. 19). Bell accepts that 'a federal Greater Britain served as a positive ideal, an inspirational model of the future necessary to crystallise transformative political action in the present.' Bell's analysis is focused mainly on the thought of the imperial advocates of Greater Britain in the latter half of the nineteenth century. He does discuss Wakefield and the colonial reform movement of the early nineteenth century, but only as far as their goals and ambitions differed from those who promoted the later idea of Greater Britain.

> The colonial reformers concentrated more on propagating specific land reform proposals (following the writings of E. G. Wakefield) and on establishing functioning social hierarchies in the colonies in order to encourage emigration by members of all classes, than they did on general constitutional proposals for the colonial empire, let alone on conceptions of a global nation or new understandings of the state. (Bell, 2007, pp. 26-27)

In his analysis of the utopian aspects of the concept of Greater Britain, Bell argues that such proposals were more akin to myths than they were utopian constructs. According to Bell, 'J. D. B. Miller once claimed, drawing on the ideas of Georges Sorel, that imperial federation was a "utopian" project' and that the schemes of the advocates of Greater Britain met with limited practical success because 'they were poor at galvanising excitement and in generating affective bonds.' Bell accepts, however, that the advocates would not have identified themselves or their visions as 'utopian' and that, 'for many, the idea [of Greater Britain] acted more as a Sorellian myth, the antithesis of utopia.' Here Bell uses Sorel's construction of a myth as 'an ideal, a picture of the future, behind which people would coalesce and which served consequently to unify and motivate transformative action' in order to argue that 'unlike utopias, myths could not be refuted; they existed as an image in the mind, and acted as a guide to action in the present.' Subsequently, 'Greater Britain was seen by many of its advocates in this sense [as a myth], hence their common reluctance to propound any specific plans and their reliance on vague rhetoric about unity, glory, and destiny.' Bell argues that the lack of specificity within the plans of those who promoted the idea of Greater Britain was a deliberate tactic and that 'rather than explicating systematic theoretical plans for the future, a course of action that many considered counterproductive, they often relied on passionate appeals to emotion, to shared values, and to the moral edification of their loosely sketched ideas.' The lack of detail within their schemes ultimately rendered their plans less influential, and successful, than they were intended to be: 'the main dilemma appeared in attempting to translate the myth of global unity, of a providential Greater Britain, into a widely acceptable scheme in an intellectual and political environment both sceptical of their general ambitions and lacking in the revolutionary impetus that a Sorellian myth would require to function adequately (if at all)' (Bell, 2006, pp. 7-8).

Although addressing a different political issue in his work, Bell's discussion of the utopian qualities of the Greater Britain is supportive of the arguments made in this thesis, even if he draws different conclusions regarding whether or not their plans were utopias, or myths. In particular, his focus serves to draw attention to the earlier ideas and conceptual schemes of Wakefield and other colonial reformers whose thought formed the basis for the projected imperial ambitions of the movement for

Greater Britain.[63]

South Australia and New Zealand: imperial utopias?

Whilst scholars of Western utopian literature have not addressed the utopian visions that underpinned the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand, scholars of both South Australian and New Zealand colonial history have not hesitated to claim that Wakefield viewed these colonies as sites for utopian experimentation. In South Australian history, numerous scholars have countenanced the utopian dimensions of Wakefield's plans to colonize South Australia. Joanne Archer, for example, noted the implicitly utopian character of Wakefield's colonial vision: 'Wakefield's theory was more than just an exercise in the facilitation of people from one side of the world to the other; it was also an exercise in social engineering, an attempt to create a model society' (Archer, 2003). Whilst the practical implementation of systematic colonization 'did not work out the way he [Wakefield] expected … [because] there was a constant labour shortage, and the land could simply not support the type of settlement he envisioned',[64] nonetheless systematic colonization was successful

---

[63] One of the differences between Wakefield's works and those that Bell addresses lies in the fact that Wakefield could not envisage the kind of international organization conceived by the late nineteenth-century advocates for Greater Britain. As Bell points out, Wakefield was a strong advocate of colonial self-government and 'was adamant that rule at a distance was detrimental to colonial development, because it took months to communicate with the "mother country"' (Bell, 2007, p. 76). He makes the salient point that, given the state of technological advancement during Wakefield's lifetime, international communication as it then existed made it impossible to conceptualise an internationally federated 'Greater Britain.' Bell argues that by the end of the nineteenth century 'the growing awareness of the potential power of new communications technologies led to a shift in the type of political community that could be envisaged as plausible … by 1870 [it] become possible to imagine a global nation-state, which would have before have been largely unintelligible' (Bell, 2007, p. 28).

[64] Scholars have argued that Wakefield's plans were altered considerably by the time South Australia was created and that the practical implementation of the colony fell quite short of Wakefield's utopian expectations. In Douglas Pike's estimation, by the time South Australia reached the stage of inception 'the planning of Wakefield and Bentham had been modified as the project was taken over by successive strata in the middling class.' As a result of this, Pike argues that 'the final result was a compromise that fell far short of the idealism of the Cambridge men, the practical hardheadedness of the Whig bankers and the liberalism of the Benthamites.' Indeed according to Pike 'in actual fact the new province was only slightly different from the colonies already planted in Australia' (Pike, 1951-52, p. 75). Langley argues that it was Wakefield's own originality that conspired against the undiluted implementation of his schemes: 'Wakefield's own beliefs were too advanced for his age … such ideas as free worship, *laissez-faire*, military conscription, annual and elected parliaments and adult male suffrage were far too much for Westminster to stomach' (Langley, 1969, p. 710). Wakefield himself complained about the changes that were made to his plans for South Australia and in 1849 he wrote: 'The South-Australian act, in the opinion of its authors, was defective in many points, and contained some vicious provisions. In order to get the Bill first through Downing-street, and then through the House of Commons, we had curtailed it and added largely to it against our will. We struck out this provision because it displeased somebody, altered another to conciliate another person, and inserted a third because it embodied somebody's crotchet. Upon the whole, at last, our plan was so disfigured, that we should have disowned it, if enough of the original stuff had not remained to let us hope, that with very good execution, the new principle of colonization would come out well of the trial' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 49).

insofar as it 'improved the lot of Britain's labouring poor.' Archer's estimation of the positive impact that the systematic colonization of South Australia had upon those poor labourers who emigrated to the new colony is supported by 'diaries and letters reveal[ing] that, in general, the immigrants felt they had found a better life in Australia than that which they could have expected in Britain, and they encouraged their families to join them in what one writer called the "land of promise"' (Archer, 2003). In Michael Langley's estimation, the apparent impracticability of successfully implementing systematic colonization in South Austraia was an indication of its basis in idealised theorizing. Langley argues that by 'salvaging what he could, Wakefield was forced to concede that his promised land would be a Crown Colony, while his system of land sale and emigration, the very core of his theory, was administered by a Board of Commissioners appointed by Parliament' (Langley, 1969, p. 710). Langley's description of Wakefield's conception as a 'promised land' is a typical example of the references and general acceptance in the scholarly literature to Wakefield's utopian vision for South Australia. Thus Douglas Pike offers the following appraisal of the utopian qualities of Wakefield's plans for the colonization of South Australia:

> Wakefield's vision in 1835 was of a country systematically settled by young enthusiasts, prudent in their ventures, liberal in their minds and unhampered by the traditional yokes that lay heavy on shoulders at home. From the beginning there was a peculiar integration about the plans for systematic colonization, each separate part having its ordered place in the whole. Perhaps for that reason, Wakefield could never be brought to see any imperfection or incompleteness in his ingenious prescription for healing by one dose all the ailments of English and colonial societies. (Pike, 1957, p. 83)

H. O. Pappe has included Wakefield's plans for the creation of perfected British colonies within an intellectual lineage of romantic and utopian authors. Pappe claims that 'though in him the vision was less accentuated than it was in Carlyle, Dickens, J. S. Mill, Ruskin, Morris, he had started out with a vision of a better world, a world of healthier and lovelier people and of laws forbidding the existence of want, of an Australia Felix' (Pappe, 1951, p. 96). In her Ph.D. thesis of 2004,[65] Jean Booth

---

[65] Gordon Copland's doctoral thesis of 2006, 'A House for the Governor: Settlement Theory, the South Australian Experiment, and the Search for the First Government House', also discusses some of the utopian aspects of Wakefield's thought, but since his focus is upon historical archaeology and 'the search for the first government house' in South Australia, Copland does not engage extensively with utopian literature, or utopian theory. Copland's primary aim is to examine the history of South Australia's colonization in order to define a theory of what constitutes the process of 'settlement.' For

also observed that 'whilst the largely Utopian framework within which the colony was established may have influenced the constituent parts of the new society to some extent, I argue that the existence of an ideological basis to the foundation of South Australia may have been exaggerated' (Booth, 2004, p. 11). Yet despite her analysis of South Australian history and her interpretation of certain aspects of its creation, Booth's discussion of Wakefield's utopianism, and the utopianism that informed the broader movement to colonize South Australia, does not engage in any extensive way with the scholarly literature of utopia. Whilst Booth does note that in early nineteenth-century Britain it was becoming commonplace for colonies to be viewed as potential 'Utopias', her analysis does not extend beyond her claim that South Australia was intended to be a 're-creation of a rural arcadia untainted by any part of the Industrial Revolution, in other words a Utopia' (Booth, 2004, p. 49). Indeed her discussion of the utopian elements of Wakefield's vision is limited to comments such as 'Wakefield's *A Letter from Sydney*, published by Robert Gouger in 1829, is partly predicated upon the Utopian ideals on which his ideal colony would be based.' These ideals 'included prosperity for the capitalists, employment for the workers, freedom from crime and minimal government for all' (Booth, 2004, p. 40). Whilst such comments are by no means inaccurate, Booth's analysis does not directly address the question of how Wakefield's schemes to colonize South Australia and New Zealand can be understood in relation to the broader Western utopian tradition.

New Zealand historians have conducted extensive analyses of New Zealand's rich utopian tradition. Rebecca Durrer, for example, has argued that the 'New Zealand Company [of which Wakefield was a founding member] embarked upon a propaganda campaign to create the "myth of a New Zealand paradise" and to cultivate public opinion supportive of their colonization scheme' (Durrer, 2006, p. 173). Miles Fairburn has suggested that 'over the 19th century the most prominent image of New Zealand was an ideal society for European settlers' (Fairburn, 1989, p. 19). In Fairburn's estimation once New Zealand had been colonized 'a great flood of literature published in Britain tended to focus the Arcadian image of the New World more narrowly on specific British colonies and possessions, including New Zealand' (Fairburn, 1989, p. 20). According to Fairburn, New Zealand was not only visualized

---

further details see Copland, Gordon, 'A House for the Governor: Settlement Theory, the South Australian Experiment, and the Search for the First Government House', Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Archaeology, Flinders University of South Australia., May 2006.

as a generally 'utopian' location by Wakefield and the other colonial promoters; it was visualized as a specifically Arcadian society. In Fairburn's reading of the literature, four themes dominate the texts that visualized both the present and future state of New Zealand society in the nineteenth century: 'that New Zealand was a country of natural abundance, that it provided ample opportunities for labouring people to win an 'independency', that it was a society which naturally created a high level of order, and that its simple life guaranteed middle-class people freedom from status anxiety' (Fairburn, 1989, p. 25). Fairburn uses J.C. Davis's typology of utopian societies to frame his argument that 'the blessings attributed to New Zealand – the contentment and prosperity of its working classes, its natural harmony, the freedom of its middle classes from status anxiety – were predicated upon Arcadianism and not upon any other type of ideal-society thought' (Fairburn, 1989, p. 27).

Fairburn contends that the Arcadian tradition in New Zealand 'imagined that the simplicity of the social organization together with natural abundance [would prevent] the emergence in New Zealand of the Old World's social problems' (Fairburn, 1989 p. 27). For Fairburn, the Arcadian tradition in New Zealand was not entirely coterminous with the classical reading of Arcadianism presented by Davis:

> of the themes constituting the Arcadian conception of New Zealand, the most common was the notion of New Zealand as a land of natural abundance … adherents [of the belief in New Zealand's Arcadian abundance] crossed all boundaries of class, religion, political persuasion, and region … in the New Zealand version [of Arcadia] man has a dynamic relationship with the abundance, whereas in the classical descriptions of Arcadia it is passive.

In Fairburn's estimation this 'difference reflects the incorporation into the New Zealand version of the Victorian imperative of material progress, the belief that material betterment stimulates moral growth which in its turn produces more material growth and so on in an everlasting upward spiral' (Fairburn, 1989, pp. 29-33). Fairburn points to the almost universal belief in New Zealand's natural abundance, and its generally Arcadian qualities, when he writes that '…the myth of the natural advantages [of New Zealand] was not propagated solely by business interests … working men did not have a different, opposing, conception of New Zealand' (Fairburn, 1989, pp. 36-37).

Despite Fairburn's assessment of the Arcadian qualities of New Zealand's nineteenth century intellectual history, his work does not offer a comprehensive account of the ways in which Wakefield's work relates to the wider canon of Western utopian literature. Whilst Fairburn's work demonstrates that scholars of New Zealand history have addressed the utopian qualities of the plans and literature that were written to promote and advance its colonization by the British, scholars have not, for the most part, discussed New Zealand's utopian history in relation to other utopian ideas and authors from the nineteenth century. Sargisson and Sargent (2004) provide a comprehensive discussion of the history of utopian settlements in New Zealand, but their work eschews extensive discussion of Wakefield's plans. Wakefield's works are excluded from their analysis because his plans cannot be considered 'successful' in the same ways as the intentional communities that their work investigates. Sargisson and Sargent offer the following definition of what constitutes an 'intentional community', along with their reasons why Wakefield's plans to colonize New Zealand can be considered to be instances of utopian theorizing, but not instances of 'intentional community' creation:

> Intentional communities are groups of people who have chosen to live (and sometimes work) together for some common purpose … but not all colonization schemes are community based or have a vision of creating a better society than that in the old country. The colonization of New Zealand *did* have such visionary schemes; therefore, the history of intentional communities in New Zealand is virtually identical with the history of New Zealand. Still, the colonization schemes as designs to create better communities with specific goals were short-lived, as were some other attempts to create communities in early New Zealand. (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. 6)

James Belich also argues that, within Britain, 'comparisons of New Zealand with both Paradise and Britain became common and uncontroversial' over the course of the nineteenth century. Belich did examine the utopian qualities of the vast amounts of colonial promotional literature published in the nineteenth century, describing the kinds of literature that promoted the 'formal settlement' of British colonies by the upper and middle classes as 'booster literature.' According to Belich, 'booster literature had a paradise complex. It portrayed newlands as biblical lands of Canaan, Lands of Goshen, and Gardens of Eden, and invoked secular paradises too: El Dorado, ripe for plunder, virtuous rural Arcadia, or more organized and urbanized

Utopia proper' (Belich, 2009, p. 154). Addressing the utopian qualities of this wider sphere of literature that we can readily associate with Wakefield's works, Belich argues that such literature:

> … did connect the emigration decision to a vague yet powerful pre-existing package of hopes. Reference to biblical promised lands can seem a mere turn of speech to us today, but we need to bear in mind that the nineteenth century was still a biblical age. The Bible was the best-known source of metaphor, especially to the literate lower classes. Various secular Utopianisms were also on the rise in the nineteenth century, and here boosters also sought to exploit the spirit of the age. Some looked upward to heaven for their promises land; some looked backward to an idealized 'world we have lost.' Others looked forward, to a religious millennium or a socialist paradise on earth. Booster literature encouraged people prone to seek promised lands to look outwards for them – to the settler newlands. (Belich, 2009, p.154)

As Fairburn also informs us, New Zealand 'was variously designated the "better" or "brighter" "Britain of the South", "the Land of Goshen", a "land of plenty", "an earthly paradise", the "labourer's paradise", the "workingman's paradise"' (Fairburn, 1989, p. 24). As we can see above, Sargisson and Sargent have argued that the plans Wakefield had for New Zealand were indeed 'visionary schemes', but they also go further and suggest that New Zealand has 'historically been viewed as a land of opportunity attracting settlers, conquerors and colonizers. Paradise, Eden, and a Heaven on Earth, this beautiful and abundant land has been, for many, a place in which to try to create a utopia' (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. xv). Dominic Alessio also contends that utopian modes of thought have played a crucial part in New Zealand's intellectual history. In Alessio's estimation 'in part this New Zealand utopian tradition might have had a connection with the country's late European colonization and its distance from the Old World, which could have given Anglo-American writers and visitors the impression that this last New World might just turn out to be a successful variant of Sir Thomas More's original prototype' (Alessio, 2004, p. 75). A.H. Reed's popular history of Canterbury, *The Story of Canterbury* (1949), also provides us with a romantic interpretation of Canterbury's foundation and further demonstrates that both scholars and popular commentators have viewed both New Zealand and Canterbury as utopian experiments. In Reed's view, Wakefield's plans for British systematic colonization in Canterbury (and the British Empire generally) were premised upon utopian ideals: 'Wakefield beheld a

vision of a better way, and having built a castle in the air, set himself with vigour and determination to re-erect it on solid foundations' (Reed, 1949, p. 80).

Other scholars have argued that Wakefield's plans for the recreation of British society in South Australia and New Zealand were not only utopian because they were intended to be 'perfect'; they were utopian because Wakefield sought to recreate a mythical, romantic era from the British past. In Keith Sinclair's estimation, 'Wakefield's central aim, the preservation of the existing social and economic structure, was essentially a conservative one.' According to Sinclair, 'in picturing the future colonial community, [Wakefield] looked back to a legendary past, to the squire surrounded by his contented, cap-tipping yokels, in the good old days before industrialism and new ideas had upset the rural harmony' (Sinclair, 1961, p. 47). Sargisson and Sargent also provide evidence in favour of the argument of the utopian yet conservative nature of Wakefield's plans for colonization when they inform us that 'the settlement of New Zealand was designed to be a conservative utopia with a gentry' (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. 12).

Such scholarly assessments demonstrate that Wakefield's works do have a distinctly utopian basis. However, Wakefield's concept of utopian imperial colonization has not been widely discussed by scholars of Western utopian thought and his works have been omitted from the canon of nineteenth century Western utopian literature. Similarly, New Zealand and South Australian historians have neglected the opportunity to make comparisons between Wakefield's works and those of the wider utopian canon. The next three chapters will perform a close reading of Wakefield's most relevant published works in order to fully demonstrate the ways in which he can be considered to be a utopian thinker. We will begin with a discussion of Wakefield's ideal system for British colonial expansion, the theory of systematic colonization.

Chapter Four
Systematic Colonization: A Perfect Theory?

Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization is crucial to understanding his importance as a utopian thinker. Wakefield intended (and attempted) to use the theory of systematic colonization in the colonization of South Australia[66] and New Zealand, but he also claimed that it could be used by the British government, or any other government or private group, for any program of colonial expansion. He believed that systematic colonization, as a theory of imperial expansion, had the potential for universal application. In this sense, systematic colonization was a general theory of colonial expansion. From a utopian perspective, systematic colonization presents an attempt to both control and idealize the process of British imperial expansion. Robert Owen, for example, argued that his system of education was not simply the only practicable way to create an ideal society, it was also the most ideal means through which such a process could occur. As we shall see, Wakefield had a similar conception of the utopian utility of systematic colonization.

This chapter will assess Wakefield's argument that systematic colonization was essential not only for the reform of British colonial policy but also for the alleviation of the social, economic and political problems facing Britain in the 1830s. A close analysis of the economic and logistical practicalities of Wakefield's plans helps us to grasp his utopian optimism concerning the creation of 'systematic' colonial societies as sites of social experiment within an ideally expanded British empire. These elements of Wakefield's thinking provide the basis for an assessment

---

[66] By the time South Australia was officially colonized in 1836, Wakefield had severed his connection with the South Australian Association. He had no direct role in the process of colonial establishment itself, which was administered and carried out by figures such as Robert Torrens, Robert Gouger, George Fife Angas, and John Hindmarsh *et al.* Wakefield's decision to abandon the South Australian project has been attributed to his disappointment and ultimate frustration with the changes that the British government and other colonial reformers made to his original plans. In particular, he considered that the price the British government set for land sales in South Australia to be too low. He argued that the British government and the South Australian Association were seeking a minimum price for land in South Australia that was insufficient to be able to 'effect anything on the lines he envisaged.' Wakefield 'quarrelled violently with [Robert] Gouger over this and, in a storm of resentment, washed his hands of the whole project in South Australia, leaving the selection of members of the Commission to Torrens and Gouger. Thus Wakefield disappeared from the official scene, leaving only his original inspiration to guide the colony's destiny' (Langley, 1969, pp. 710-711). Wakefield also sought to colonize New Zealand using his scheme of systematic colonization, but according to Lyman Tower Sargent 'the Wakefield scheme was only attempted in Canterbury and even there only briefly' (Sargent, 2001, p. 2).

in the following two chapters of the utopian qualities of his plans for colonizing South Australia and New Zealand and, as a consequence, a fuller understanding and appreciation of his work in relation to the wider Western utopian tradition.

Systematic colonization and colonial troubles

Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization was intended to establish a profitable and proportional balance between the amounts of capital and labour within colonial economies. The fundamental importance of this aim is set forth in Wakefield's summary of his theory of systematic colonization in his 'Outline of a System of Colonization' (Appendix to *Letter from Sydney*, 1829):

> Article I – It is suggested that a payment in money of [an unspecified amount] 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 – 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.

> Artice 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.

> 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. (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), pp. 178-181)

These articles constitute the economic framework of Wakefield's theory of systematic colonization. The South Australian Land Company of 1831, of which Wakefield was one of 22 founding members, advocated the use of systematic colonization from the outset. Their 1831 prospectus stated that

> … the promoters of this undertaking have framed a set of Regulations for the disposal of waste land according to an uniform system, having for object, the prevention of the numerous evils which have arisen in all modern colonies, from the infinite variety of modes in which the *basis* of colonization has been treated.

The Company believed that systematic colonization would facilitate 'the greatest progress of colonization' in South Australia (South Australian Land Company, 1831, p. 4). The 'leading principles' of colonization enumerated by the Land Company were, for the most part, consistent with Wakefield's own stipulations (South Australian Land Company, 1831, pp. 5-8). Their 1831 prospectus proposed that the new colony would consist 'principally of labourers and farmers' (South Australian Land Company, 1831, p. 18). In Wakefield's 1834 scheme addressed specifically to colonizing South Australia, *The New British Province of South Australia,* he argued that 'the whole of [the 'purchase-money of public land'] is to be employed in conveying poor labourers to the colony' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 105). The Commission that would be established to oversee the management of the colony's affairs would organize and administer the use of these funds obtained from the sale of land. This would ensure that 'the supply of labour will be measured by the quantity of employment; deficiency and excess being at all times equally prevented.' One of the

most important tenets of Wakefield's scheme was his belief that such a Commission should[67]

> … fix such a price … as will prevent the labourers taken out with the purchase-money of new land, from becoming landowners until others shall have arrived to take their place in the market of hired labour … [and that] for every acre appropriated there will be a supply of labour wherewith to cultivate it. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 105)

Wakefield considered that the problems arising in previous colonial ventures from an unequal balance between capital and labour must be avoided. Specifically, the size of individual land holdings made available to capitalists should be limited. His reasoning on this point is revealing and critical. His concern was not that large holdings would lead to a deleterious concentration of power. Rather, if the land owned by one capitalist became too large, the owner would not have a sufficient labour force to cultivate the land effectively. Thus Wakefield writes:

> … it is quite as necessary, that the field of production should never be too large; should never be so large as to encourage hurtful dispersion, as to promote that cutting up of capital and labour into small fractions, which, in the greater number of modern colonies, has led to poverty and barbarism, or speedy ruin. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 89)

Wakefield was concerned that, since the land available in South Australia was of a potentially limitless extent, upon arrival emigrants would all seek to become capitalists and landowners themselves. Thus it was necessary to place a limit on both the amount of land designated for sale, and upon how many emigrants could themselves own land: 'the land of a colony having no natural limit, if the government do not place some artificial limit on the appropriation of it by individuals, every individual in the colony is tempted to become a land-owner and cultivator' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 89). In restricting the ownership of land, systematic colonization

---

[67] As Wakefield points out in *A View of the Art of Colonization* (1849), 'the South-Australian Act confided the business of colonization apart from government to a commission, the members of which were to be appointed by the Crown; that is, by the Colonial Office' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 49). The South Australia Act itself states that 'it shall be lawful for his majesty … to appoint three or more fit persons to be commissioners to carry certain parts of this act and the powers and authorities hereinafter contained into execution.' The Board of Commissioners was intended to govern the colony in consort with a Governor appointed by the Crown, and as Douglas Pike informs us 'the Wakefield theory of systematic colonization was trusted to a Board of Commissioners, and in this way the control of land sales and emigration was taken out of the hands of the Colonial Office' (Pike, 1951-52, p. 75).

would ensure that the colony would always have a plentiful supply of labour in proportion to the land and capital of the colony.

An equal proportion of men and women was also a central tenet of Wakefield's plans for colonization. As he writes in *The New British Province of South Australia:* '*All the poor persons taken to the colony by means of the Emigration Fund, shall be, as far as it is possible to make the selection, young adult persons, of both sexes in an equal proportion*' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 107, emphasis in original). An equal balance between the sexes was crucial in order to populate the colonies, but also to provide male colonists with incentives to thrift and sobriety, thus ensuring that they would be reliable and effective labourers. In South Australia:

> All the evils which have so often sprang from a disproportion between the sexes [in British colonies], would be avoided. Every pair of immigrants would have the strongest motives for industry, steadiness, and thrift. In a colony thus peopled, there would scarcely ever be any single men or single women: nearly the whole population would consist of married men and women, boys and girls, and children.

Wakefield believed that South Australia would be most successfully colonized by young, childless married couples. This was a view he shared with Jeremy Bentham, who had argued in his *Colonization Proposal for South Australia* (1831) that

1. No settler in a single state is to be accepted.
2. Not any person in a state of childhood.
3. All settlers shall go as married couples.
4. No couple shall be allowed to take with it any child. (Bentham, 1831, p. 164)

As a result of a balanced proportion between the sexes, South Australia soon 'would be an immense nursery, and, all being at ease without being scattered, would offer the finest opportunity that ever occurred, to see what may be done for society by universal education' (Wakefield, 1834, pp. 110-111).

Once a new body of colonists from within Britain was organized, they should migrate to their new home as a whole. This was another important general tenet of his theory of systematic colonization. In addition to the practical economic benefits from exporting an entire colony simultaneously, Wakefield argued, 'in a moral point of view … a large body of colonists from the very beginning is indispensable, to sustain the spirits of all, to inspire confidence and good humour, [and] to prevent the

hesitation and despondency which are apt to infect a small number of settlers in a wide wilderness' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 139). Colonization, he felt, could only be successful if it were conducted on a suitably large scale and that 'in colonization, as in war, it is always wise, when it is possible, to operate with masses.'

Wakefield stresses the importance of 'rendering the colony as like as possible to England from the very beginning of its career,' envisaging that as soon as the colonists decide to migrate they would become 'a new public, separate from the old one, with public wants, objects, and interests, different from those of the old state.' Wakefield's belief that the colonists should be 'a temporary *imperium in imperio,* a small nation on the move' prior to their departure from Britain was intended to ensure that they 'run no risk of losing those habits of concert and subordination which give peace and power to long-established societies' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 140). Consequently, 'a colony ought to be made, even before its departure, a distinct and well-regulated society', since 'such a society will remove with order, and can hardly fail to be established in peace and prosperity' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 142).[68] Wakefield's imaginative conception of new colonies being independent miniature versions of Britain prior to their arrival in the actual location of the new colony is strongly indicative of his utopian perspective. Although the colonies he sought to establish would be so many extensions of Britain, and thus remain constituent parts of the wider British empire, the idea that they would nonetheless be from the outset smaller, perfected versions of Britain illustrates the utopian vision that underlies his work.

Besides the economic benefits of systematic colonization for both the colonists and the British government, Wakefield's theory was inspired by his normative disapproval of the penal colonies Britain had established in Australia, and his opposition to the free granting, or unregulated sale, of colonial land. The lack of success that had marked the history of the Swan River colony in Western Australia since its inception in 1829[69] was the primary example that Wakefield used to

---

[68] Wakefield was opposed to the British government administering its colonies entirely from London and believed that colonial self government was important to the success of any new colonial venture. In Wakefield's view, 'if colonies were so many extensions of an old society, they would never submit to be governed from a distance' (Wakefield, 1833(1968) p. 579).

[69] For details of the early history of the Swan River colony see: Berryman, Ian (ed.), *Swan River Letters*, Swan River Press: Western Australia, 2002; Cameron, J.M.R., *Ambition's Fire: the Agricultural Colonization of Pre-Convict Western Australia*, University of Western Australia Press: Western Australia, 1981; Appleyard, R. T. and Manford, Toby, *The Beginning : European Discovery*

demonstrate the severe problems that could be caused in a colony by a lack of regulation and systematic control of land sales. He traced the problems that had occurred in the Swan River colony 'not to a want of labour absolutely; for plenty of workmen were taken to the colony by the first emigrant capitalists; but to the want of arrangements for preserving constancy and combination of labour' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 99). In his discussion of the Swan River colony in *The New British Province of South Australia*, he quotes an article from the *Literary Gazette,* (of November 29, 1831) which claimed that 'the original cause of failure at the Swan River appears to have been the inattention of government to that irrational desire to obtain large tracts of wilderness, which belongs to most emigrants from an old to a new country.' But in Wakefield's estimation, the Swan River colony did not fail because of the lack of governmental regulation of such an 'irrational' desire. It failed because the lack of regulation of land sales in the colony led to a lack of an adequate labour supply. In Wakefield's own words, 'To THE WANT OF LABOUR, and to that alone, may be traced all the evils that have afflicted this infant colony' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 99, emphasis in original).

Wakefield's critique of the Swan River colony is re-emphasized in another of his works, *England & America* (1833), where he writes that 'in the last colony founded by Englishmen – the Swan River settlement – … a great mass of capital, of seeds, implements, and cattle, has perished for want of labourers to use it' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 472). Whilst he does mention 'the false accounts of its prosperity now and then received in England' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 485), Wakefield does not criticize the fact that the Swan River colony had been promoted in utopian terms. For example, J.M.R. Cameron has argued that Captain John Stirling, the figure who was primarily responsible for the initial colonization of Swan River in 1829, 'was the most effective proponent of an antipodean paradise' in Western Australia. Other figures supported Stirling's claims in favour of the utopian potential of Swan River and Cameron argues that 'Sir John Barrow of the Admiralty, one of the founders of the

---

and Early Eettlement of Swan River, Western Australia, University of Western Australia Press: Western Australia, 1979; Cowan, Peter, *A colonial experience : Swan River 1839-1888, from the diary and reports of Walkinshaw Cowan, secretary to Governor Hutt - clerk of the Councils, Perth, guardian of Aborigines, resident magistrate*, P. Cowan: Claremont, Western Australia, 1978; Markey, D., *More a symbol than a success: foundation years of the Swan River Colony*, Westbooks: Bayswater, Western Australia, 1977; and Cameron, J.M.R., 'Western Australia, 1616-1829: An Antipodean Paradise' *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 140, No. 3 (October), 1974, pp. 373-385.

Royal Geographical Society … accepted Stirling's assessment of the land quality completely and, in the April 1829 issue of the *Quarterly Review*, elaborated upon it, comparing Swan River to Hesperia – the Grecian "Isles of the Blest" – and Goshen – the biblical "land of plenty"' (Cameron, 1974, pp. 381-382). Because the Swan River experiment was not particularly successful as a colonial venture in its early years, and ultimately became a penal colony in 1849 because of the economic difficulties it had continued to face, Wakefield portrays the Swan River experiment in a completely negative light throughout his works.[70] It is interesting, nevertheless, that he would later use similarly utopian language to promote his own colonial ventures.

Wakefield argued that the problems that had beset the Swan River colony illustrated the difficulties caused by insufficient regulation in the process of colonization. Without effective regulation, colonial societies such as the Swan River would be unable to sustain the economic and social distinctions necessary to ensure that sufficient amounts of labourers worked for sufficient numbers of capitalists. Moreover, without these economic and social distinctions, colonial societies would fail to achieve their desired identity as civilized, orderly and, most of all, British societies. According to Wakefield, 'if each person appropriate no more land than he is able to cultivate, still, *all* being independent proprietors, both capital and labour are divided into fractions as numerous as the cultivators.' The result of such fragmentation was the removal of all class and economic distinctions. Consequently, in such an environment, 'there is no class of capitalists, no class of labourers; nor indeed any classification, all being the same.' In an unregulated colony, Wakefield argued, 'it is impossible that large masses of capital and many hands should be employed in the same work, at the same time, and for a long period' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 90). Clearly, in his view, the system of land allocation was of critical importance both to the economic viability and the cultural identity of the colony.

The extent to which Wakefield believed deregulated colonial land sales to be deleterious for both economic and social organization is effectively demonstrated when, in his discussion of the state of society in unregulated colonies, he argues that 'we must not [call such an arrangement] *society*.' Class stratification was necessary in the colonies because if 'there are no classes, all raise the same kind of produce; and there is no motive for exchange amongst the cultivators themselves.' But this was not

---

[70] For more examples of Wakefield's denunciations of the Swan River colony see *A View of the Art of Colonization*, 1849 (1914) p. 43 and *The New British Province of New Zealand*, 1837, pp. 10-13.

simply an economic argument about productivity. Wakefield argued that without class stratification, the colonies would only be capable of producing 'mere necessaries' and would fall 'into a state of but half-civilization.' This loss of civilization would occur because none of the cultivators of land would be able to spend any time contributing to the 'the wants, tastes, and habits which belong to an advanced society' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 91). In Wakefield's view, the only way to counter the problems of colonial dispersion without the use of systematic colonization was to use either 'the greater evil of negro slavery' or convict labour. He was as opposed to the use of slavery or convict labour as he was to the unregulated sale of colonial lands. Yet his position on the question of convict labour was not entirely free of contradiction.

In analyzing Wakefield's critique of the methods of colonization that had previously been used by Britain in North America and Australia, it important to note that he was as opposed to the unregulated sale, or free provision, of land as he was to the creation of penal settlements. Wakefield's opposition to the use of convict labour in the British settler empire was based on his disapproval of the social and moral timbre of penal colonies such as Sydney, along with his belief that convict labour, or slavery, would be economically unnecessary in colonies founded through the process of systematic colonization. His antipathy to convict settlement is most notable in South Australian history, since a prominent feature of South Australia's early history was its non-penal social and economic foundation. South Australia's preclusion of convict labour was initially its most distinguishing feature and 'in that respect at least South Australia was different from any [British] colony which had ever been founded' (Pike, 1951-52, p. 75). As Archer also points out, 'the planners of the colony intended that this community should be free of the problems that had plagued the other Australian colonies through the proper selection of immigrants, the restriction of land, and the concentration of settlement' (Archer, 2003). According to Wakefield, Australia had not been a popular destination for emigrants in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century because of the stigma of convict settlement. In his view 'the great natural advantages of Australia had been counteracted by the moral evils of the convict system' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 134). Wakefield subsequently argued that the act of parliament that would create South Australia 'will provide that no convicts shall ever be transported to this settlement' and that South Australia 'besides never suffering the infliction, will never feel the want of convict labour' (Wakefield, 1834,

pp. 134-135). Wakefield was also opposed to the British government's continued financial investment in penal colonies and he argued that 'as for the penal settlements of the English in Australia, they are societies altogether unnatural; having been founded, and being maintained by the government of England with the produce of taxes paid by the people of England' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 500).

Due to the equal proportion between labour and capital that systematic colonization was intended to ensure, a colony founded on this system would not have an economic need for convict labour. However, in spite of Wakefield's denunciations of the evils inherent within penal colonies and the moral dangers that the use of convict labour presented for free settler colonies, he did not reject the usage of convict labour in free settler colonies outright, provided it was utilised with certain stipulations. In *A Letter from Sydney* (1829), Wakefield argued that:

> There could be no objection to the employment of convicts on various parts of the coast, at a distance from any actual settlement … [and] if good judgment were exercised in the selection of spots calculated to become important sea-port towns, the Transports would act as pioneers to a future army of Emigrants; and when they had paved the way for a settlement, not penal, they might be removed to other desert places. (Wakefield, 1829 (1929) p. 87)

Despite this qualified inconsistency, Wakefield remained, for the most part, strongly opposed to the use of convict labour in British colonies. His antipathy to the moral evils of penal colonies and the economic uncertainty of unregulated colonial land sales thus constitute his main arguments in favour of the reform of Britain's colonial policy in the 1830s. Avoiding these problems while ensuring a proportional balance between labour and capital were, however, not the only aims of Wakefield's advocacy to the British government and the broader population of Britain. He also promoted his theory as a means for improving their social and economic prospects.

An appeal to all classes?

An analysis of the economic principles of systematic colonization reveals that a significant proportion of Wakefield's plan is framed in terms of the dichotomous relationship between capitalists and labourers. However Wakefield's social vision for the colonies was not simply two-dimensional. Rather, his plans for colonies in South Australia and New Zealand were projected as means to create total social environments comprised of emigrants from all of the socioeconomic classes of Britain.

Pressing questions regarding overpopulation and the rapid increase of Britain's pauper population were dominant in the early nineteenth century and Wakefield expressed concern about the potentially revolutionary repercussions of the growth of Britain's numbers of un- (or under-) employed poor.[71] He wrote in 1833 that 'the late insurrection of the peasantry of the south of England, and the modern practice of burning farm-produce, are universally attributed to the misery and discontent' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 339) of Britain's labouring poor. Wakefield claimed that the lives of Britain's labouring poor were worse than slaves or convicts and he believed that 'the peasant of the south of England suffers nearly all the evils, but enjoys none of the advantages, of slavery.' Britain's poor were not only miserable but potentially socially disruptive and violent, and 'if the English had been a martial people, those forlorn men, once roused as they were, would either have destroyed the classes whom they consider their oppressors, or have perished in a servile war' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 339).

Wakefield shared a widespread concern among the educated classes that there was a growing potential for revolution in Britain. He warned that 'if their [Britain's labouring poor] condition be such that it must be worse before it can be better, the crisis is coming' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 353). He observed, somewhat enigmatically, that 'revolutions are terrible, but in one point of view seem better than great political changes conducted without violence. After a revolution comes peace; after a great peaceful change comes, very often, revolution' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 393). This is not to say that Wakefield believed revolution to be inevitable or necessarily beneficial for the resolution of Britain's domestic problems. It seems rather that he entertained the possibility of revolution to highlight the necessity of implementing his own solutions to these problems, and to persuade the labouring poor that, through emigration, their social and economic prospects could be enhanced to an

---

[71] Wakefield did not agree with Thomas Malthus's predictions regarding the problems overpopulation could one day cause in Britain. Whilst he did argue that the economic and political situation in Britain was potentially revolutionary, for Wakefield this predicament had been caused by economic and political problems, not by overpopulation. In *A Letter from Sydney* (1829) he wrote that 'though we should always acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Malthus, for having told us what we had not even guessed till he wrote, namely, the precise reasons why some men are, and ever must be, richer than others; still, we might avoid, for a time, the worst evils of which that eminent philosopher discovered the causes. This, though but a temporary gain, is worth the greatest efforts' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 164). For Wakefield the 'worst evils' that Malthus predicted could only be avoided through the process of systematic colonization. In *The New British Province of South Australia* (1834), he also refers the reader to George Poulett Scrope's *Principles of Political Economy* (1833) 'for a complete anti-Malthusian argument in favour of the *expediency* of extensive colonization' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 101, emphasis in original).

extent never possible if they were to remain in Britain. Indeed despite Marx's criticisms of Wakefield for his apparent lack of interest in allowing colonial labourers to become capitalists themselves,[72] Wakefield did suggest that 'the poor emigrant to South Australia may look forward to a high gratification of that pride which is the greatest incentive to human exertion' and that all of the labourers who emigrated to South Australia would, in time, become landowners themselves (Wakefield, 1834, p. 116). For those whose lives were restricted by Britain's economic problems in the 1830s, life in the colonies at least presented an *opportunity* to better their station in life, even if the reality of colonial life might ultimately not fulfill that promise. Whilst Wakefield's plans for colonization did ultimately favour British capitalists over British labourers, it is nonetheless difficult to deny that his colonial plans were also intended to 'give Britain's poor the opportunity for a better life' (Archer, 2003).

The importance Wakefield placed upon the colonies receiving a supply of financially disadvantaged labourers is further emphasized in *A Letter from Sydney* by a striking legislative proposal that was, at the very least, an innovative approach to family law and social reform. He proposed that poor married couples in Britain unable to support their own children should be transported to the colonies. In Wakefield's view 'parliament should make it a transportable offence to contract marriage without provision for children.' But despite such unions being a transportable offence, 'the whole cost' of transporting these impoverished couples would be subsidised by colonial capitalists. Initially, 'it would … be absolutely necessary to forbid the transports from becoming owners of land' (Wakefield, 1829 (1929), pp. 42-43). However, once the couples arrive in Australia, they would then 'be at liberty *to dispose of their labour to the highest bidder'* and, like the other labouring emigrants, would eventually be able to buy their own land. Wakefield maintains the distinction between labour and capital, but nevertheless preserves the idea of a free market, at least for labour.

This aspect of Wakefield's colonizing scheme was not without its peculiarities. Wakefield argues that the legislation making these impecunious unions a transportable offence should also have a voluntary component. Thus 'parties accused of the offence created by this Statute shall not be prosecuted *without their free consent*

---

[72] As noted in Chapter One, Marx argued that Wakefield's theories did not represent anything more than an attempt to artificially recreate the inequitable economic structures of British capitalism in the previously unregulated economic systems of the colonies.

in writing first had and obtained' (emphasis in original). Wakefield believed that these provisions 'would take off the seeming harshness of the law, and would, no doubt, promote convictions.' Whether Wakefield was entirely serious about this suggestion is open to a degree of speculation since he concludes his account of this particular proposal by asking the reader:

> What think you of the plan? When I mentioned it to our Chief Justice, he, thinking I meant to insult him, coloured up, and said, "are you mad?" I did not answer, but took comfort, repeating to myself after the Abbe Raynal, "Madmen sometimes utter words of profound meaning"'. (Wakefield, 1829 (1929), p. 43)

It is difficult to ascertain whether or not Wakefield included this proposal on a whim or was at least partially serious since he does not mention it in his other writings. Most importantly though it shows us that Wakefield was willing to go to relatively prescriptive extremes in order to ensure that the colonies had an adequate labour supply and that the regulation and systematic control of the emigrants themselves, along with the overall economic progress of the colony, was crucial to his designs. But there are more subtle implications. A plan to people a colony has to be promotional and practical, appealing to numbers of young people as well as to governmental and judicial officials. Wakefield's proposal to transport poor families envisaged a ready source of suitable emigrants who might well seize the opportunity.

Although it can be demonstrated that Wakefield's schemes anticipated benefits for both the wealthy capitalist and the working classes of 1830s Britain, it has been suggested that he was mainly concerned with the problems faced by the middle, or, in his terminology, the 'uneasy' class of nineteenth century Britain. As Buckley and Wheelwright point out Wakefield sought to make the colonies attractive 'for ambitious, educated gentlemen of modest fortune like himself' (Buckley and Wheelwright, 1988, p. 71). Douglas Pike has also argued that:

> [Wakefield's] gospel was not for those bent on preserving inherited wealth or obsolete traditions; nor for dispirited paupers incapable of industry, improvident and generally ill-behaved. His message was for the 'uneasy classes' who needed a little encouragement to shake off their chains and recapture their independence; for the citizen who worked hard, lived frugally, saved his money and invested it wisely. This message was not aimed at the middling class alone but at all those was aspired to enter it – at the thousands of wage-earners who

had enough enterprise and ambition and wanted only opportunity. (Pike, 1957, pp. 77-78)

It is worth emphasising that Wakefield considered the plight of the middle class to be a new and hitherto insufficiently addressed problem in British politics. In *England and America* (1833) he argued that 'the great uneasiness of the middle class in England is a new state of things.' He defines the uneasy class as follows:

> By the uneasy class, I mean those who, not being labourers, suffer from agricultural distress, manufacturing distress, commercial distress, distress of the shipping interest, and many more kinds of distress … the uneasy class consists of three-fourths, or rather perhaps nine-tenths, of all who are engaged in trades and professions, as well as all who, not being very rich, intend that their children should follow some industrious pursuit. (Wakefield, 1833(1968), pp. 355-56)

The growth of the 'uneasy class' was problematic because it contributed to the growth of the disproportionate ratio between capital and labour within Britain. Wakefield sensed that the middle class of Britain were experiencing unprecedented levels of economic and social stress. The members of this relatively 'new' class found themselves the victims of the antipathy of both the laboring majority and the aristocratic minority because of the apparent economic threat they presented to both the poor and the wealthy. Wakefield writes that 'wherever there exist only two classes, as in Russia and the slave-states of America, the ruling class despise the slaves, and the slaves hate their rulers.' However, 'as a middle class grows up, the highest and lowest classes generally conspire to injure those from whom they are separated. England, ever since the [1688] revolution, presents a striking instance of the combination between the aristocracy and the mob for the purpose of harming the middle class' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 386).

Whether Wakefield was correct in his depiction of the victimisation and oppression the British middle class was experiencing from both the poor and the wealthy is not presently relevant. The important fact is that he used this argument in an attempt to persuade the middle class of the benefits they stood to receive from systematic colonization. For example, in *The New British Province of South Australia* Wakefield discusses why middle (to upper) class people would benefit from emigration. According to Wakefield, 'there are two orders of men in England, to

whom a civilized colony, if there were one, would be full of attractions.' The first type of man to whom colonization would appeal most strongly is 'the man of small fortune and large family, who, wanting a knowledge of business, is unable to increase his means [in Britain itself].' Such men, revolted 'at the thought of becoming a backwoodsman in Canada, a convict driver in New South Wales, or a bush-man at the Swan River', would find systematic colonization appealing. They would

> … find present ease without any shock to his habits,—a career for all his sons whatever the number,—husbands for all his daughters, however large the brood,—and for himself, if he had superior or even common talents, a field of profitable exertion and honourable ambition'. (Wakefield, 1834, pp. 122-123)

According to Wakefield, 'in going to South Australia, the prospect of such an emigrant would be one of unmixed good.' Not only would their economic prospects benefit from the possibilities afforded by colonization, they would also not have to fear any 'barbarity' amongst the society of their fellow colonists: '[such an emigrant] is going to a new, but not to a barbarous country; and if, in the new place, he may indulge the social habits and refined tastes which are become his second nature, then the newness of the country is a most favourable circumstance' (Wakefield, 1834, pp. 123-124).

A second group to benefit from colonization would be the 'nouveau riche', who possessed the wealth but not the social capital (or social skills) to realize their ambitions.

> The other order of Englishmen who might, with great advantage to themselves, take part in establishing a civilized colony, consists of young men of good fortune, and what is called mean birth, who, because they are rich, aspire to live on equal terms with the highest ranks, and yet who, not because they are upstarts or new-rich, but because they want impudence and tact, are repelled and insulted by the newest, the most upstart of aristocracies. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 126)

Wakefield initially seems to demean such 'orders of gentlemen', commenting that 'there are not many vices, nor is there any meanness, to which they will not resort, though against their inclination and judgment, for the sake of associating with persons of rank.' However Wakefield is critical of the treatment that such men received from other orders of the British aristocracy. He suggests that wealthy

gentlemen of 'mean birth' who are unable to find acceptance within the ranks of the British aristocracy find themselves in receipt of 'flagrant but wholesome affronts … a mere sham of friendship before their faces, and, behind their backs, contemptuous abuse which seldom fails to come round.' Wakefield then suggests that because 'the founding of a well-planned colony is a great as well as an original work,' engaging in the process of colonization was perhaps the only means by which such men could remedy their existential and social problems. Wakefield argues that for such 'young men of good fortune':

> Taking part in such a work, this capable, but useless and dissatisfied class of men would kill time by action worthy of a man; displaying good qualities hardly known to themselves; indulging in the strongest, though most harmless excitement; gratified by the possession of present consequence and authority; creating an honourable ancestry for their children, and for themselves a higher distinction than mere birth ever bestowed. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 127)

Wakefield also discusses the opportunities colonization provided for middle class British women, for example by increasing their prospects for marriage. In *England & America*, he writes that 'a great proportion of the females in [the middle] class are doomed to celibacy … [because] in England, a certain state of political economy, pride, or prudence, and custom, occasion more unnatural suffering than the villainous theocracies of Italy and Spain' (Wakefield, 1833(1968) pp. 364-365). Indeed 'the English women suffer more than the others, because, living in the world, they are more in the way of temptation, more cruelly tantalised by their intercourse with happy wives and mothers' (Wakefield, 1833(1968) p. 365). Such suffering had occurred in Britain because 'a great proportion of young men in the uneasy class dread marriage, unless there be fortune in the case, as the surest means of increasing their embarrassment.'

Moreover, young middle class men who could not afford marriage contributed to the suffering of middle class women. Their inability to afford marriage lowered the overall moral tone of British society by causing the growth 'of that exuberant prostitution which shocks an American.' This growth in prostitution was injurious to middle class women because 'custom forbids them to practice that sort of "moral restraint" to which their brothers resort without disgrace; and custom is stronger than walls and bars.' Wakefield is arguing that 'moral restraint', or 'the custom of abstaining from marriage, the custom of celibacy' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 352), as

a means to limit the population of Britain caused middle class men to resort to prostitutes as a means of relieving their sexual desires. Middle class women, due to the restraints imposed upon them by social customs and mores, could not obtain such relief for themselves. Thus Wakefield argues that if British middle class men continued to refuse to marry middle class women, the economic and existential problems faced by British middle class women would continue. In the colonies, however, British middle class women would be able to marry and raise families of their own, since one of the principles of Wakefield's systematic colonization was to ensure an adequate balance between the sexes. Wakefield presented the colonies as the only means through which the labouring *and* the middle classes could permanently alter the social, economic and existential predicaments they were facing.

Wakefield did not, however, intend for the colonies to appeal only to capitalists and labourers, or to stifled and disaffected members of the middle class. The colonies must appeal to 'all classes' of British society and 'must also furnish a demand for the services of all kinds of people who are not called either capitalists or labourers; such as surveyors, architects, engineers, clerks, teachers, lawyers, and clergymen' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 122). As Rebecca Durrer points out, Wakefield's schemes were intended to appeal to the widest possible cross section of British society: by 'employing labourers, relieving the "uneasy class" and providing financial opportunities to the wealthy, Wakefieldian colonization appealed to all classes' (Durrer, 2006, p. 180).

Appreciating the promotional necessity of making colonization attractive to all classes of society, he argued that 'the attractiveness of the colony to persons of all classes, by which alone persons of all classes would be induced to settle there, must depend upon measures for preserving in the colony the attributes of society and civilization' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 7). Wakefield was not simply looking to alleviate the social problems faced by various classes in Britain. Resolving the problems of the poor and the middle class was crucial to Wakefield's plans, and he was looking to ensure that such problems could not reappear in colonial ventures. However, these problems were, in Wakefield's estimation, the manifestation of Britain's more entrenched economic problems. Wakefield's plan of systematic colonization for Britain's already expanding colonial empire was also intended to ensure the resolution of Britain's critical domestic economic problems.

Solving the domestic crisis

Systematic colonization was promoted in Britain as a scheme to enhance the economic and social prospects of the laboring and middle classes. It was also proposed as an economic policy to remedy problems that were being created in Britain as a result of the structural imbalance between capital and labour. Wakefield identifies 'four states of society' to establish the economic reasoning behind his argument that the systematic expansion of Britain's colonial empire was the most effective economic means by which Britain could solve its domestic problems.

According to Wakefield, 'political economists have described three states of society, the progressive, the stationary, and the retrograde.' The progressive state of society is one 'in which both capital and the field of production increase as fast as population can possibly increase.' In this state, profits and wages are 'constantly high' and, subsequently, 'the people increase as fast as possible.' In the stationary state, 'there is no further room for the productive employment of industry, in which case, profits and wages are constantly as low as possible.' Finally, the retrograde state is one 'in which, generally from moral causes, the field of production constantly decreases … not only are profits and wages constantly at the minimum, but every year some capitalists are reduced to the state of labourers; and yet the labouring class becomes less and less numerous' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), pp. 375-376).

Wakefield then describes a new, fourth state of society, a condition that 'has been the case of England since 1815.' This fourth stage, which Wakefield did not give a specific name, 'may be called stationary as to profits and wages, but which is progressive as to the amount of capital, the extent of the field for employing industry, and the number of people.' This was the cause of England's problems in the 1830s because whilst 'both capitalists and labourers will increase in number', there was not a sufficient increase in the 'field of production' to allow capitalists to obtain profits that were high enough to maintain high wages. According to Wakefield 'the land … from which a society derives its food, constitutes its field of production' and he argued that 'as the field of production was not enlarged so rapidly as capital increased, more and more competition among capitalists led to the lowest rate of profit, and made the condition of the greater number worse than that of the smaller number.' The increase in the amounts of capital and human population without an

expansion of the field of production available to British capitalists was the underlying and intensifying cause of Britain's social, economic and political problems. In Wakefield's own terms: 'this change of the proportion between two of the elements of production (capital and the size of Britain's population) and the third or chief element (Britain's field of production), explains the coincidence of enormous, nay, of rapidly increasing national wealth, with the uneasiness of the middle class and the misery of the bulk of the people' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), pp. 375-376).

Wakefield believed that 'every class' in Britain was suffering due to this 'excess of people in proportion to territory' (Wakefield, 1829 (1929), p. 82) and that Britain generally suffered from 'a want of room for people of all classes' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 65). Large scale emigration, facilitated by the process of systematic colonization, was the best means by which Britain could assure social stability and economic prosperity. The problems that Britain was experiencing from increasing population and insufficient readily available, cultivable physical space could be circumvented by creating colonies in places where land was almost infinite.[73] This would alleviate Britain's domestic problems by providing an outlet for its 'superabundance of capital and labourers' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 485). Britain could not expand or convert the ocean surrounding Britain into land, but the effect on Britain's economy would be the same by expanding its colonial empire.

> Suppose the sea, for three hundred miles east and west of England, to be turned into excellent land … [cultivated] with the greatest combination of power, according to the English system of farming … [and was] of so good a quality that the gross produce of all capital employed on it should be sufficient to replace that capital, to pay high wages, and to leave high profits for the

[73] Wakefield also argued that systematic colonization would provide a remedy to the domestic problems Britain was facing from the impacts of the Corn Laws, provided that the Corn Laws were themselves repealed. In Wakefield's estimation, the Corn Laws were obstructing the expansion of British agriculture and, when combined with the literally finite physical space available within England itself, were contributing directly to the increase of misery and social upheaval within 1830s Britain. In *England & America*, Wakefield wrote that 'in England … the field of production is limited, first by nature, and next by the corn laws, which decree that the people of the United Kingdom shall have no bread but that which is grown in the United Kingdom' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 372). For Wakefield, the Corn Laws exacerbated the problems created by Britain's limited field of production and thus contributed to the reduction of wages and profits within Britain itself. Subsequently, Wakefield believed that if the Corn Laws were repealed and Britain's colonial empire expanded, the food shortages facing Britain in the 1830s as a result of the Corn Laws and its limited field of production would be overcome. Bernard Semmel also suggests that 'Wakefield advocated the repeal of the Corn Laws to assure England of an "informal" trade empire, as well as a formal colonial one' (Semmel, 1961, p. 516).

capitalists … would not the effect be a general rise of profits? (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 371)

Since this was obviously impossible, it followed that extending the British colonial empire where land was readily available was thus an economic and physical necessity.

Such arguments seem to confirm that Wakefield was convinced that colonization would remedy the problems facing Britain from overpopulation and the disproportion between capital and labour. Yet Booth disagrees, claiming that Wakefield 'stated that colonization did not in fact provide a viable answer to excess population' (Booth, 2004, p. 158). Wakefield did in fact concede that 'in modern times, no old country has ever obtained relief from excessive numbers by means of colonization' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 513). But this was because 'in no one colony of modern times, has any uniform system [i.e. systematic colonization] been adopted even for a week' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), p. 531).

Universal applicability: a perfect theory?

Wakefield was ambitious as well as optimistic. He believed that systematic colonization was not only the most effective means Britain could use to create new colonies wherever it chose to do so, it was also the best means to reform the political economy of already established British colonies. Thus he argued that 'it is our earnest wish, that through the success of this experiment in colonization [South Australia] … the Canadas, Van Diemen's Land, New South Wales, and South Africa, may obtain such a reform of their colonizing economy, as shall render each of them a mere extension of the mother country without the evils arising from want of room' (Wakefield, 1834, pp. 135-136). South Australia was intended to provide an example for all future British colonial development: 'we hope and trust … that [the] early and complete success [of systematic colonization in South Australia] will lead to the foundation of other colonies in various parts of the world' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 136).

Wakefield speculated that systematic colonization could be used by any nation to create a new colony, or to extend its existent dominion in land already colonized. It was the best means of increasing the size and extent of a nation's 'civilized' empire and ensuring that the expansion of its own field of domestic production was effective and profitable. For example, Wakefield argued that the American government should 'regulate the proportion between numbers [of labourers] and acres of appropriated

land' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 489) to ensure that the proportion between capital and labour in America would remain stable and prosperous. In keeping with a key principle of systematic colonization he proposed that the American government should raise the price of land so that labourers would be prevented 'from becoming independent land-owners until others had followed to take their place.' The benefits Wakefield believed America would gain from regulated land sales are many: 'people [would be] … less dispersed than they are, should help each other more, should produce more with the same labour, should have a higher rate of profit and a higher rate of wages.' Wakefield also believed that the creation of a fund from land sales would enable the American government to abolish slavery. As a direct corollary of systematic, governmental regulation of land sales, 'then might free labour take the place of slave labour, then might the owners of slaves and of land set free their slaves without loss, then might slavery be abolished without injury to any one, with the greatest benefit to all' (Wakefield, 1833(1968), pp. 489-490).

Wakefield's belief in the wide reaching reformative potential of systematic colonization is noteworthy because it reflects his conviction that his plan had universal applicability. Systematic colonization would not only allow Britain to create colonies that were a great advance in the history of its own imperial expansion, it provide as template for resolving any nation's colonial problems. Systematic colonization was superior to all other modes of colonization not only because it would ensure, in actual practice, a colony's proportional balance of labour and capital. It was preferable because it was, quite simply, an ideal *system* of colonization.

> Those who are at all acquainted with the evils that have resulted, in many of our colonies, from a total want of system in the disposal of waste land, and from the partiality with which the power of withholding, as well as the power of granting, has been exercised, will, though examining the subject with a colonial view merely, perceive the great advantages of a system, which is *uniform,* which is *permanent,* which provides for *complete impartiality,* and under which, the *liberty of appropriation will be perfect,* subject to only one condition. (Wakefield, 1834, emphasis in original, p. 104)

Wakefield often claimed to have been the first author to undertake a comprehensive assessment of Britain's methods of colonization. He boasted that 'this subject [colonization] [has not been] thoroughly examined by any writer on political

economy' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 498).[74] Wakefield considered himself to be an authority on the subject and he was firmly convinced of the inherent superiority of his schemes for colonization. He also believed that his plans were historically unique. The following excerpt from *England & America* is worth quoting in its entirety to illustrate the extent of his confidence in systematic colonization as the ideal means for expanding the British colonial empire.

> In any colony where this perfect rule for treating the chief elements of colonization should be adopted, colonization would proceed, not as everywhere hitherto, more or less, by scattering of people over a wilderness, and placing them for ages in a state between civilization and barbarism, but by the extension to new places of all that is good in an old society; by the removal to new places of people, civilized, and experienced in all the arts of production; willing and able to assist each other; excited to the most skilful application of capital and labour by ready markets for disposing of surplus produce; producing, by means of the most skilful industry in the richest field, more than colonial industry has ever produced; obtaining the highest profits of capital and the highest wages of labour; offering the strongest attraction for the immigration of capital and people; increasing rapidly; enjoying the advantages of an old society without its evils; without any call for slavery, or restrictions on foreign trade; an old society in every thing save the uneasiness of capitalists and the misery of the bulk of the people. Colonization, as hitherto conducted, may be likened to the building of a bridge; a work, no part of which is complete until the whole be completed: according to the method here proposed, colonization would be like the making of a tunnel; a work, in the progress of which each step must be complete before another step can be taken. (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 549)

In Wakefield's estimation, once systematic colonization was properly and fully implemented, it would represent 'the first attempt since the time of the ancient Greeks to Colonize systematically' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 136). As already discussed, scholars are generally divided on the question of Wakefield's originality. Lionel Robbins, for example, argues that Wakefield believed that systematic colonization and the use of the 'sufficient price' to be his own 'great political invention' (Robbins, 1958, p. 160). Robbins also contends that Wakefield's claims of originality are accompanied by 'wide, sweeping historical generalizations [regarding the previous history of European colonization] … the qualified defence of slavery and the unqualified assertion that [in the process of colonization] it was a matter of slavery,

---

[74] As noted in Chapter One, Wakefield had numerous predecessors in the field of large scale emigration and colonization and was one of many British authors who addressed this question in the early to mid nineteenth century.

hired labour or chaos' (Robbins, 1958, p. 161). However, Robbins also points to one central issue relating to the utopian qualities of Wakefield's scheme: the very simple fact that the scheme was an artificial imposition of structure and regulation upon the previously unregulated land of British colonies.

In discussing how Wakefield's scheme was often misunderstood during his lifetime, Robbins observes that 'the recommendation that what, in the circumstances, was a free good [colonial land] should be made artificially scarce, was something which, to minds accustomed to regard free goods as good things, was (and is) intrinsically difficult to swallow' (Robbins, 1958, p. 161). Wakefield believed that regulation and organization, in and of themselves, were good and fundamentally necessary components of successful colonial development. It is a belief with a distinctly utopian resonance. The following chapters will examine the extent to which regulation was central to Wakefield's plans for colonization. Without regulation the colonies he envisaged could not be created. The utopian dimensions of his thinking emerge in Wakefield's portrayal of his systematic plan as 'the perfect rule' of colonization. In his view, the plan was capable of creating a colonial society that would have 'the advantages of an old society without its evils' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 549). The utopian characteristics of Wakefield's thought – solving at one stroke the ills of Britain whilst simultaneously founding an idealized British colony purged of those evils – are clearly revealed in an analysis his plan to colonize South Australia.

Chapter Five

Utopia in South Australia

Promoting the systematic colonization of South Australia was Wakefield's first project as a colonial reformer.[75] His writings on this subject provide us with the earliest and most notable examples of the utopian vision that motivated his career as an advocate of British colonial expansion. The utopian qualities of his plans for South Australia are best demonstrated in *A Letter from Sydney* (1829) and *The New British Province of South Australia* (1834). His discussion of the 'art of colonization' in other works, including *England & America* (1833) and *A View of the Art of Colonization* (1849), provide a wider context for our discussion of the utopian nature of the South Australian scheme. Wakefield's proposals for the South Australia project will also be placed within the context of utopian perspectives expressed by others who were involved in the colonization of South Australia.

---

[75] Despite his public ignominy, between 1829 and 1832 Wakefield was involved in the creation of several colonization societies and groups that were intended to colonize South Australia. According to Douglas Pike, 'The first group formed [with the express intention of colonizing South Australia] by Wakefield was called the National Colonization Society. The list of members included very few practical men from the business world. The greater proportion were young and ardent intellectuals, most of whom had studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, during the 1820s' (Pike, 1951-52, p. 70). From 1831 to 1834 the name of the group spearheading the efforts to colonize South Australia changed from the National Colonization Society, to the South Australian Land Company (initially a chartered company) to the South Australian Association. This name change reflected the fact that the South Australian Association sought to colonize South Australia not 'as was formerly proposed, by means of a royal charter, but by act of Parliament' (Wakefield, 1834, pp. 1-2). In Langley's estimation, the changes in the constitution and political ambitions of the successive associations and companies seeking to colonize South Australia were a direct result of the influence of the British Colonial Office. Langley argues that the Colonial Office's opposition to Wakefield's schemes, combined 'with [Wilmot] Horton's continued resistance,' initially led to 'the end of the National Colonization Society and the creation in its stead of the South Australian Land Company.' According to Langley, the aims of the South Australian Land Company 'were purely economic' and, despite the apparent diminution in its 'republican' aspirations, it was 'to be succeeded in 1832 by the South Australian Association under the auspices of which the South Australia Act was steered through Parliament' (Langley, 1969, p. 710). The bill to create South Australia as a province of Britain 'was actually introduced in the Commons by members of the S.A. Association, a new society which Wakefield had formed after the Land Company had ceased to function' (Pike, 1951-52, p. 74). Whilst *A Letter from Sydney* had received support from 'a few such notables as John Stuart Mill and Malthus' (Pike, 1957, p. 53) when in 1834 legislation enabling the creation of South Australia was passed in the British parliament South Australia was, as J.M. Main notes, 'the only British colony whose foundation rested upon a parliamentary statute' (Main, in Jaensch (ed.), 1986, p. 1). For a concise account of South Australia's history until 1836 see Dickey and Howell (ed.), 'Introduction', 1986, pp. 7-8.

A Letter from Sydney: the blueprint for utopia?

A Letter from Sydney (1829) and *The New British Province* (1834), the major works Wakefield wrote on the subject of South Australia's colonization, are the primary textual representations of his utopian plans for the colony. Before analyzing the details of Wakefield's utopian vision, it is important to understand how *A Letter from Sydney* was constructed as a text. *The New British Province*, a directly promotional tract, was preceded by *A Letter from Sydney*, ostensibly written as a first person narrative by a colonist in New South Wales. According to H.O. Pappe *A Letter from Sydney* is 'his greatest piece of writing' (Pappe, 1951, p. 94) and thus it requires a close reading.

As its name implies, *A Letter from Sydney* did not specifically promote the colonization of South Australia. Its purpose was to encourage systematic rather than penal colonization in Australia, and to provide convincing arguments in favour of emigration to a new, non-penal British settlement in Australia. Wakefield wrote *A Letter from Sydney,* a volume of some 130 pages*,* while serving his sentence in Newgate Prison, never having been to Australia. Although Wakefield's interest in the project to colonize South Australia began in 1829 with the publication in London of the pamphlet *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia,*[76] this pamphlet was closely followed by the anonymous publication (also in 1829) of *A Letter from Sydney, The Principal Town of Australasia.* The first edition of *A Letter from Sydney* was a compilation of a series of anonymous letters Wakefield had published in a London newspaper, the *Morning Chronicle*, beginning on 21 August 1829 (Pike, 1957, p. 53). No author was credited for the publication of this collection and it 'was [initially] described as [having been] "edited by Robert Gouger,"' who later became one of the founders of South Australia' (Mills, 1929, p. vii). Wakefield based *A Letter from Sydney* upon descriptions and reports that detailed the apparent realities of colonial life, but his rendering of them is based in fiction. *A Letter from Sydney*, whilst not entirely fictional, was nonetheless a fabrication of colonial life written by an author who had no direct experience of colonization.[77] At the same it provided the theoretical framework upon which Wakefield based his efforts to promote the actual colonization of South Australia and, later, New Zealand. Wakefield does not give a

---

[76] As Prichard informs us this pamphlet was 'printed in early 1829' (Prichard, 1968, p. 13).
[77] A.G.L. Shaw has argued that Wakefield and the other members of the colonial reform movement 'though posing as experts in imperial affairs, really knew little about them, and one of their basic tenets concerning land policy was absurd, as every Australian knew perfectly well' (Shaw, 1969, p. 72).

specific reason as to why he adopted the fictional format in *A Letter from Sydney*, but his choice of an at least partially fictional account of colonial life does situate this work in a similar generic category to other works of utopian travel fiction written in the nineteenth century, such as Etienne Cabet's *Travels in Icaria* (1840) and, at a later date, Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* (1872). Although Cabet and Butler's novels are located in fictional settings, Wakefield's presentation of a first person fictional account of Australian colonial life perhaps enabled him to present his critiques of British colonial policy, and his imaginative rendering of an ideal British colony, in a way that was both more attractive to the British reading public, and less susceptible to criticism from the British government.

The information and descriptions in *A Letter from Sydney* are based on books he read 'on New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land as well as newspapers published there' (Prichard, 1968, p. 13). Whilst Wakefield does not attribute any direct quotations from these authors, he lists works by authors such as 'Mr. Curr, Mr. Widdowson, and Mr. Atkinson' as 'unpretending but very useful little books' for the analysis and study of Australian colonial life, although he does warn the reader to be wary 'of taking for granted their statements of cause and effect' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 102).[78] Wakefield betrays a playful use of narrative when he writes that 'all that you read in the works of Wentworth and Cunningham, as to the healthfulness and beauty of the climate [of Australia], is strictly true,'[79] despite the fact that he had not visited Australia once before publishing *A Letter from Sydney*.

The book is not strictly speaking a fictional 'narrative.' Yet in its obvious guise as a general promotional tract for systematic colonization, *A Letter from Sydney*

---

[78] Publications written by Curr, Widdowson and Atkinson on the subject of Australian colonization include the following: Curr, Edward, *An Account of the colony of Van Diemen's Land ... for the use of emigrants*, George Cowie: London, 1824; Widdowson, Henry, *Present State of Van Diemen's Land; comprising an account of its agricultural capabilities, with observations on the present state of farming, &c. &c. pursued in that colony: and other important matters connected with Emigration*, S. Robinson, W. Joy and J. Cross: London; and J. Birdsall, Northampton, 1829; and Atkinson, James, *Account of the state of agriculture and grazing in New South Wales: including observations on the soils and general appearance of the country and some of its most useful natural productions: with an account of the various methods of clearing and improving lands, breeding and grazing livestock, erecting buildings, the system of employing convicts, and the expense of labour generally : the mode of applying for grants of land: with other information important to those who are about to emigrate to that country: the result of several years' residence and practical experience in those matters in the colony*, J. Cross: London, 1826
[79] For further details of these texts see Wentworth, William Charles, *A statistical, historical, and political description of the colony of New South Wales, and its dependent settlements in Van Diemen's Land*, Printed for G. and W.B. Whittaker: London, 1820; and Cunningham, Miller Peter, *Two years in New South Wales: comprising sketches of the actual state of society in that colony; of its peculiar advantages to emigrants; of its topography, natural history, &c., &c*, H. Colburn: London, 1827.

does offer the reader an imaginative narrative written from the perspective of an anonymous colonist who had travelled to New South Wales via the United States and bought '20,000 acres' in the New South Wales countryside. He becomes disillusioned with the modes of colonization that had been used by the British, and proceeds to offer his solutions to the problems he perceives. Wakefield writes that the colonist obtained his land at '2s. per acre' and initially 'turned farmer myself, and endeavoured, by my own exertions, with the assistance of convict servants, to extract something from the soil' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 104).

The colonist soon became disillusioned with the convicts in his employ, describing them as 'mischievous animals' and 'country bumpkins, transported for poaching.' He then dismisses the convict servants and sends to England 'for shepherds, ploughmen, carpenters, a blacksmith, a bricklayer, and other useful labourers' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 106). The colonist then details the 'mistake' that he made in paying for the passage of these British labourers, confessing that he had been 'weak enough to think that free agents would prove better servants than bondsmen.' Wakefield then writes that 'by dint of flattery, appeals to their honour, and promises of comfort, I induced the mere peasants to observe their agreement and follow me to the wilds' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 107).[80] The reference to the labourers as 'mere peasants' is indicative of the hierarchical and class based views Wakefield assumes in relation to the colonizing process in *A Letter from Sydney*. While in his subsequent texts Wakefield sought to make colonization appeal to all the classes of Britain, in *A Letter from Sydney* he avows that he is appealing to 'a man of independent fortune, who prefers his library, even to the beauties of nature, and to whom intellectual society is necessary for his peace of mind' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 106).

The labourers that the colonist procured from Britain eventually abandon him to become landowners themselves and 'in less than two years each of my servants saved wherewith to stock a small farm, and one by one they all left me.' The colonist then found that producing any kind of stock or produce on his farm was difficult without sufficient labourers, and that he 'wanted [the] industry, skill, economy, and taste, for any such pursuits, or, at least, a drudge of a wife to supply those wants' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 107). Dismayed by the prospect of attempting to maintain

---

[80] Given that *A Letter from Sydney* was originally written as a series of letters to a newspaper, Wakefield uses the colonist's perspective throughout the text.

the life of an independent farmer and saying that he 'was sick of the bush', the colonist then 'made over my estate for twenty years, with everything upon it, to a tough Scotch farmer, on condition of receiving one-third of its produce.' Upon his return to Sydney the colonist proceeds to analyze the problems that Australia faced as a result of the ways in which it had been colonized. Following the initial narrative of the colonist's experiences in Australia, Wakefield uses the remainder of *A Letter from Sydney* to outline the moral and economic problems he saw with convict labour, the dangers inherent within the unregulated sale of colonial land, and, most importantly, the utopian potential he saw for systematic colonization in Australia. In the context of his later works *A Letter from Sydney* provides important insights and foreshadows Wakefield's utopian vision for South Australia.

As Wakefield considered British society to be the superior form of social and political configuration, it followed that systematic colonization was the most perfect means to spread this particular ideal of society throughout the world. Colonies founded through this system would not only be British, they would be perfectly British. Some examples of Wakefield's idealised descriptions of systematic colonization from *A Letter from Sydney* will amply demonstrate that Wakefield's vision for the later colonization of South Australia was a utopian project. Given that *A Letter from Sydney* was written as a work of fiction whose generic characteristics share certain commonalities with the travel narrative component of much utopian literature, it is not surprising to find that it contains some of Wakefield's most utopian discussions of systematic colonization. For example, in the colonist's discussion of the 'many castles in the air' he built on his way to Australia, he initially reflects upon his plans 'to settle in Van Diemen's Land, because I fancied that its insular position and small extent would render it, not merely foreign, but also superior, to New South Wales.' The narrator then details his vision of the ways in which a systematically colonized British colonial utopia might function in Van Diemen's Land:

> Labour, therefore, will be plentiful, and, perhaps, even cheap; at least, there will not be a scarcity of dear labour. Division of labour will follow. That will cause, as, indeed, nothing else can cause, great production. Wages being moderate, the employer of labour will take a large share of a great produce. This will cause accumulation; and the accumulated produce of labour is wealth. Wealth will bestow leisure; and leisure will bestow knowledge. Wealth, leisure, and knowledge mean civilization. Schools and colleges will be established. The arts and sciences will flourish, because artists and discoverers will be paid and

honoured. Abstract truth will be sought, because its pursuit will be rewarded; and this will make philosophers. A little island of the Southern Ocean will produce painters, sculptors, poets, orators, and friends of mankind. A nation will be born free, under a clear sky, and will be highly instructed. Being a new people, they will reject the prejudices, whilst they improve the accumulated knowledge, of other worlds; and at length it will be fairly decided whether or not man can reach perfection. (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 133)

Following this passage of unabashed utopian idealization, the narrator then negates this vision of capitalist colonial perfection by stating that the vision 'was my foolish dream. Its basis was delusion, which vanished in America' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 133). The colonist had visited America en route to Australia and he explains that 'the migrating habits of the Americans, opened my eyes' to the problems inherent in an unsystematic and unregulated system of land distribution. In America, the narrator 'saw a people without monuments, without history, without local attachments founded on impressions of the past, without any love of birthplace, without patriotism—unless men roaming over immense regions may be called a country' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 134).

Whilst such pessimistic sentiments might seem to constitute an argument in favour of Wakefield's inherent practicality, these warnings against unregulated colonization can be interpreted as evidence of Wakefield's utopianism. Wakefield believed that the problems caused by the lack of regulated land sales in America were becoming similarly pronounced in Australia. Thus a regulated system of controlled land sales was the only means by which a new Australian colony could avoid the problems that were occurring in both America and colonial Australia. Wakefield goes on to argue that because of the lack of regulation of the price of land in the current Australian colonies, he would not be able to realise his dreams for a utopian life in Tasmania: 'my hopes of Tasmania were a dream, which could not come true, unless the rest of Australasia were swallowed by the sea' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p.134). Wakefield argues that since colonists could acquire land along the southern and eastern coasts of the Australian mainland for a minimal price, they would not willingly buy land at a higher price in Van Diemen's Land unless they were forced to do so. The Australian colonies would remain merely barbarous vestiges of British society unless they were subjected to a rigorous system of regulation:

I had fancied that the waves which surround Van Diemen's Land would prevent

its inhabitants from spreading; and the CONCENTRATION would produce what never did and never can exist without it—CIVILIZATION. I know now that it is easier to migrate from the coast of Van Diemen's Land to the Southern and Eastern coasts of Australia, which present a line of many thousand miles, than from some interior parts of the island to others not fifty miles distant. I believe, therefore, that New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land are one and the same colony, and that they will become, at the same time, districts of one and the same country, remaining equally barbarous until the year 3000, and becoming afterwards equally civilized, if the world should last so long. (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), emphasis in original, p.134)

The lack of regulation within the administration of Australian land sales caused the colonist of *A Letter from Sydney* to realise that his utopian aspirations for colonial life could not be realised in Australia, at least until systematic colonization was implemented in the existing colonies, or a new colony was founded upon the theory of systematic colonization.

Interestingly, despite his misgivings towards Australian penal colonies, Wakefield includes in *A Letter from Sydney* discussions and descriptions of young Australian men and women, and its climate, that serve to reinforce the utopian vision he presents of a systematically created South Australian colony. The language that he uses to describe the Australian climate and the behaviour and physical characteristics of Australian youth is distinctly romantic and indicative of utopian speculation. Wakefield was prone to comparing his schemes of colonial expansion to those of ancient Greece.[81] Similarly, he conducts his discussion of the 'perfections' of Australian men and women in relation to ancient Greek standards of beauty. For example, Wakefield writes that

in spite of the many proverbs which declare that there is no standard of taste, the same human form which more than two thousand years ago was embodied by Phidias and Praxiteles, is still considered the model of perfection by all

---

[81] Wakefield was not alone in comparing the creation of new British colonies to the colonial projects of ancient Greece. As Duncan Bell has argued, 'While he thought that many aspects of this project were novel, the result of innovative theoretical advances in moral philosophy and political economy, [John Stuart] Mill also suggested that in some respects it resembled the noble experiments of the ancient Greeks.' Bell provides the following quote to demonstrate the ways in which Mill compared the colonization of South Australia to ancient Greek attempts at colonization: '"Like the Grecian colonies, which flourished so rapidly and so wonderfully as soon to eclipse the mother cities, this settlement will be formed by transplanting an entire society, and not a mere fragment of one. English colonies have almost always remained in a half-savage state for many years from their establishment. This colony will be a civilized country from the very commencement"' (Mill, J. S. Mill, "Wakefield's *The New British Province of South Australia*," *Examiner*, July, 20, 1834, *Collected Works*, 23:739, quoted in Bell, 2010, p. 39).

refined Europeans. Where does that form most commonly breathe? In Greece, and even in the very Cyprus, where Adonis was conceived, and where the Goddess of Beauty has two temples. (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), pp. 145-146)

Wakefield argues that the 'latitude of Sydney corresponds exactly with that of Paphos; and it is no less true that native Australians bear a stronger resemblance to the modern Greeks than any other people.' Wakefield also compares the Australian youth to the coastal populations of Italy and he writes that 'they resemble the Castilians, the sea-coast Italians, and more especially the island Greeks, which last enjoy, like them, perpetual summer upon a soil not alluvial' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 146). Wakefield makes a strong argument for the influence that climate has upon the happiness and beauty of a population:

> Whatever the human variety, a face of joy and a form of ease make the perfection of beauty; whilst general deformity is the type of suffering and constraint. As we feel and act continually, so we shall appear. Thus, after all, soil and climate may produce beauty or ugliness by a moral rather than a physical process … The supposed influence of soil and climate on happiness, without reference to beauty, gave a name to the Fortunate Isles. Why should not this ill-named part of Australasia be called Australia Felix? (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 148)

Although Wakefield conducts his discussion of the relationship between climate, beauty and happiness in relation to the differences between the beauty, happiness and climate of the Italian cities of Alessandria, Turin and Genoa, his discussion of the beauty and perfection of Australian colonial youth concludes that Australian youth, even in their less than perfect condition as products of penal and unsystematic colonization, are nonetheless more perfect than the youth of Italy and Britain, and are comparable in most respects to modern Greeks. Following his assessment of the beneficial relationship between climate and beauty (a not hugely original view to take in the nineteenth century, it is true), Wakefield goes on to argue the following:

> Allowing that soil and climate produce beauty by means of happiness, still the character must, in a great measure, depend on original causes strictly moral. The disposition of a people will be governed by their condition; and their condition again will, in most cases, be ordered by their laws. The Colonial Government, though not necessarily bad, is far superior both to the late oligarchy of Genoa and to the actual despotism of Carlo Feroce. In one most

essential point, it is greatly superior to the government of Britain. Able to increase its territory according to the increase of its people, it avails itself of that mighty advantage; and thus, by the most gentle laws, forbids the existence of Want … The Australian youth suffer none of the evils of poverty. It follows that what may be called their natural character is excellent … Both sexes have a strong capacity for knowledge; and I observe in them a certain natural refinement of mind … in short, they resemble the modern Greeks, mentally as well as bodily. A Triple Alliance offers to Greeks the means of exerting their capacity for all that is great and good. Shall British laws forbid this young race of British Subjects to eschew evil and cultivate good – to escape from that moral debasement which, wherever it occurs, is due rather to bad laws than to the nature of things? (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), pp. 148-149)

This suggests not only that Australian youth were capable of reaching heights of moral and physical perfection not available to British youth; it also shows us that Wakefield believed systematic colonization to be of essential importance to the future development and maintenance of such perfection in Australia. Obviously such writing had a promotional purpose and Wakefield goes on to write that 'you may laugh at my admiration of these despised colonists' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 149). However, the fact that Wakefield's writings were promotional does not detract from the utopian sentiments demonstrated therein; obviously commercial pragmatism informed such writing, but it is also clear that such writing was motivated by ideas and concepts not purely commercial.

South Australia: a transplanted Britain

Wakefield sought to create a miniature version of British society in South Australia, but one free from the social and economic troubles Britain was facing in the 1830s. It is the argument of this thesis that Wakefield's proposal for the creation of such new British colonies was essentially a form of utopian idealization. Britain's parliamentary system and principles of liberal political economy had recently become the targets for socialist criticism in England and France, but at the same time Britain's liberal institutions and dynamic new industrial wealth were the envy of Continental intellectuals and reformers. Wakefield readily accepted that British society in the 1830s was plagued with economic, political and social problems. Yet he also considered that it was nonetheless the best social, political and economic configuration available to the people of Britain, and its colonies. Wakefield sought to create a perfected version of this configuration in South Australia. In order to facilitate this idea, he sought to 'transplant' an entire cross section of British society to South Australia. This was intended to ensure that the various professions and

vocations of British society were represented in the colony, thus ensuring that the colony would be both economically and socially viable. Such a holistic process would also ensure that South Australia would be a functioning replica of British society from its inception.

Wakefield compares this process of social transplantation to the uprooting and replanting of trees. In the opening pages of *The New British Province*, Wakefield describes the different methods that the naturalists Joseph Banks and Henry Stewart used to transport fully grown trees. This combination of a scientific biological analogy with an ancient organic metaphor for the 'body politic' would become a persuasive rhetorical trope taken up in later years by John Stuart Mill's romantic, anti-mechanistic imagery of a diverse, free and progressive society. Wakefield argued that Banks erred in his method of transportation because, 'in order to save trouble in moving them, all their smaller roots and branches were cut off: the trunks, thus mutilated, were stuck into the ground; and there, wanting the nourishment which they had before received, through innumerable leaves and fibres, they soon died and rotted.' Stewart, however, discovered the means 'of transplanting full-grown trees, so that they shall flourish as if they had not been removed.' His method consisted of 'removing *the whole of the tree uninjured*; the stem, all the limbs, every branch and twig, every root and fibre; and in placing the several parts of this whole in *the same relative situation as they occupied before*: so that each part shall continue to perform its proper office.' Wakefield then draws an analogy between the different methods of transplanting fully grown trees and the process of colonization: he argues that 'the work of colonizing a desert bears a curious resemblance to that of transplanting full-grown trees.' The transplantation of each 'branch' of British society was intended to ensure that no single component of British society that contributed to the wellbeing of the whole was excluded, and that South Australia must function as an entirely 'British' colony from the very outset to live and thrive as a social body:

> …in neither case [either tree planting or colonization], is it the ultimate object merely to remove; in both cases, it is to establish; and as in the former case, the immediate object is to remove, not a mere trunk, but an entire tree, so, in the latter case, the immediate object is to remove, not people merely, but society. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 5)

Wakefield also used the tree planting metaphor to illustrate his argument that

meticulous planning and organization were synonymous with the success of any colonial experiment. He argued that in any colonial endeavour 'success depends on attention to details.' The removal of an entire cross-section of society was the most important detail that previous colonizers had disregarded: 'the planters of modern colonies have generally gone to work without much attention to details…. Many a modern colony has perished through the inattention of its founders to little matters which, it was supposed, would take care of themselves.' In contrast, Wakefield argued that in the scheme to colonize South Australia 'the greatest attention will be paid to details' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 6). By subsuming every aspect of the process of colonization into a system, Wakefield sought not only to ensure the practical and economic success of his colonial endeavours. Through the implementation of this system, he also sought to ensure that the colonies founded under the aegis of his scheme would be perfected, versions of British society.[82]

Ideal colonists

Whether Wakefield's plans were intended to benefit the poor of Britain as much as they were intended to benefit the middle classes and lower ranks of the British aristocracy is a questionable issue. Wakefield contended that both labouring and capitalist members of British society would benefit from emigration, and his arguments in favour of the transplanting the whole 'tree' of British society show us that poor, labouring classes were a constituent part of his vision. However, Wakefield (and the colonial reform movement generally) did nonetheless have a vision for an ideal type of emigrant, either rich or poor, that would best fulfil his aims.

Wakefield argued, firstly, that young married couples have priority for emigration to South Australia: 'it would be advisable to select as emigrants young persons only, and especially young couples of both sexes.' Such a selection of emigrants was prudent for several reasons. The emigration of young married couples would decrease the 'pressure of population' in Britain whilst simultaneously providing the best means for the expansion of population in South Australia: 'the object is, to reduce, as much as the system would allow, the population of the emigrating country, and to increase, as much as possible, that of the immigrating

---

[82]The metaphor of 'planting' colonies is found throughout colonial promotional literature and Wakefield was not alone in his usage of this particular rhetorical technique. For further discussion of the language and rhetoric of British colonial literature, see Grant, Robert, *Representations of British emigration, colonization, and settlement: imagining empire, 1800-1860*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke; New York, 2005.

countries.' Wakefield believed that any moral or social dangers threatened by an inequality of the sexes would be minimized, if not avoided, by sending out young married couples as the major constitutive component of the colony's labour force. It is clear that certain values such as sobriety, thrift and personal industriousness were to be valued highly in the emigration selection process. Thus, on the topic of the moral advantages that a balance between the sexes would provide, Wakefield's religious allusions and speculation about gender and family relations are telling rhetorical gestures:

> The moral advantages of such a selection of immigrants would not be few. Each female would have a special protector from the moment of her departure from home. No man would have any excuse for dissolute habits. All the evils, which have so often sprung from a disproportion between the sexes, would be avoided. Every pair of immigrants would have the strongest motives for industry, steadiness, and thrift. In a colony thus peopled, there would scarcely ever be any single men or single women: nearly the whole population would consist of married men and women, boys, and girls, and children. For many years, the proportion of children to grown-up people would be greater than was ever known since Shem, Ham, and Japhet were surrounded by their little ones. The colony would be an immense nursery, and, all being at ease without being scattered, would offer the finest opportunity that ever occurred, to see what may be done for society by universal education. That must be a narrow breast in which the last consideration does not raise some generous emotion. (Wakefield, 1833, 1968), p. 567)

The judicious selection of emigrants for their moral timbre was intended to ensure that the colony as a whole was of the highest quality. As Pike has argued, 'the new Arcadia [in South Australia] was to be peopled only by superior persons … this would not be a colony at all but a new province, just like Devonshire, separated from England only by distance' (Pike, 1951-1952, p. 74). Grant argues that Wakefield and his fellow colonial promoters were opposed to the emigration of people who were either likely to revert to 'savagery' upon reaching the colonies, or were simply unsuited to engaging in the life of hard work and sober industry they believed necessary for successful colonization. According to Grant, numerous 'writers appeared to confirm that the allure of savage life was just as capable of seducing the renunciation of civilized life in Britain's colonial possessions, and a number were only too willing to provide examples' (Grant, 2005, p. 125). Grant uses examples from colonial promoters who worked with Wakefield, such as John Robert Godley

(involved with Wakefield in the colonization of Canterbury), and Wakefield's son Edward Jerningham Wakefield to suggest that the colonial reform movement as a whole was opposed to the emigration of 'the old, infirm and sickly, convict children or pickpockets … the drone and voluptuary … the socially compromised …' and favoured instead 'the steady, thrifty and industrious' (Grant, 2005, pp. 130-132). Grant goes on to argue that the restrictions that Wakefield and his fellow colonial promoters sought to impose upon emigrants acted as a dilution of the utopian promises they had made in order to encourage emigration in the first place.

> Strictures against the restless and unsteady, paupers and the infirm, the socially compromised and politically restive, signalled that despite the Arcadian terms in which many of these colonial prospects were figured, a particular set of dispositions was considered essential to release their potential. In these, the abjection of colonial/settler landscapes through the 'othering' of undesirable types of emigrant constituted a potent warning that was aimed at reinforcing the 'right' form of colonial relations, helping secure them against a worrying proclivity to slippage and decay. (Grant, 2005, p. 137)

In any case, the colonial promoters' ambition for the selection of an idealized type of British settler does not mean that their goals were any less utopian because they aimed for exclusivity. Scholars such as Grant have argued that Wakefield's exclusive intentions to select people of a particular moral and social character diminished the utopian character of his scheme. However the principle of exclusivity, no less than systematic regimentation, was a crucial component of Wakefield's utopian vision for South Australia. Exclusivity was intended to ensure that the colonies of Wakefield's imagination could indeed become perfected versions of British society. Given that this was his primary goal as a colonial reformer and promoter, it would seem both logical and efficient to exclude 'undesirable' members of society (convicts being a particularly prominent example).

Agriculture, not pastoralism

The lynchpin of Wakefield's scheme was the regulation of land sales. A colony's success was dependent upon the disciplined and systematic control of its economic development and Wakefield believed economic regulation to be the most important criteria for success in any colonial venture. Indeed regulation in all aspects of colonial development was necessary for the creation of an ideal colony. For Wakefield, pastoralism was synonymous with the previous disorganised, dispersed

and uncivilized colonial experiments Britain had conducted in the Swan River and he was thus in favour of agriculture as the preferred economic basis for South Australia.

Initially in *The New British Province* Wakefield suggests that 'there is a vague but common impression that Australia is not fit to become an agricultural country; that it is fit only to be a pastoral country' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 15). Previous arguments in favour of pastoralism in South Australia were 'drawn from an English estimate of the soil and climate of Australia, and from the fact that hitherto in Australia it has been far more easy [*sic*] to produce sheep and cattle, than to raise corn and other products of agriculture.' Wakefield argued for agricultural development in South Australia for one primary reason: to prevent dispersion and to ensure the creation of a successful civilized colony. Wakefield claimed that if a European estimation had been taken of Australia it would have been clear that Australia was better suited for agriculture: 'settlers coming from a corresponding latitude of Europe, would have formed a different estimate of the soil and climate of Australia, and, probably, a more correct one.'[83] Wakefield notes that the colonies of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land Australia had previously been pastoral economies because 'the colonists of Australia have been so planted, so widely dispersed and separated from each other, that they could not have been an agricultural people, even though their soil and climate had resembled those of the plains of Lombardy or the Low Countries.' Australia was, he claimed, no less suited to agriculture than European countries where, 'in order to raise the agricultural products of Flanders and the north of Italy … it is necessary to employ considerable masses of labour, and of capital as well, in constant combination; and this skilful application of capital and labour could not take place amongst a few scattered shepherds.' His point is not that Australian colonies should mimic European agricultural practices as such. Rather, he argued that the history of colonial expansion in Australia had been unproductive because of the way in which it had been colonized: 'it may be, therefore, that the pastoral habits of the Australians are owing rather to the mode in which the country has been colonized, than to the nature of its soil' (Wakefield, 1834, pp. 15-16). Systematic agricultural colonization was thus intended to not only provide a stronger

---

[83] As noted earlier, Wakefield was not particularly well informed about the realities of Australian climatic and soil conditions. Such arguments were most likely included to familiarise his audience through readily understandable examples.

economic basis than pastoralism, but to ensure that the colony was socially and politically united from the outset.

The role of religion

Religion was another practical measure that, in Wakefield's estimation, would ensure the social cohesion of South Australia. He regarded the institutional practice of religion as one of the most important characteristics of a civilized society and thus one of the most important distinguishing features of a systematically colonized British society. Wakefield sought to encourage religious association in South Australia for the benefits it would bring in achieving and maintaining social harmony. In his estimation, 'whatever the consolations and other advantages of religion, it is difficult to conceive a situation which requires them more, than that in which men place themselves who become the first inhabitants of a wilderness, distant from the abode of society' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 144). Religion was particularly important because, 'in the planting of a colony, the chief elements of success are fortitude, patience, and brotherly affection.' He appealed to the example of the religious bonds within 'the prosperous State of Massachusetts' and William Penn's colony, suggesting that 'amongst all the bodies of men who planted colonies in America, none but these … who were bound together by a strong religious tie, greatly prospered from the very beginning' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 144). He expands on this point by arguing that:

> … in the present case … when the object is to maintain religion amongst a civilized society, the efforts which may be made for that great object, will, it is confidently hoped, be amply rewarded by success; no exertion which may be afforded to the [Colonial] Society will be labour in vain; nor is there reason to doubt that every contribution for this purpose will, with God's help, fructify to His glory, and to the eternal happiness of His creatures. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 147)

Wakefield proposed that the South Australian Association should establish a Church Society 'composed of Englishmen and Colonists' that would 'sustain in the colony the doctrine and discipline of that church which is established in the mother-country.' Since the object of the Church Society was to 'maintain between the colony and its mother-country the most intimate union and affection,' the Church Society would

> … tend to make the colonists, in the words of Dr. Adam Smith, "instead of turbulent and factious subjects of the mother-country, her most faithful and

affectionate allies; with the same parental affection on the one side, and the same filial respect on the other, as used to subsist between the colonies of ancient Greece, and the mother city from which they descended." (Wakefield, 1834, p. 148; no reference given for Smith quotation)[84]

Religion as a unifying, inspirational force in South Australia was important to the colony's chances of success since 'the object of the South Australian Association is not to place a scattered and half barbarous colony on the coast of New Holland, but to establish there, and gradually to extend, a wealthy, civilized society.' Thus, 'in a colony to which, not men and women merely, but *society* shall be transplanted, there will religion, which is an attribute of society, take immediate root, and exert all its happy social influence' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 147).

Perfect Britains

Through regulated land sales, agricultural development, the encouragement of religion, and the careful selection of emigrants, Wakefield believed that Britain could establish colonies that would be free from the problems that had plagued previous British colonial experiments. Wakefield argued that systematic colonization would produce many individual *extensions* of British society, with South Australia to be the first place where such a process should occurred successfully. Wakefield intended to directly transport the 'old' society of Britain to the 'new' land of the colonies. As H.O. Pappe observes, Wakefield's primary goal 'was not to design a new society, but

---

[84] In regards to whether Wakefield looked to instil higher levels of religious freedom and tolerance in South Australia than had been found in previous British colonial experiments, Jenny Booth has argued that whilst scholars such as 'Douglas Pike … lay considerable stress on the attractions of religious freedom and civil liberty in South Australia … [Paul] Bloomfield [also] points out that this attraction was not confined to South Australia, as it was commonplace in earlier colonies' (Booth, 2004, p. 43). Booth suggests that 'provision for religious dissent and the voluntary principle in religion was an element in the colonization of South Australia which was added after the publication of Wakefield's theory, most probably at the instigation of George Fife Angas' (Booth, 2004, p.43). Despite this, freedom of religious association was a much touted aspect of South Australia's colonial history and is one of the primary reasons why Douglas Pike's extensive history of colonial South Australia is titled '*Paradise of Dissent.*' The South Australian Land Company prospectus of 1831, for example, argued that because the Company was 'altogether of a commercial nature [they would] abstain from all interference with the religious sentiments of the colonists, or with an arrangements which they may think proper to establish for instruction according to their respective opinions' (South Australian Land Company, 1831, p. 20). Wakefield's view on the question of free association changed over time. In the colonization of South Australia, he argued that no religious denomination should be favoured over another. However by 1850 he sought to create the purely Anglican colony of Canterbury in New Zealand. As Pike argues, 'by 1849 Wakefield reversed his opinion and came to believe that the true friend of colonization would do well to limit each settlement to one creed. But in the foundation of South Australia he insisted on religious equality and personally supported the proposal to employ the voluntary principle in planting the Church of England in the new colony' (Pike, 1957, p. 83).

to transplant the conditions for organic growth of the old world to the new' (Pappe, 1951, p. 94).

Thus the colonies were not intended to be models of a 'new' society, in the sense of a radically different structure, civility and culture. Rather, South Australia 'should be an extension of the old society without its evils' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 122). In *A Letter from Sydney*, he predicts that 'the colonies, however, would no longer be new societies, strictly speaking. They would be so many *extensions* of an old society' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 165). In *A View of the Art of Colonization*, twenty years after the publication of *A Letter from Sydney*, Wakefield maintained his argument in favour of creating colonies that were miniature versions of Britain: 'it would be gratifying to our national pride, if our colonies were made to resemble their parent; to be extensions of the mother-country' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 106). In *England & America*, he also asserted that 'a colony, founded or extended in the way proposed, 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' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 576).

In the *New British Province*, Wakefield writes that if all British colonies were to be either retroactively reformed through the use of systematic colonization, or newly created with this system, they would be 'to use the language of Archbishop Whately … "little more revolting to the habits and feelings of an emigrant than if he had merely shifted his residence from Sussex to Cumberland or Devonshire, – little more than a change of natural scenery"' (Wakefield, 1834, p. 136). Wakefield believed that systematically planting the 'old' British society in the 'new' lands of the colonies was the only truly effective means to manufacture colonies that would be productive, harmonious and without the 'sin and sorrow' of 1830s Britain. Thus the colonies founded through systematic colonization would not just be miniature versions of existent British society; they would be perfected versions of the society from which they originated. Wakefield believed that systematic colonization was the 'perfect rule' and the 'golden mean' for creating 'an old society in every thing save the uneasiness of capitalists and the misery of the bulk of the people' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968) p. 549).

The benefits to Britain

As discussed in the previous chapter, Wakefield believed that systematic colonization could remedy the problems facing Britain from 'an excess of people in proportion to

territory.' According to Wakefield, 'the sole object' of 'an Englishman who ardently desires the greatest good of his country … would be to put an end to that portion of crime and misery which in Britain is produced by an excess of people in proportion to territory' (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 163). The only effective means by which such an excess could be removed was through systematic colonization. *A Letter from Sydney* reflects the inherent utopian ambitions of systematic colonization in both the negative effects – population reduction – and the positive benefits of moral and social improvement in Britain. Appealing to English gentlemen who were seeking to achieve the 'greatest good' for their country, Wakefield argues that 'this system of restriction, anticipation and free migration [systematic colonization], does offer you the accomplishment of your wish. The good, therefore, is not the less attainable, because it would be very great.' Whilst Wakefield initially suggests that 'the stupendous good' is 'not the less attainable because it would be very great', he goes on to argue that:

> Nevertheless, this stupendous good must have a limit as to its duration. Of course it must; because the world is of limited extent. But even if a system of free migration were adopted in all new countries, so as to permit the population of the world to exert its utmost capacity of increase, still half a century must elapse before the pressure of population upon territory would be felt, at the same moment, all over the world; and perhaps in the course of fifty years we might discover a way to "new countries" in the moon, or, what appears quite as difficult, a means of checking population otherwise than by sin and sorrow. (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 164)

Clearly Wakefield was aware of the limitations of his own theory to relieve the 'pressures of population.' Such a recognition does not imply a lack of confidence in his utopian vision; he simply recognised that its efficacy was directly linked to the finite size of the material world. Nevertheless, he firmly believed that no other plan could alleviate Britain's, or any other country's, problems 'of population' in both the near and distant future. Thus his suggestion that discovering 'a way to "new countries" in the moon [is] quite as difficult, a means of checking population otherwise than by sin and sorrow' underscores Wakefield's conviction that systematic colonization was the only way Britain could remove its own 'sin and sorrow' without simultaneously using 'sin and sorrow' to do so (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 164).

Wakefield's writings also warn against the dangers of 'indulging in day-dreams' (Wakefield, 1849, p. 124).[85] These warnings can perhaps be construed as rhetorical devices intended to dissuade all but the most dedicated to attempt to engage in the process of colonization. They emphasize what he considered to be a stark contrast between the form of colonization he sought to use in comparison to that which had been utilized to create Britain's earlier colonial ventures in Australia. It was crucial that those seeking to colonize South Australia be made fully aware of the potential dangers of colonization and that would-be colonists should rid themselves of any illusions regarding the possibilities colonization might provide for a simple, carefree life of leisure, or an escape from the problems they faced living in Britain. However, despite the seemingly practical focus of such warnings, it is clear that Wakefield was concerned to demonstrate the benefits that colonial life could bestow upon those willing to take part in such a process, whilst also ensuring that only those of suitable moral and social quality would populate South Australia. Only this would facilitate the creation of a miniature, but perfected, version of Britain in South Australia. Unmistakable evidence of such utopian qualities is to be found in the final passages of *A Letter from Sydney*:

> My castle in the air is finished. View it only as a structure of the imagination. Still, does its foundation appear solid? Are its ideal proportions just? Does it seem to unite the chief properties of a good building – usefulness, strength and beauty? If you answer, yes, then I ask, though this plan be too magnificent for execution, may we not really construct a smaller edifice upon this model? In plain English – if the principles here suggested be correct, why should they not be reduced to practice, upon whatever scale? (Wakefield, 1829, p. 86)

---

[85] Wakefield was conscious of the stigma colonial life possessed within Britain and he sought to repeal this stigma as rapidly and effectively as he could: '… any one may see distinctly that the advantage of those who shall remove from the mother country is a necessary condition of emigration; that emigration to any considerable extent could not take place without benefit to the emigrants. This, however, is not the general impression in England. A different impression has been made on the English vulgar, high and low. Never having heard of emigration, save, according to Mr. Wilmot-Horton's views, as a means of relief from the pressure of the poor's-rate, they have supposed that, whether or not the object was attained, the poor emigrants must be driven away for the good of those who should remain behind, instead of being drawn away for their own good' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 568). Wakefield was obviously concerned with making the colonies as attractive as possible to as many people as possible so it is not surprising that he would argue that emigration colonies would be a positive life decision. Nonetheless, the stigma attached to emigration was a real phenomenon in Britain and if Wakefield's schemes were to be successful he had to combat this stigma by effectively demonstrating the benefits that colonial life could provide.

The imagery Wakefield uses here exceeds any effort to describe a purely practical program. His rhetorical style and visual imagery are at the service of an idealized *theory* for British colonial expansion as well as a perfect *colony* in South Australia. Similarly in *The New British Province* he writes:

> Without losing the enjoyments of civilization, he [the colonist] will take part in laying the foundation of an empire; and none but those who have been occupied in converting the desert into fields, gardens, and towns, can tell with what pleasurable feelings the colonist regards the creation, as it were, of his own hands. Of all that he sees now, nothing existed lately except the bare wilderness. He looks upon the whole as if it were his own, and prefers the new country to that which he has left; in the same manner as he who has built a house from the ground, planned it, and watched its progress to completion, is prouder of his own work than he would have been of a finer house which he had inherited or purchased. Invention is said to be the prerogative of genius; but the work of creating is agreeable to every order of mind. The story of Robinson Crusoe is so interesting to all, because it describes, not a number of improvements, but a number of creations. In colonizing, everything but the land is created; and every part of the work bears that character of originality which strikes most forcibly on the imagination of mankind. To improve is good and pleasant; but it is better and more pleasant to call into existence that to which every improvement shall be applicable. (Wakefield, 1834, p. 124)

This undeniably romantic view of colonial life vividly illustrates that Wakefield believed colonial life to be more than just an efficacious solution to the economic problems of British citizens. Systematic colonization was, rather, a comprehensive solution to the panoply of problems of life in Britain. For those willing to embark on such a project, emigration to the colonies would provide them with the means to create their own personal paradise.

Utopian dreams of other colonial promoters

Wakefield was not the only advocate of the colonization of South Australia, nor was he the only author to harbour utopian ambitions for the colony. There is not scope in this thesis to examine the full range of such authors and their publications, but it is possible to survey a cross section of these figures. Most of these were either colonists themselves or were actively involved in the official promotion that led to the colonization of South Australia.

There were numerous figures in the colonial reform movement who envisioned a certain kind of utopian potential in South Australia. Several useful examples were recorded in the second appendix to *The New British Province* (1834).

This appendix contains transcripts of speeches given by supporters and promoters of the colonization of South Australia at a public meeting held in Exeter Hall in London on the 30th of June, 1834. These speeches demonstrate that Wakefield's utopian ideas were shared by numerous advocates of the colonization of South Australia. For example, Captain William Gowan, a member of the South Australian Land Company of 1831, conveys the mood of pervasive utopianism in the South Australia Association:

> When I recollect the regions that exist in another hemisphere—the beauties they display—the capabilities they afford—so calculated to give to man all that the heart can yearn after, I cannot but say to myself, that the All-wise Creator of the universe did destine them to be the refuge of the population of the old world—where those have been driven to want by the introduction of machinery, and cannot all at once turn their hands to a new calling, might find a refuge and a home (cheers). I do not believe that these lands were destined always to be the haunt of savage beasts and noxious reptiles; but rather to be subservient to the wants of man, and to be subject to his dominion. These lands are susceptible of cultivation; they are well calculated for the spread of civilization, for the extension of the arts, for the encouragement of commerce; and, I believe, they were intended for the support of the redundant population of the old world, and as a refuge for the unfortunate and the distressed. (Gowan, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, pp. 185-186)

Other figures, such as Wolryche Whitmore, Robert Gouger, Robert Torrens, John Hutt, George Grote and even Robert Owen delivered speeches at this meeting and their comments are no less idealized and romantic than Gowan's. Whitmore hoped that South Australia 'may take its station amongst the great nations of the world' and that in the new colony 'we may lay the foundations of another mighty empire, emanating from this great country, and second only to her in all those things which constitute the real happiness and glory of states' (Whitmore, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, p. 154). Whilst figures such as George Grote argued that the colonial promoters were 'far from representing the settlement as an *El Dorado*— as a place where gold can be picked up on the sea-shore', Robert Torrens nonetheless affirmed that 'if we succeed in this we shall be extending the greatest of blessings. We shall assist to replenish the earth, to extend Christianity and civilization to the remote portions of the earth, and, in all humbleness, we may enjoy the happiness and patriarchal joy said to belong to God in seeing a happy world' (Grote and Torrens, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, pp. 160 and 177). John Hutt also points to the scope of

promoters' ambitions for South Australia, and the benefits they believed systematic colonization could provide any colonial venture: 'You must attempt condensation, and you may then succeed in raising mightier states and fairer cities than those which Greece could boast: you may plant colonies as rich as the Spanish Indies, and extend civilization till stopped by the boundless deserts and the depths of the ocean' (Hutt, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, p. 181). George Poulett Scrope's utopian ambitions for the South Australian venture are equally robust:

> By carrying these principles extensively into effect, it is scarcely doubtful that Britain may found and give birth, at no sacrifice—but, on the contrary, with infinite benefit—to more than one—to many great and new nations, off-sets from the same stock which has already, by a very inferior and imperfect mode of colonization, created that great transatlantic people of the United States—to nations composed of Britons in race, language, laws, arts, and manners—attached to Britain by all these ties, as well as by constant intercourse and mutual interest—to nations, which as they in turn grow and spread themselves, and in turn send out their colonies, may extend the British name and character, and race, and language, and civilization, and refinement, wider and wider over the fair and fertile fields of the globe—till, in the fulness of time, the earth be possessed as it were by but one family, and the seed scattered from this little island, this speck in the ocean, have covered the globe with a rich harvest of human happiness. (Scrope, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, pp. 193-194)

More evidence of the utopian qualities of the colonial promoters' plans for South Australia is to be found in other texts published both prior to and after the colonization of South Australia in 1836. Robert Torrens, for example, provides richly idealised imagery of colonization in South Australia in a speech he delivered to the House of Commons on the 15th of February 1827:

> While we legislate for our country, we may be permitted to rejoice in the brightening prospects of the world – while our chief aim should be to endeavour to do good in our generation, we may be allowed to exult in the thought, and to derive a heightened ardour from the consideration, that the beneficial influence of our measures may extend to the generations that are to come. In Time's resistless revolutions, that which is now British America will be a confederation of new independent States, stretching from the St. Lawrence to the Pacific, and rivalling their elder brethren south of the interior waters; and the vast insular continent of New Holland, more populous than Europe, must cease to be an appendage of the British Isles. But throughout these extensive and remotest regions of the world, the British race, language and institutions will prevail. In giving effect to extensive and improved plans of colonization, we are multiplying the British nation; we are rocking the cradles of giant empires; we are cooperating in the schemes of Providence; and are its favoured instruments

in causing civilization to "cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea". (Torrens, 1827 (1962), pp. 55-56)

Sir Charles James Napier's *Colonization, particularly in Southern Australia: with some remarks on small farms and overpopulation* (1835) offers further evidence of the utopianism that underpinned the plans of the promoters who sought to colonize South Australia.[86] Napier believed that by following Wakefield's plan of systematic colonization, the British settlement of South Australia would result in 'the foundation of a great nation' (Napier, 1835 (1969) p. 46).[87]According to Napier, colonization was the only remedy for the boredom and spiritual lassitude of civilized life in the urban metropolis. The arguments he makes in favour of colonial life combined with his belief that life in Britain could never be both materially and spiritually fulfilling are the clearest examples of Napier's utopianism, and such views resonate strongly with Wakefield's. According to Napier civilized metropolitan life bred existential stagnation and was repetitive and boring. He argued that "*Ennui* is not the inhabitant of a new colony: but arises for want of energy in the mind, which is not found amongst colonists" (Napier, 1835, (1969) p. 78). Napier contrasts the dull monotony of life in Britain with the vigorous excitement of colonial life and argues that:

> … in a colony all is new, all is interesting … A man then feels that he is, indeed, "*Lord of the creation*": … he is no longer the wretch of "*civilized*" life … Here a man really worships his God, instead of yawning at a bad sermon in the aristocratic pew of a Protestant church. In the midst of his works, in the midst of their splendour, is the true tabernacle of the Deity….In England, a man is like a bird in an aviary; in Australia, he regains the woods and glades,

---

[86] Although he supported Wakefield's plans for the systematic colonization of South Australia, Napier disagreed with Wakefield on the question of whether large scale or small scale agriculture should be the dominant form of agriculture within Britain itself. In Napier's estimation, converting Britain's system of large scale farming to a smaller system of concentrated individual plots would increase the efficiency, economy and overall productivity of British agriculture. The efficiency and productivity that would result from farms being worked by small scale individual farmers was Napier's main argument in favour of changing Britain's dominant mode of agricultural production, and one that he consistently posited in contrast to Wakefield's own schemes: 'by the farm being worked by one pair of hands, all these [time, knowledge, labour, money, land and tools] are economised, improved, "*combined*," and the result of this "*distribution*," (as the author of "England and America" terms it) is increased produce' (Napier, 1835, (1969), p. 25).

[87] Unlike Wakefield Napier does discuss the ways in which both the British colonists and the British government should conduct themselves in relation to the indigenous communities of South Australia. Napier uses examples from conflicts in Van Diemen's Land to criticise the British government's treatment of indigenous peoples in its colonies. In Napier's opinion, 'the story of the war with them in Van Diemen's Land, is that of aggression, and horrid cruelties on the part of the English; of forbearance, long suffering, and, at last, of unqualified vengeance, on the part of the blacks' (Napier, 1835, (1969), p. 94).

and exchanges sameness for variety; the dullness of repetition, and *con*finement, and *re*finement, for the constant change of scenes, for freedom and the happy feel, which belongs to that state, "When wild in woods the noble savage ran", possessing as many of the advantages of civilization as are required for social enjoyment, but which, in England, we are pushing, perhaps, beyond that point. (Napier, 1835, (1969), emphasis in original, pp. 78-79)

Whilst the above passage is hyperbolic, Napier clearly believed that the possibilities for material and existential improvement within Britain itself were nearly exhausted and that life in the colonies could not fail to be an improvement upon life in Britain. Indeed Napier was so concerned with some of the potential problems in Britain given its state of economic and governmental degradation, colonization was the only way to avoid seeing '"*Frankenstein*" no longer a romance' (Napier, 1835, (1969) p. 79). Napier juxtaposes a dystopian Britain to utopian colonial life when he argues that:

… my writing is as wild as the places I described; led away by the recollection of those beautiful and lonely scenes, which I have seen on my pilgrimage through many countries; all crying aloud for *people*: every where regions without people! And yet in despite of this we huddle together in towns; and bilious philosophers, walking the crowded city, get elbowed in the ribs, till they are quite sore, and then, out of temper, go home to write on the necessity of "*moral restraint*", and the danger of starving from *over-population*…! (Napier, 1835, (1969), emphasis in original, pp. 79-80).

For Napier, the colonization of South Australia offered an opportunity for British society to be recreated anew and free from the problems that were plaguing Britain in the 1830s.

After its inception as a British colony in 1836 figures such as John Stephens continued to discuss South Australia in utopian terms. In 1839, Stephens argued that 'to capitalists and labourers alike … [South Australia offered] the best prospect of securing that easy and peaceful independence which is now so rarely to be witnessed amongst the tradesmen, agriculturists, and mechanics of this crowded Isle' (Stephens, 1839, p. iv). The conception of South Australia as a 'southern' version of Britain is also invoked by Stephens: 'nature in its superior situation, and Providence in the previous establishment of so many colonies around it, combined with the wisdom of the British legislature, have afforded in South Australia a field in which nothing but the application of individual and combined energy is requisite to complete the

foundation of a southern Britain' (Stephens, 1839, p. 11). Stephens' chapter on the 'Satisfaction of the Colonists' quotes colonial officials, capitalists and labourers documenting that, at least in letters sent back to Britain, South Australia was described as a utopian location by authors other than Wakefield and the leading promoters. Stephens himself writes that 'the most delightful feature in the [South Australian] picture is the domestic prosperity of the people, the happiness of individuals, which is the proudest object of a political constitution.' Other colonial residents are also quoted as affirming that:

> Nature … has given us more than my most sanguine hopes had pictured; we have a soil of fertility, plenty of water, a lovely climate, well, but not too thickly wooded, peaceful natives, an excellent harbour – in fact, every thing which a bountiful Creator can bestow upon us" … "we are in the centre of a country blessed with all the capabilities of contributing not only to the comforts, but also to the luxuries of man" … "you could never anticipate … the comfort and independence that flourish around us; and, while you are suffering all manner of distresses you cannot define, here we are enjoying the comfort and freshness and independence of a new colony. (Various authors, quoted in Stephens, 1839, pp. 149-151)

Whilst these examples were expressly used for their promotional value, the simple fact that Stephens named his promotional tract 'The Land of Promise' underscores the utopian aspirations of the colonial promoters both prior to and after the act of colonization.

The preceding analysis demonstrates that Wakefield's plans were more than simply economic models intended to shape the practical economic and political functions of colonial South Australia. It is true that, through systematic colonization, Wakefield and the other colonial promoters sought to create the first British colony that would be economically successful from its inception. But as we have seen, Wakefield's plans for South Australia were not solely pragmatic and economic. The regulation of land sales in South Australia, combined with the judicious selection of a certain class and 'quality' of emigrants, constituted a plan to transplant a perfected cross section of British society to the new colony of South Australia. This process had a dual purpose. Firstly, it was intended to ensure that the labouring population of South Australia was maintained in direct proportion to the amount of capital that was being expended on land purchases and agricultural and commercial development. Secondly, it was designed to create a miniature version of British society in South

Australia, free from the economic and social problems facing Britain while retaining fundamental elements of British social, political and economic institutions. This ambitious conception animated Wakefield's thinking and constitutes his primary interest as a utopian theorist.

Despite the critical view he took of the way South Australia was eventually colonized, Wakefield's utopian ideas were not exhausted through his experiences with the South Australia project. Following his decision to retire from the South Australian colonization scheme in 1835, his next major colonization project was the systematic colonization of New Zealand. There Wakefield demonstrated his continuing belief in the utility and generally preferable nature of systematic colonization as a means of colonial expansion, with his utopian ideals largely intact. The greater prominence of Maori people in New Zealand, as well as their salience in British public consciousness, led Wakefield to address the question of racial integration in his plans for New Zealand's colonization.

Chapter Six

New Zealand: Racial Integration and an Anglican Utopia

Wakefield's promotion of the colonization of New Zealand was his second attempt to implement a British program of systematic colonization in the Antipodes.[88] His plans for New Zealand's colonization possess utopian characteristics very similar to those he proposed for South Australia. However, in his plans to colonize New Zealand Wakefield includes a component of racial integration missing in his plans for South Australia. In his promotion of the colonization of Canterbury he also adopted a more religious approach to colonial expansion. Our analysis of Wakefield's plans to colonize New Zealand will be conducted with reference to the two major published works Wakefield wrote on the topic: *The British Colonization of New Zealand: Being an Account of the Principles, Objects and Plans of the New Zealand Association* (1837)[89] and *The Founders of Canterbury* (1868).[90] *The British Colonization of New Zealand* contains Wakefield's general plans for the systematic colonization of New Zealand, whereas *The Founders of Canterbury* is a series of letters Wakefield wrote between 1847 and 1850 that discussed the colonization of the Canterbury settlement.

---

[88] The history of British colonization in New Zealand begins several decades before it was officially annexed to Britain in 1840. Not only were missionaries, sealers, whalers and other small groups of European traders living in New Zealand prior to 1840, missionaries had been present in New Zealand since 1814 (Burns, 1989, p. 20; Moon, 2006, p. 14). As Eric Richards informs us, 'New Zealand had been a site of British enterprise, both missionary and secular, since the 1820s, and emigrants arrived embarrassingly ahead of the government *imprimatur* of 1840' (Richards, 2004, p. 129). One of the primary differences between South Australia's colonization and that of New Zealand was that New Zealand already had an established European population and history of British legislation and governance prior to its official annexation to Britain in 1840. Whilst Australia as a whole had a British population prior to the colonization of South Australia, South Australia itself had no settled British or European population when it was colonized in 1836. New Zealand had been under the jurisdiction of New South Wales since 1788, although British residents or settlers in New Zealand were few in number until the early nineteenth century. As J.M.R. Owens informs us, the British government passed 'its first legislation relating to New Zealand in 1817 … subsequent legislation in 1823 and 1828 made provision for offences [that occurred in New Zealand] to be tried in New South Wales' (Owens, in Oliver and Williams, (eds.), 1981, p. 42). New Zealand as a whole was under British jurisdiction only after 1840 when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed. As Prichard informs us, in 1840 'the New South Wales Continuance Act made New Zealand a separate colony and, by Letters Patent on November 16, a Crown Colony' (Prichard, 1968, p. 53). Further details of the early years of British colonization in New Zealand can be found in works by authors such as James Belich (2001), Patricia Burns (1989) and Peter Adams (1977).

[89] Hereafter referred to as *The British Colonization of New Zealand*. This work was initially published anonymously and was written by Wakefield in collaboration with John Ward, author of publications such as *Information relative to New-Zealand for the use of colonists* (1839), and *New Zealand: Nelson, the latest settlement of the New Zealand Company* (1842).

[90] The full title of this work is *The founders of Canterbury: vol. 1; being letters from the late Edward Gibbon Wakefield to the late John Robert Godley, and to other well-known helpers in the foundation of the settlement of Canterbury in New Zealand*. These letters were edited and first published by Wakefield's son Edward Jerningham Wakefield in 1868.

The utopian basis of New Zealand's creation is especially pronounced and has been addressed by numerous scholars. The works of other authors who sought to create an ideal British society in New Zealand will also be discussed in this chapter to provide a clearer picture of the utopian ambitions that fuelled the British colonization of New Zealand, and to demonstrate that Wakefield's works were not only historically significant in themselves, but also part of a wider utopian discourse directly associated with the British colonization of New Zealand.

New Zealand: a brighter Britain

Wakefield established his arguments for the utopian potential of New Zealand in relation to its economic, physical and climatic advantages as a site for colonial expansion. Firstly, he argued that there was 'already existing within it, an important and increasing trade.' This existent trade would provide the colonists with 'the advantages of a commerce which, anywhere else, it might require a great many years to create and bring to the same maturity' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 338). New Zealand was an ideal location for British colonial expansion due to its beauty and natural abundance: 'the physical circumstances of these islands – their relative position, their soil, climate, harbours, rivers, and valuable natural productions – all invite Englishmen to settle there.' In Wakefield's view New Zealand had been described by 'numerous witnesses of ample experience' as possessing 'as one of the most equable climates in the world' (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 43-44). Wakefield also argued that British colonization would be beneficial for the Maori population who were, in Wakefield's view, suffering extensively at the hands of immoral and dissolute British settlers. According to Wakefield the British citizens currently residing in New Zealand were 'settled in detached groups, almost on every favourable locality of both islands … they continued to reside there, not only in safety, but in unmerited impunity, whilst insulting the natives by all manner of outrage, atrocity, and oppression' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 252).[91] Systematic colonization was intended to remedy the problems created by the previous unsystematic and immoral British colonization of New Zealand.

---

[91] Owens argues that Wakefield's claims regarding the levels of anarchy and unruly, illegal behaviour on the part of European colonists in New Zealand were overstated. In Owens's estimation 'the humanitarian justification for annexation, the idea that New Zealand was sliding into uncontrollable warfare, anarchy, and depopulation, was greatly exaggerated: the migration from New South Wales of the late 1830s would not have occurred if men had not been confident enough to risk families and property in New Zealand conditions' (Owens, in Oliver and Williams, (eds.), 1981, p. 53).

Wakefield sought to use the process of systematic colonization to create purified versions of British society in New Zealand and, as Burroughs has argued, 'Wakefield regarded his theory as a panacea of universal validity … He wanted to transplant in colonial wildernesses a cross-section of English rural society, with its hierarchical structure and middle-class ethos carefully preserved, but purged of its grosser civil, religious, and economic restrictions' (Burroughs, 1973, p. vi). Thus his plans for the colonization of New Zealand further consolidate his position as a utopian thinker.

Much like South Australia, the version of British society that was to be created in New Zealand would be 'without the very rich or the very poor.' This was a consistent component of Wakefield's colonial vision. A clear example of the ways in which an equitable distribution of wealth was a planned element of all of Wakefield's colonial theorizing is to be found in *England & America*:

> In the progressive state of society, capital has a tendency to an equal distribution among all the people. In America, notwithstanding high profits, individuals seldom accumulate large fortunes. Though the produce divided between the capitalist and the labourer be large, the labourer takes so great a share that he soon becomes a capitalist. Under this most progressive state of society, therefore, the increase of capital is divided, pretty equally, among a number of capitalists increasing at the same rate as the capital, so that while none are compelled to work as servants through life, few, even of those whose lives are unusually long, can accumulate great masses of wealth. Moreover, in such a state of things, the independence and self-respect of all begets a love of equality, and thus conduces to the equal distribution of the capitalist's wealth among his children; so that an individual seldom inherits the savings of many generations, or even the bulk of his father's property. In this state of things, there is no idle class, no spending class, as Captain Hall has remarked, no adoration of wealth, no oppression of the poor, no reason for political discontent. This appears to be the happiest state of society consistent with the institution of property. (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), p. 377)

The use of systematic colonization would 'obviate every species of bondage' in New Zealand and 'make the colony as attractive as possible, both to capitalists and labourers … but also, by bestowing on the colony the better attributes of an old society, to those who have a distaste for the primitive condition of new colonies heretofore' (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 14-15). That New Zealand was intended to be colonized along the same systematic lines as South Australia is further demonstrated when Wakefield informs us that the 'merits [of systematic colonization] have been

sufficiently ascertained by experience [in South Australia]. In the application, therefore, of that system to New Zealand, there is no such novelty as requires an apology for its adoption' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 27).[92] The extent to which Wakefield's plans for the colonization of New Zealand resembled the plans he had promoted for South Australia is indicated by the fact that he uses several quotations from his earlier publications *England & America* (1833) and *The New British Province of South Australia* (1834) to support the arguments he makes in *The British Colonization of New Zealand*. He includes excerpts such as the tree planting metaphor from *The New British Province of South Australia* (Wakefield, 1837, pp.xii-xiv) and the discussion of the importance of an equal balance between the sexes from *England & America* (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 18-23). Wakefield's use of his own previous works as supporting evidence for the coherence and cogency of the New Zealand scheme demonstrate, on the one hand, that his plans for colonization remained consistent over time. Whilst the use of such examples might also suggest that his thought did not progress or develop significantly, the intellectual consistency Wakefield displays in his different schemes for colonization suggests that the utopian ideals that motivated his writing and promotional activities also remained consistent.

An 1839 advertisement from the New Zealand Company demonstrates the desire of Wakefield and the New Zealand Company to directly transplant a miniature version of Britain to New Zealand soil:

> The aim of the Directors is not confined to mere emigration, but is directed to colonization in its ancient and systematic form. Their object is to transplant English society with its various gradations in due proportions, carrying out or laws, customs, associations, habits, manners, feelings - everything of England, in short, but the soil. (Advertisement quoted in Great Britain Parliamentary Papers, 18, quoted in Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. 13)

The exemplary potential of New Zealand was stressed by Wakefield and he argued that through the process of systematic colonization New Zealand would become 'a nursery of moral good.' Wakefield again demonstrates his opposition to

---

[92] One of the main practical differences between the plans for colonization in South Australia and New Zealand was that land in New Zealand was to be bought from the Maori by the New Zealand Company and then sold to British colonists at considerable profit. As James Belich argues, 'Wakefield's plan required that land be bought cheap from the Maori and sold dear to immigrants and absentee investors' (Belich, 2001, p. 183).

penal colonies when he argues that 'if New Zealand were so colonized that her aboriginal people should be truly civilized, embracing the Christian faith, and acquiring, by degrees, a moral equality with the British race, then will England have taken the most effectual step towards counteracting the pestilent influence upon surrounding nations of her convict colonies in Australia' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 50). Systematic colonization was framed as being the only means to counter the problems caused by penal colonization: 'the penal settlements of Australia have infected with their moral corruption, not only New Zealand, but all the inhabited islands of the Polynesian and Indian Archipelagos' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 50).

Wakefield's plan to transplant an entire cross section of British society to New Zealand was intended to be made easier and more harmonious by the public financial support of religious development free from denominational discrimination:

> Looking still to the great principle on which the colony will be formed – the removal from this country, not of persons merely, but of society – to provide for the religious elements of society is another important object. It is proposed to defray, from the common fund of the colony, the expense of erecting places of worship, and of paying the officiating ministers. According to a principle which is carried into effect in several British colonies – and especially in the Canadas, Australia, and our Indian empire, it is proposed that, in the distribution of this portion of the colonial funds, no preference should be given to any one denomination of Christians. (Wakefield, 1837, p. 58)

This was also intended to further consolidate New Zealand's exemplary social and moral character. That Wakefield's plans for New Zealand were informed by utopian idealization is also demonstrated within the opposition to Wakefield's schemes that was expressed in newspapers such as *The Times*, who argued that:

> To suppose that the "New Zealand Association" signifies nothing more than a joint-stock company of rapacious Radicals and their dupes, were to take a very circumscribed view of its ostensible character. In some illiberal minds, we can conceive that such an association may be identified with no other ideas than those of fortune-hunting and a fraudulent circumvention of savage chiefs; but in the gorgeous fancy of Mr. Gibbon Wakefield and the minor magicians by whose wand it has sprung into existence, it doubtless conjures up a state of things resembling, as nearly as may be, a moral and political paradise. (*The Times,* February 10, 1838, p. 5)

Whilst other contemporaries of Wakefield's disagreed with *The Times*' assessment of the radical nature of the New Zealand scheme,[93] such examples demonstrate not only that Wakefield promoted the colonization of New Zealand in utopian terms. They also demonstrate that the utopian nature of his plan to create a 'moral and political paradise' in New Zealand had a profile within the broader public consciousness of Britain.

The British and the Maori

Another aspect of Wakefield's plans for the colonization of New Zealand that was informed by utopian ideas was his proposal for the interbreeding and racial amalgamation of Maori and Europeans. Wakefield dedicated a significant proportion of *The British Colonization of New Zealand* to an analysis of the ways in which British colonists and Maori people would interact and relate to one another during, and after, the process of British colonization. Whilst, as we have stated earlier, it is beyond the means of this thesis to provide a reinterpretation of the historical literature that discusses the interactions between European and indigenous populations in either New Zealand or South Australia, Wakefield's views upon this question must be addressed since they show us that the 'British' utopia Wakefield sought to establish in New Zealand was complicated, and perhaps confused, by the presence of the Maori population.

Wakefield's discussion of the Maori focuses on three main points: that the Maori were being treated shamefully by Britons and other Europeans already living in New Zealand; that they deserved to be treated with respect and dignity by the British colonizers; and that they presented the best opportunity yet for the amalgamation of a 'savage' race with a 'civilized' race.[94] Wakefield argued that the treatment that the Maori had received by British settlers in New Zealand before 1837 was depraved and generally inhumane. In Wakefield's estimation the 'Englishmen' that had lived in New Zealand prior to 1837 presented 'the revolting spectacle of civilized men corrupting savages – enlightening them to give a wider range of the worst propensities of their nature – teaching them new lessons in crime' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 165).

---

[93] As Sargisson and Sargent inform us: 'E. R. McCormick wrote, commenting on the *Times* editorial, "A utopia, perhaps, but surely not a Radical utopia" (McCormick, E. H., 'The Happy Colony', *Landfall*, 9 (4), 1955, p. 307, quoted in Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. 12).

[94] According to Wakefield previous British efforts to colonize New Zealand had failed (at least in part) because of fears surrounding Maori cannibalism: 'if it had not been for the terror excited by their cannibalism, New Zealand would probably have been colonized long ago' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 50).

Wakefield argued that a fractious contest for the affections and trust of Maori people was occurring between missionaries and the less 'civilized' European settlers. He contrasts the efforts of the missionaries to convert the Maori to Christian civilization with those the less civilized European settlers were making to 'corrupt' the Maori and argues that:

> On the other hand – and in direct rivalry, as it may be termed, to the labours of these missionaries – civilization of a very different description is making rapid strides everywhere through the islands. It is impossible to conceive a more revolting exhibition, than that of civilized men corrupting savages – enlightening them only to give greater scope to the worst propensities of human nature, and teaching them new lessons of evil; it almost realises the idea of the author of evil and his fallen angels in their work of demoralising the world; and it is not too much to assert that such is actually the state of things in New Zealand at this moment. (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 70-71)

The British colonization of New Zealand was intended to remove from New Zealand those who had caused Britain to be 'charged "with the guilt and disgrace of having occasioned and tolerated [the kinds of] atrocities"' that the Maori people had experienced at the hands of European settlers (Wakefield, 1837, p. 132).

Wakefield argues that not only should the Maori people be treated with respect by British colonizers, they should be consulted and included in all of the negotiations regarding the sale of their land: 'we should not attempt to convert any part of their country into British territory, without their full, free, and perfectly-understanding consent and approval' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 53). The relatively small size of the Maori population would ensure that the British could obtain all of the cultivable land they desired without impinging upon the land rights or land usage practises of Maori people. In Wakefield's words 'another argument in favour of the colonization of New Zealand arises from the want of a sufficient native population for so extensive and fertile a country. There is abundance and to spare of vast unoccupied territory, without encroaching on what is required by the native population, – a surplus which they are most desirous to sell (Wakefield, 1837, p.271). Whilst Wakefield and the New Zealand Company have been accused of not considering the land rights of Maori people to a sufficient or morally acceptable extent, he does nonetheless claim that during the process of colonization:

… we must always religiously, that is, justly and generously, respect the primary and inalienable right of the aborigines to a subsistence out of the soil on which they were born. No plan of colonization ought to be encouraged, or even tolerated, that does not begin with the principle of upholding the rights and improving the condition of the aborigines (Wakefield, 1837, p. 286).

This is not to say that such claims were acted upon once colonization occurred, and scholars have criticized the ways in which the New Zealand Company and the British government negotiated the colonization of New Zealand with the Maori people.[95] Robert Grant, for example, has accused Wakefield of omitting indigenous peoples entirely from his plans to colonize both South Australia and New Zealand and has suggested that 'for writers such as Edward Gibbon Wakefield … indigenous presences simply did not register [even] at the level of contents lists. It was as if these were presences with which putative emigrants simply need not concern themselves' (Grant, 2005, p. 12). Grant does not enumerate which of Wakefield's publications he is referring to besides Wakefield's *New British Province of South Australia*, and he ignores the fact that Chapter II of Wakefield's *The British Colonization of New Zealand* is dedicated entirely to 'The Civilization of the New Zealanders.' Cynicism regarding the sincerity of Wakefield's plans to convert the Maori to Christianity was also displayed in newspapers such as *The Times* and in an 1838 editorial *The Times* argued that 'to say the truth, the worthy Governor's[96] plan for making converts of the cannibals is, as might be expected, fully more indefinite than his scheme for making cash' (*The Times*, 1838).

Scholars have argued that Wakefield was forced to include indigenous peoples in his plans to colonize New Zealand because of the changing attitudes within Britain

---

[95] On Wakefield's depictions of the Maori in *The British Colonization of New Zealand*, Patricia Burns has argued, that 'the picture presented by the [New Zealand] Association of the Maori race was dangerous nonsense, as the natives were, in fact, martial, skilled in agriculture, and architecture, the possessors of a rich and developing culture, and passionately attached to the land' (Burns, 1989, pp. 52-53). Raewyn Dalziel has also contended that whilst 'New Zealand experienced a colonialism and colonization less brutal than some … nevertheless, annexation and colonization were acts of possession and dispossession, settlement and unsettlement' (Dalziel, in Porter (ed.), 1999 (2004), p. 574). For further discussion of the historical impact of British colonization on the Maori, especially in relation to the contentious question of the Treaty of Waitangi, see Ritter, David and Byrnes, Giselle, ' Antipodean Settler Societies and their Complexities: the Waitangi Process in New Zealand and Native Title and the Stolen Generations in Australia', *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* Vol. 46, No. 1, February 2008, pp. 54–78; Hill, Richard and Bönisch-Brednich, Brigitte, 'Politicizing the Past: Indigenous Scholarship and Crown-Maori Reparations Process in New Zealand', *Social & Legal Studies*, June 2007, Vol. 16 Issue 2, pp. 163-181; Bourassa, Steven C. and Strong, Louise Ann, 'Restitution of Land to New Zealand Maori: The Role of Social Structure', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (Summer), 2002, pp. 227-260.
[96] According to *The Times* Wakefield intended to become the Governor of New Zealand.

to the moral and political legitimacy of British imperialism. For Katherine Smits, whilst 'Wakefield made almost no reference to the situation of indigenous peoples in South Australia … by the time he launched his New Zealand plan, he confronted considerable opposition to his plan from both the Colonial Office and missionary groups alarmed at the effects of colonization upon the Aboriginal peoples of Australia' (Smits, 2008, p. 5).[97] Whether or not Wakefield was more sympathetic towards, or cognisant of, the problems indigenous populations faced from European colonization than scholars such as Grant have suggested is not, however, a question that this thesis has space to address. Such concerns and issues are of clear historical and intellectual significance, and it is not being suggested that the reality of British colonization in New Zealand approximated any of Wakefield's proposed plans, or that the plans themselves were normatively acceptable in the first place. This discussion has been included to provide context for our analysis of the utopian component of Wakefield's comments regarding the integration of the Maori and British people in New Zealand.

Although Wakefield did argue that Maori land rights should be respected, this ambition existed alongside, and was perhaps superseded, by his desire to 'civilize' the Maori and to 'amalgamate' them with the British population of New Zealand.[98] Wakefield argued that the 'civilizing' component of the New Zealand Company's plans to colonize New Zealand made its plans for New Zealand unique amongst all other previous British colonization schemes:

---

[97] Paul Moon has argued that within the British government, and especially in two select committees of 1837 and 1838, 'there was a sincere, albeit exceptionally ambitious wish by some politicians and senior officials for improvement in the way in which Britain dealt with its colonial interests' (Moon, 2006, p. 135).

[98] Wakefield also claimed that Maoris actively sought European civilization and religion: 'the principal chiefs [of Aotea harbour] … [made] earnest applications for British settlers … [in the harbour of Waingaroa] there were 'about six hundred natives, who have for years been making urgent applications for British settlers among them' (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 105-106). According to Wakefield, most Maori people believed that 'it is no longer a question whether Englishmen shall come into their country, but whether they shall do so under the sanction and control of a proper authority, acting with strict impartiality between both parties, or whether they shall come with gunpowder, brandy, and debauchery, to corrupt their wives and daughters, plunder their potato grounds, and set all the neighbouring tribes at variance' (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 269-270). Burns argues that Wakefield's arguments regarding the extent to which Maori people actively sought European colonization were greatly exaggerated and that Wakefield only used 'carefully selected quotations from missionaries and travellers' to support his claims (Burns, 1989, pp. 52-53).

In selecting New Zealand as a field to which that system [British systematic colonization] may be very beneficially extended, the Association have had an object which may be described as altogether new, – that is reclaiming and cultivating a moral wilderness, – that of civilising a barbarous people by means of a deliberate plan and systematic efforts. This, indeed, will be an experiment; for, though professions of a desire to civilize barbarians have often been used as pretexts for oppressing and exterminating them, no attempt to improve a savage people, by means of colonization, was ever made deliberately and systematically. The success of such an experiment must in a great measure depend on the natural capacity of the inferior race for improvement. It will be seen that, in this respect, the native inhabitants of New Zealand are superior to most, if not all thoroughly savage people. (Wakefield, 1837, 27-28)

The extent to which Wakefield presented the 'civilizing of the Maori' as a fundamental goal of the New Zealand Company is indicated when he writes that:

This [the civilizing of Maoris] is one of the main grounds on which the Association have built their plan for colonising New Zealand. But their plan will be found to differ very materially from all other projects for extending British dominion; since, as we have indicated before, and as will be now fully seen further on, it comprises a deliberate and methodical scheme for leading a savage people to embrace the religion, language, laws, and social habits of an advanced country, – for serving in the highest degree, instead of gradually exterminating, the aborigines of the country to be settled. We are not only ready to admit, but should be amongst the first to assert, that the common effect of measures of *mere* colonization has been to exterminate the aboriginal race. This, however, is not a plan of mere colonization: it has for its object to civilize as well as colonize: referring to the words of Lord Goderich, we may even say, that our plan has in view, to preserve the New Zealand race from extermination. (Wakefield 1837, p. 42)

Wakefield also suggested that the British colonizers in New Zealand would one day form one amalgamated race with the Maori. Wakefield contended that Maori people were the most likely of all indigenous populations to interbreed effectively and productively with Europeans: 'you have [in New Zealand] a race of aborigines calculated, by intermarriage with Europeans, to form the basis of a great nation; there is not, as there is in the United States between the American and the Negro, any physical repugnance to the complete amalgamation of all classes of settlers (Wakefield, 1837, pp. 278-279). The extent to which Wakefield sought to create 'one race' of settlers in New Zealand is demonstrated when he writes that 'there is good reason to hope that, under favourable circumstances, future generations of Europeans and natives may intermarry and become one people' (Wakefield, 1837, 29). Although

it was primarily through intermarriage that Wakefield sought to create the single race of amalgamated Britons and Maori in New Zealand, public education and Christian tutelage was also intended to hasten the creation of this single race. On this matter, Wakefield writes that 'by teaching the natives to appreciate the advantages, and respect the obligations of Christian marriage, would tend to promote more than the equality, – namely, the ultimate amalgamation of the two races' (Wakefield, 1837, p. 56).

In Patricia Burns' estimation, Wakefield's suggestion that the British and Maori residents of New Zealand should intermarry and become 'one people' was, on the one hand, 'extraordinarily liberal' and politically progressive. However Burns also argues that 'the Wakefield plan intended the majority of emigrants to be young married couples, and hence intermarriage was presumably intended for future generations, when the Maori were Anglicised and therefore "civilized"' (Burns, 1989, p. 70). Whilst the implementation of this component of Wakefield's plan for New Zealand might have indeed been less practicable and perhaps more spurious than other elements of his scheme, the suggestion that the British and Maori inhabitants of New Zealand would one day form 'one race' and 'one great nation' shows us that Wakefield was at least inspired by utopian concepts of racial unity and homogeneity.[99]

Canterbury: an Anglican utopia

Further evidence of the utopian vision Wakefield had for New Zealand can be found in his plans to create the Anglican colony of Canterbury. The colonization of Canterbury was Wakefield's final attempt to create an ideal colonial society. Wakefield began his advocacy for the colonization of Canterbury in collaboration with the Irish-born social reformer John Robert Godley (1814-1861).[100] According to L. C. Webb, 'the scheme of the actual Canterbury settlement was born at a meeting between John Robert Godley and Edward Gibbon Wakefield in the autumn of 1847'

---

[99]Many scholars have condemned the racial politics of the British Empire and it is not the suggestion of this thesis that Wakefield's views are either morally acceptable (or unique) within the intellectual history of British, and European, imperial expansion. The point here is simply that Wakefield's visualisation of a 'miniature Britain' in New Zealand was intended in some ways to be racially *and* socially homogenous, even if a hybrid British and Maori race would arguably no longer (strictly speaking) be purely 'British.' For further analysis of the relationship between race and British imperialism see: Evans, Grimshaw, Philips, and Swain, (2003); Rich (1986); Mohanram (2007); Macphee and Poddar (eds.) (2007); McClintock (1994).

[100] For further information on Godley's life and works see: Godley (1950); Godley, Charlotte (1951); and Godley (1863).

(Webb, 1957, in Hight and Straubel et al, p. 135). Wakefield's son Edward Jerningham Wakefield[101] argued that 'in the end of 1843, Mr. Wakefield conceived the idea of a Church of England settlement in New Zealand, under the auspices of the [New Zealand] Company' (Jerningham Wakefield, 1868 (1973), p. iii). As Jerningham points out, the primary difference between Canterbury and the other settlements in South Australia and New Zealand was its religious basis: in Canterbury 'provision for Ecclesiastical and Educational institutions [were] to be endowed out of a portion of the purchase-money of land … in connection with the Free Kirk of Scotland' (Jerningham, 1868 (1973), p. v).[102] In Jerningham's estimation, Canterbury, or, in his words, 'the Free Kirk of Scotland Colony', was 'the first instance in which my father's plans for securing a good kind of colonization by means of ecclesiastical and educational endowments from the land-fund were carried into practice' (Jerningham, 1868 (1973), p. vi). Not surprisingly, Jerningham argues that Wakefield's role in the creation of Canterbury was pivotal, suggesting that John Robert Godley 'unaided by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, could never have completed the task' (Jerningham, 1868 (1973), p. x). Canterbury was to be founded by the Canterbury Association under the auspices of the New Zealand Company. As Burroughs informs us 'a plan was devised [by Godley and Wakefield], whereby

---

[101] Edward Jerningham Wakefield will hereafter be referred to as Jerningham for ease of reference.

[102] The first concerted British effort to colonize New Zealand was conducted by a private company and occurred in 1825 with the formation, in London, of the New Zealand Company.[102] Its members included figures such as Robert Torrens, who was also involved in the colonization of South Australia, and several members of the British parliament, including John George Lambton and Edward Ellice (Burns, 1989, p. 18). These first efforts to facilitate the colonization of New Zealand stalled due to British government claims regarding the 'impracticality' of their plans (Burns, 1989, p. 21). However Wakefield and other figures such as William Hutt, Lord Durham and Sir William Molesworth revived the efforts of the first New Zealand Company and formed the New Zealand Association in 1837. The New Zealand Association became the New Zealand Land Company in 1839 and as Burns informs us several of the men involved in the 1825 New Zealand Company were also involved in creating the New Zealand Land Company. In Burns's estimation 'the gentlemen of the New Zealand Land and Colonization Company, with others who had been involved in the New Zealand Company of 1825 and the New Zealand Association of 1837-8, formed the New Zealand Land Company' (Burns, 1989, p. 16) in 1839. The New Zealand Land Company was established along similar lines to the South Australia Company. In Gardner's view it was 'formed as a joint-stock venture by London capitalists in 1838 … [and] proposed to obliterate the raffish free-for-all of "Old New Zealand" with a "New Old England", established according to Edward Gibbon Wakefield's principles of systematic colonization' (Gardner, 1981, p. 59). The New Zealand Company sought to establish 'a proper balance' between 'land, capital and labour … through the mechanism of the "sufficient price".' Gardner also points out that 'the Company's announced objective was to establish "concentrated" agricultural settlements, on the model of the best English corn counties' (Gardner, 1981, pp. 59-60). James Belich provides a succinct appraisal of the first ten years of official colonization in New Zealand: 'Auckland was established in 1840-1 … [and] five other instant townships were founded by the New Zealand Company and its affiliates, including the Otago and Canterbury Associations: Wellington, Nelson and New Plymouth (1840-42), and Dunedin and Christchurch (1848 and 1850)' (Belich, 1996, p. 188).

300,000 acres would be purchased at 10s. an acre from the New Zealand Company, possibly in the valley of Ruamahanga, near Wellington, and resold to colonists or absentees at £3 an acre, the revenue expended on such public objects as emigration, roads, and church and school endowments' (Burroughs, 1973, p.xiv).

Wakefield intended to colonize Canterbury again using systematic colonization.[103] Although the Canterbury scheme was established under the aegis of the New Zealand Company, Wakefield planned for Canterbury to be run by a 'society' who were external to the New Zealand Company: 'the plan of the colony … [should] be carried out, by a society outside of the Company, consisting of bishops and clergymen, peers, members of parliament, and intending colonists of the highest class' (Wakefield, 1868, p. 3).

In keeping with his other plans for colonization Wakefield argued that Canterbury should be populated by young married couples: 'to be single is contrary to the nature of a new colony, where the laws of society are labour, peace, domestic life, increase and multiply.' Marriage would provide an important psychological check on the dangers of a single man becoming 'wedded to his pipe and his bottle, not to mention the billiard table.' In Wakefield's view, if a male colonist 'is nicely married, he has a sweet home to go to after his day's work, and his mind is kept tranquil enough to bear without injury the intense excitement of sharing in the *creation of society*' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of June 1850, p. 255). In Canterbury, Wakefield favoured the emigration of aristocratic, 'elite' colonists: 'the [Canterbury] plan somehow repels desperate and bad people, such as commonly form a large proportion of the materials of a new settlement.' According to Wakefield, the Canterbury colonists were, for the most part, 'steady, prudent people, of quiet, moderate tastes, and simple habits.' Wakefield believed that Canterbury would also be a successful colonial experiment: 'judging by the case of the New England Pilgrimage, which this Canterbury Emigration really and truly resembles in the religious feature, the effects must be immense if nothing untoward should happen during the next two years' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of June 1850, p. 284).

---

[103] In a letter to John Abel Smith written on the 30th of November, 1847, Wakefield wrote that 'we adhere to the old plan of a settlement, to consist of 300,000 acres (with the right of pasturage attached), to be purchased from the Company for 10s. per acre, or £150,000.' Wakefield sought to ensure that 'the purchasers, whether colonists or absentees, [were] to pay to the Company, as a trustee for them, £2.10s. per acre in addition to the price of 10s.; and the amount, being in all £750,000, to be laid out by the Company on behalf of the purchasers, in public objects, such as emigration, roads, and church and school endowments' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), pp. 2-3).

Whether or not Wakefield was entirely sincere in his advocacy for the religious colonization of Canterbury has been debated. Webb, for example, has contended that 'Wakefield's interest in the religious side of colonization has been written off as opportunism' by scholars of Wakefield's life such as Richard Garnett. However, in Webb's opinion, whilst 'it may be true that in 1847 Wakefield turned to the church as a colonizing agency mainly because the New Zealand Company had lost its vigour … it is fair to add that his interest in the religious side of colonization dated back at least ten years.' According to Webb, Wakefield 'had worked hard for the establishment of a bishopric in New Zealand … and in 1841 he took pleasure in the thought that "in all probability New Zealand will be the most Church of England country in the world"' (Webb, in Hight and Straubel (eds.), 1957, p. 148).[104] Burroughs has suggested that Wakefield's support for the religious colonization of Canterbury did demonstrate 'a degree of opportunism' since 'in the climate of English opinion at that time, he shrewdly anticipated that the cause of religion might be summoned to reinvigorate the flagging spirit of colonization.' However Burroughs goes on to argue that 'Wakefield recalled the powerful religious inspiration that had stimulated the successful sectarian colonising ventures in North America in the seventeenth century.' In Burroughs's estimation Wakefield came to believe that his 'idea of founding little Englands overseas might be materially reinforced by the presence in colonial communities of the strong, unifying bonds of religion' (Burroughs, 1973, pp. viii-ix). For Wakefield, Canterbury's Anglican basis was crucial to its chances for economic and social success: 'a strong Church colour' in the colony was crucial, especially when viewed in opposition to 'neutrality, which is another word for inefficiency' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of December 1847, p. 5). As such, whilst Wakefield might have been opportunistic in his adoption of religion as a fundamental component of the Canterbury scheme, it was founded upon more distinctly religious lines than Wakefield's earlier colonial experiments.

The organization founded to implement the colonization of Canterbury, the Canterbury Association, was intended to 'set an example of a colonial settlement in which, from the first, all the elements, including the very highest, of a good and right state of society, shall find their proper place, and their active operation' (*Plan of the Association for Forming the Settlement of Canterbury in New Zealand*, London, June

---

[104] Wakefield to Mrs Torlesse, 15 November 1841, MS. Canterbury Museum, quoted in Webb, in Hight and Straubel (ed.), 1957, p. 148.

1848, quoted in Webb, 1957, p. 151). That the Canterbury Association was both a practical and a utopian venture is demonstrated by Grant when he argues that the Association's 'organization of emigration and colonization appears to have been both radical and conservative, historically grounded and utopian' (Grant, 2005, p. 68). The kind of colonial government Wakefield preferred for Canterbury demonstrates the utopian ambitions he held for the colony. Wakefield argued that Canterbury should be governed by 'a municipal Monarchy with government by the *elite* of the people' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of June 1849, p. 64). In Wakefield's view 'the best form of government for Canterbury' would be a 'form of government of which an essential condition is an eminent English family holding in perpetual succession the office of subordinate and merely local sovereign' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of May 1849, p. 56). Such a clear argument in favour of government by an elite is reminiscent of many forms of utopian government. As Northrop Frye has argued, 'most utopias are conceived as elite societies in which a small group is entrusted with essential responsibilities, and this elite is usually some analogy of a priesthood' (Frye, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 35).

The importance of regulation in the colonization of Canterbury was even more pronounced than Wakefield's other schemes, since not only was Canterbury intended to be yet another purified version of Britain, it was intended to be a purely Anglican version of Britain. Whilst the Canterbury Association operated under the auspices of the New Zealand Company, its 'right of selection [of colonists] applied to both purchasers of land and to assisted emigrants and was to be used to restrict settlement to members of the Church of England and to maintain a proper balance among the various sections of the new community.' It has been suggested that Canterbury was the most 'English' of Wakefield's colonial experiments; for Hight and Straubel 'the approximation in Canterbury to the gradations of English society … was achieved not through an agricultural community constructed upon the sufficient price, but through pastoralism with leasehold tenure' (Hight and Straubel, 1957, pp. vii-viii).[105] Wakefield sought to transplant a complete copy of British society to the colony of

---

[105] Hight and Straubel argue that whilst 'Canterbury has always been regarded as the settlement in which Wakefield's theories were given their fullest application … Wakefield did not understand or sufficiently provide for the development of extensive pastoralism in a colony where the chief natural resource was open grassland' (Hight and Straubel, 1957, p. vii). Since Wakefield has been shown to have had questionable amounts of prior knowledge regarding the physical and logistical characteristics of all of his colonial experiments, it is not surprising to find that his practical knowledge of Canterbury and its environs was also lacking.

Canterbury. However the main difference between Canterbury and all of the other Wakefieldian colonies was its Anglican basis. As Sargent informs us, 'Canterbury was to be a Church of England settlement, complete with a Bishop, in which there would be neither extremely rich or extremely poor but which would include a strict hierarchy within those who settled (Sargent, 2001, p. 2). Canterbury was intended to be not only a systematically colonized *British* colony, it was intended to be a systematically colonized *Anglican* British colony:

> "We intend to form a settlement, to be composed entirely of members of our own church, accompanied by an adequate supply of clergy…" (*Canterbury Papers* 6) … "What we wish is … to plant … a community … to include all that is good in our society at home; to exclude, as far as possible, all that is evil". (Lord George William Lyttelton (1817-76) quoted in *Canterbury Settlement* 6, quoted in Sargent, 2001, p. 2)

Wakefield dubbed Canterbury a 'City of Refuge' for those who decided to emigrate there (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of December 1847, p. 15) and a letter Wakefield wrote to E. H. W. Bellairs on the 11th of November, 1849, further demonstrates the expectations Wakefield had for Canterbury's success, along with his desire to promote the colony's attractiveness to as many people as possible. Wakefield writes that 'the detailed accounts of the "Great Southern Plains of New Zealand" … represent the spot [Canterbury's location] as not merely unsurpassed, but unrivalled … and they satisfy me that neither New Zealand nor any other colony possesses so fine a location for a new settlement.' He goes on to argue that 'this Canterbury colony, with its unrivalled site, its thorough previous survey, and a Godley for its pioneer, has greater elements of success for individuals and the whole enterprise, than has, or has had, any similar undertaking' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), p. 138). The optimism that Wakefield possessed for Canterbury's success is demonstrated when, in a letter to Godley on the 22nd of June, 1850 he writes of the plan to colonize Canterbury that 'it is a good plan; there is a good colony of people; an excellent prospect, on this side, of the largest and best emigration that we ever hoped for' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), p. 290). Whilst Wakefield was disappointed with the ways in which the colonization of Canterbury was handled at an administrative and governmental level, he nonetheless believed that Canterbury was the most successful of his schemes, at least in regards to the quality of its colonists: 'assuredly

nothing in modern times is to be compared to our first body of colonists, actual and probable' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of June 1850, 282). Despite his fear that 'our most prosperous beginning … should be nipped in the bud by some untoward event', Wakefield argued that:

> If no great error be committed in any quarter, there will be sent out this year, and resident at Lyttelton in 1851, a far more important colony than were, in the first year of their existence, all those put together with which I have been personally concerned, namely, Adelaide, Wellington, New Plymouth, Nelson and Otago. (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of June 1850, pp. 282-283)

In the estimation of a descendant of Godley, both Godley and Wakefield 'hoped to see "a complete segment of English society established in "New Canterbury", and insisted that provision for Church and schools could not be merely regarded as accessories … [they were] essential to the formation of a civilized community' (Godley, 1950, pp. xii-xiii). According to Webb, 'Godley and Wakefield were brought together by a common belief in the possibilities of systematic colonization.' From Webb's analysis, Godley was perhaps even more fervently in favour of systematic colonization than Wakefield. Due to the dangers democracy and industrial development posed for the stability of English society and English religion Godley felt that systematic colonization was necessitous because it could work to counteract the 'evil and destructive forces at work in Church and society.' Godley argued that industrial development and the decline of the Church were causing the majority of Britain and Europe's problems; industrial development because it was 'wrecking an agricultural society in which the various gradations were linked together and stabilised by the bonds of mutual obligation', and the decline of the Church because it had suffered 'a loss of spiritual vigour and doctrinal independence' (Webb, 1957, pp. 138-139). Whilst they did not necessarily intend to limit the possibilities for social development indefinitely, both Wakefield and Godley sought to mitigate the likelihood of radical social change in the Canterbury settlement. Godley was opposed to the growing predilection in Britain for 'betterment' and progress and he opposed 'the fundamental principle of Whig political thought – "the derivation of power from below".' Godley argued that, in society at large, this principle of political thought resulted 'in the exaltation of manufactures at the expense of agriculture, in the attempt at universal *secular* education, in the collection of men into towns instead of leaving

them under the influence of local superiors, - the universal mania for *bettering* our condition, instead of calmly and contentedly performing our duties'.[106] According to Webb, 'Godley's political convictions proceeded from and were subordinate to his religious convictions. The Church, in his view, [was] the custodian of principles and truths which are the only legitimate bases of political authority' (Webb, 1957, p. 137). Subsequently, Godley was not in favour of political reform that sought, for example, to expand the franchise and encourage democracy: '… the age of equality is coming upon us … our business is not so much to struggle against it, with a view to repulse it altogether, as to *retard* its progress and *modify* its effects' (Godley, quoted in Webb, 1957, p. 137). Whilst Godley ultimately changed his mind regarding the practicability of his and Wakefield's plans to create a utopian Anglican colony, the specifically utopian nature of his and Wakefield's vision for Canterbury is demonstrated when he argues that:

> When I first adopted and made my own, the idea of this colony, it pictured itself to my mind in the colours of a Utopia. Now that I have been a practical colonizer, and have seen how these things are managed in fact, I often smile when I think of the ideal Canterbury of which imagination dreamed. Yet I see nothing in the dream to regret or be ashamed of, and I am quite sure that without the enthusiasm, the poetry, the unreality (if you will,) with which our scheme was overlaid, it would never have been accomplished.[107]

The utopian characteristics of Godley's designs for Canterbury are further evidenced when Webb writes that, for Godley, 'the western world was near to final calamity, and his hope was that civilization would regenerate itself in the newer societies of the Americas and the Antipodes' (Webb, 1957, p. 137). Whilst the debates that occurred between Wakefield and Godley over the ways in which they could transform 'the ideal into the practical' in Canterbury ultimately led to their 'estrangement' (Godley, 1950, p. xiv),[108] both authors had similarly utopian plans for Canterbury. Indeed according to Burroughs, both Godley and Wakefield 'possessed a vision of a perfect pattern of society that they wanted to create' (Burroughs, 1973, p.

---

[106] J. R. Godley to C. B. Adderley, in Godley, *Letters from America*, London, 1844, Letter dated 23rd November, 1840, pp. 8-10, quoted in Webb, in Hight and Straubel (ed.), 1957, p. 136.
[107] "Farewell Breakfast to Mr. & Mrs Godley", *Lyttleton Times*, 25 December 1852, p. 9, quoted in Sargent, 2001, p. 3.
[108] See Burroughs, 1973, pp. xxxiv-xxxvii for further details on Godley and Wakefield's falling out. Burroughs argues that their relationship became strained because of Wakefield's attempt to control the process of Canterbury's colonization from London.

vi). A letter that Wakefield wrote to Godley on the 22nd of June, 1850 further shows us that whilst Wakefield's idealization of his own schemes might be at times obscured by the machinations and practical realities of political scheming, he continued to be motivated by a vision of perfection. In the letter, Wakefield discusses the fact that the Canterbury Company was to 'be broken up in July, and superseded by the Colonial Office.' In Wakefield's estimation, this event ruined all of his plans for Canterbury and New Zealand: 'and thus my dream of making New Zealand a model, as respects both colonization and government, has come to an end' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), pp. 277-278). The fact that Wakefield eventually grew disillusioned with his utopian dream for Canterbury does not lessen its status as a utopian vision. Indeed Wakefield's description of Canterbury as one of his 'colonizing dreams' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), p. 292) further demonstrates the kinds of utopian idealization that motivated his career as a colonial reformer.

Wakefield's advocacy of the systematic colonization of New Zealand lasted until the settlement of Canterbury in 1850 and it is clear that the utopian impulse that initially inspired Wakefield in 1829 remained constant throughout his career as a colonial reformer. Douglas Pike has indeed argued that the Canterbury settlement was an even more utopian project than the South Australia scheme. According to Pike 'not until he [Wakefield] came to found Canterbury did his appeal go beyond acquisitiveness and pride, to include something of his own passionate ambition; inspired by his self-imposed mission as an architect of society, he played on the urge to be constructive, "to build, create, achieve" (Pike, 1957, p. 79). As mentioned previously, Wakefield was only one of many authors who promoted the colonization of New Zealand in utopian terms. A brief assessment of the works of such authors will further demonstrate that the British colonization of New Zealand was viewed as a utopian project by both British colonial promoters and British colonists.

Utopia in New Zealand: a broad discourse

An extensive amount of literature published in both Britain and New Zealand in the nineteenth century discussed New Zealand using utopian language and utopian tropes. As James Belich informs us, the 'titles of books on New Zealand published between the 1850s and the 1880s included *The Land of Promise, The Wonderland of the Antipodes, The Wonderland of the World* … etc' (Belich, 2001, p. 299). Given the size of this body of literature, a few select examples will amply demonstrate that

Wakefield's utopian speculations for New Zealand were shared by numerous British authors in the nineteenth century. Thomas Cholmondeley's publication, *Ultima Thule; or, Thoughts Suggested by a Residence in New Zealand* (1854), contains numerous examples of the kinds of utopian thought that permeate the literature of nineteenth century New Zealand. Cholmondeley writes that:

> The possession of a great colony is like a pledge of a new life. There we may renew ourselves. For as a colony derives much of its strength and light from the history, tradition, language, laws and feelings of the mother-country, so *she* may reasonably look for and obtain a filial benefit from her offspring in return for her nursing care. The contests with which we are so sadly familiar in our old country, may be, under more propitious circumstances, successfully fought out on a new soil. Dangers which never can be escaped, obstacles which can never be surmounted here, may have no existence there. New faculties may be bestowed upon us; fresh energy radiated from the inventive and constructive genius of a young society, as yet unbent by conventionalities, unbroken by excess. (Cholmondeley, 1854, p. 4)

In Cholmondeley's estimation, 'in a new country we may avoid our old national mistakes, and escape their retribution. Behold a clean new conscience. Here we may reap the great blessing of experience, without being any longer bowed down by the overwhelming debt of purchase.' Cholmondeley offers practical warnings similar to those of Wakefield's and writes that whilst 'no other [colony] presents a resemblance and a contrast to England so strong as New Zealand … what an immense opportunity for mutual good exists in their relationship: what a dreadful possibility of evil!' (Cholmondeley, 1854, p. 5). Much like Wakefield's 'warnings' such comments can be read as attempts to simply dissuade the usage of the 'wrong' methods of colonization in New Zealand rather than caveats that diminish the utopian characteristics of these works.

In his discussion of the state of New Zealand in 1851 William Fox used evocative utopian language to argue that if the 'Wiltshire or Somersetshire labourer … be made aware that there is such a land of milk and honey to be got at by a four months' voyage … I cannot help thinking that it would be very difficult to keep him where he is' (Fox, 1851, p. 11). Whilst Fox would have been biased in his account of the potential prospects that awaited British labourers in New Zealand given his position as 'the Resident agent of the New Zealand Company at Nelson' between 1843 and 1848, along with his latter appointment as the 'Principal agent of the New

Zealand Company', his comments nonetheless demonstrate the presence of utopian tropes in the broader colonial promotional literature of New Zealand (Fox, 1851, pp. iv-v). In their historical study of New Zealand's intentional communities, Lucy Sargisson and Lyman Tower Sargent include an excerpt from a letter written by a Canterbury settler, Charles Hursthouse, which amply demonstrates the utopian aspirations that underpinned the Canterbury project:

> It is this fact that for me gives the country such a charm, the charm of our home beauties stealing over the wild grandeur of this favoured land, and heightened by a climate, of which the most lovely of English days can scarcely convey an idea. When Christchurch has grown to a pretty town, when the young oak of England stands by the giant trees indigenous to New Zealand, when the avenues of houses are lined by the graceful and beautiful shrubs, when the green grass of England is sprouting in her meadows, fenced by hawthorn hedges, when daisies and butter-cups flower over the land, when the timid hare springs across the field, and the coveys of partridges break from cover, and the sun of heaven shines brightly through the pure atmosphere, tempered by breezes from the Pacific and the Alpine shore, then there will be but one thing wanting to make New Zealand the Eden of the world – the charm of age, the vestiges of the past, the spot endeared by old associations and traditions. (Hursthouse, 1857, p. 99, quoted in Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. 14).

Other authors such as C. Warren Adams wrote that Canterbury was a place where 'the losses and errors of the old life in the old country were to be retrieved' (Adams, 1853, p. 16). That New Zealand was regarded within Britain itself as a site for utopian experimentation in the early nineteenth century is indicated in the following excerpt from a speech George Grey delivered to the British parliament in 1890: '"Honourable members will scarcely believe now the kind of fervour which existed in Great Britain in the time of my youth to found a New World differing greatly from the Old World".'[109]

Wakefield also includes excerpts from other authors in *The British Colonization of New Zealand* and *The Founders of Canterbury* that further demonstrate the utopian vision that British colonial promoters had for New Zealand. Reverend White, for example, sought to create in New Zealand '"a perfect establishment, that is, the British nation in miniature, governed by equitable laws; influenced by truly Christian principles; and prompted by evangelical and

---

[109] Sir George Grey, speaking in the House of Representatives, 1890, quoted in Sinclair, 1961, p. 36.

philanthropic motives'" (White, quoted in Wakefield, 1837, pp. 256-257). In a letter to James Cecil Wynter[110] dated the 16th February, 1850, Wakefield shows us that he was not alone in promoting systematic colonization as the best means to create a perfected version of Britain in New Zealand. In the letter Wakefield discusses what Wynter called '"the best design the mind of man ever framed for the reproduction of an English nation'" (Wakefield, 1868, p. 218). He laments what he sees as the slim chance this design had to be implemented in New Zealand. Such examples clearly demonstrate that Wakefield was not the only British author who viewed the colonization of New Zealand as a utopian project. That Wakefield was motivated by a utopian vision of British colonial perfection for the entirety of his career as a colonial reformer is demonstrated by the fact that he promoted the colonization of New Zealand in utopian language similar to that which he used to advocate the colonization of South Australia.

We will now complete our analysis of Wakefield's utopian qualities with a broader assessment of the similarities and differences between Wakefield's particular vision of imperial utopian perfection and the concepts and ideas that continue to challenge scholarly assessments of Western utopian thought.

---

[110] Publications written by Wynter include *Hints on Church Colonization* (1850).

Chapter Seven

Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Western Utopian Tradition

The previous three chapters have demonstrated that Wakefield is a utopian thinker in his own right. In this final chapter, we will discuss the utopian characteristics of Wakefield's works in comparison with the main themes addressed by other early nineteenth century utopian authors. The ways in which Wakefield's particular brand of utopian thinking can be understood in relation to the key concepts addressed in the broader scholarly literature of utopian studies will also be countenanced. Such comparisons will enable us to contextualize Wakefield's works with other early nineteenth century utopian authors, and provide us with a broader understanding of the relationship between Wakefield's works and the Western utopian tradition.

Utopia: a new society?

The utopian authors of the early nineteenth century were, for the most part, united in their belief that the society that would be created through the implementation of their plans would be a 'new' society, one that was fundamentally different from the social form that they were looking to supplant. The concept that this 'new society' would be free from the problematic institutions, hierarchies and social arrangements of the old was central to their platforms for reform. However, what constituted a 'new' society for these authors differed and they were not necessarily looking to remodel all social and political institutions; the reform of existent institutions to the point of perfection was also a component of several of the utopians' plans. The ideal society that these authors sought to create was intended to be vastly different from the existent society of Europe in the early nineteenth century, but this does not mean that earlier forms of European social organization did not inform their vision for an ideal society, or that their visions for a new society were not based upon a refashioning of 'old' systems. Examples of utopian refashioning of existent institutions are to be found in plans for the creation of a 'new' order devised by Owen and Fourier. Their elaborate drawings of their new communities bear a striking resemblance to the grounds and buildings of the Versailles palace or an Oxford college. Although Owen's schemes for universal education were central to his plans for social reorganization, they were also augmented by his plans to establish a system of villages that would facilitate this process of education, whilst simultaneously providing productive employment for the

working classes. This was Owen's vision of a 'new' utopian society that would, in economic and educational terms, be fundamentally different from the society of early nineteenth century Britain.[111] In Owen's estimation, if such a series of villages were to be created, 'the foundations of a new and better social order for the whole community would speedily be laid.' As Cole informs us, Owen's initial plan to create a series of Villages of Co-operation based on his own New Lanark establishment soon became a global scheme for utopian redevelopment. In Cole's words:

> [Owen] began by preaching it [his plan] as a cure for unemployment; but soon he was putting it forward as a complete and immediately practicable social Utopia, destined speedily to sweep away capitalism and the competitive system, and to inaugurate for all the world a new era of peace and brotherhood based on a rational idea of the formation and development of human character under the influence of environment.' (Cole, 1927 (1966), pp. xiii-xiv)

An excerpt from Owen's *Revolution in the Mind and Practice of the Human Race* (1849) demonstrates the view Owen had of the 'new' society he sought to create:

> The governments of the world will, therefore, soon be compelled, in their own defence, to adopt this superior system, to prevent their being involved in anarchy, war, and ruin … This change will root up and utterly destroy the old vicious and miserable system of ignorance, poverty, individual competition, and contests, and of national war, throughout the world; and will introduce, in place thereof, the rational system of society, in which competition, strife, and wars, will cease for ever; and all will be trained, from infancy, solely to promote each other's happiness. (Owen, 1849 (1991), p. 365)

Whilst it is clear that Owen sought to create a 'new' society in the sense that it would have a different economic basis from the 'old' society and thus be free from all possible causes of social foment and distress, Owen's plans for the creation of a 'new' society were still based on plans to reform and improve the existing institutions of British society until they were perfect. As Tsuzuki informs us, Owen did not look to replace familiar political structures with entirely 'new' ones; rather 'Owen's method for effecting political change was a permeation of the existing governments with his

---

[111] Owen argued that 'instead of paying out doles, the Government should employ the poor in "Villages of Co-operation" modelled on his own establishment at New Lanark and [thus create] centres of social life and rational education as well as of productive activity (Cole, 1927 (1966), p. xiii). Owen's Villages of Co-operation were intended to be 'self-supporting … agricultural as well as industrial, and should raise the produce needed for their own consumption, exchanging their surplus products of different kinds one with another' (Cole, 1927 (1966), p. xiii).

views' (Tsuzuki, in Pollard (ed.), 1971, p. 21). Whilst Owen believed that the society that would emerge after this process would be 'new', he did not argue that all of the social institutions of Britain, and, indeed, the wider world, needed to be uprooted in order to facilitate this process.

Saint-Simon had a similarly reformist approach and based his arguments for 'a better order' upon an examination of existent political institutions. Saint-Simon argued that 'the social order [and the 'body politic' of Europe] has been overturned because it no longer corresponded with the level of enlightenment' in European philosophy and that it was the responsibility of the 'writers of the nineteenth century' to 'create a better order.' In Saint-Simon's discussion of the best form of political organization Europe could adopt in order to remedy its international political troubles, he looked to English parliamentary systems as a model for future European reform. According to Saint-Simon, 'the best possible constitution' is 'the parliamentary constitution' and it was to this form of government that he attributed the 'prosperity and power' of England in the early nineteenth century. For Saint-Simon a European society wherein 'all the nations of Europe should be governed by national parliaments, and should combine to form a common parliament to decide on the common interests of the European community' would be the most perfect form of political organization. According to Saint-Simon the adoption of parliamentary constitutions that recognised 'the supremacy of a common parliament set above all the nationals governments' would lead to 'the following conclusion: that wherever the hierarchic or feudal form of government is replaced by the parliamentary form, this change of itself produces a new, more perfect organization, no longer ephemeral like the old system, because its value does not depend on a particular state of the human mind which changes in the course of time, but on the invariable nature of things' (Saint-Simon, 1814 (1964), p. 45). Like Owen's plans to 'permeate' existent political institutions with his own ideas in order to elicit a utopian form of social change, Saint-Simon's plan to use the British parliamentary constitution as the basis for the creation of a perfected political order in Europe demonstrates that his thought was based upon the reform and improvement of existent institutions. Saint-Simon's plan to improve upon the orders and institutions of European society is similar to Wakefield's plan to *improve* the orders and institutions of British society in the colonies: Wakefield did not seek to create *new* social orders and institutions. Whilst the utopians did argue that

the society that would be created following the implementation of their reforms would be fundamentally different from the old, the emphasis that Owen and Saint-Simon placed upon reforming existing institutions to the point of perfection resonates with Wakefield's efforts to reform and improve existent British institutions through the creation of perfected colonial societies.

Colonies as examples of perfection

For Wakefield the creation of perfected British colonies was the only way in which the ideal society of his imagination could be realised. Simultaneously, this plan offered a solution to the underlying causes of Britain's domestic problems. However this does not mean that he did not have a cosmopolitan view of colonial expansion. The very obvious fact that his plans for colonization in South Australia and New Zealand were part of the broader expansion of the British Empire reveal the global perspective of Wakefield's thought. However he did not seek the global change as desired by Charles Fourier, Robert Owen *et al*. He did not envisage that all of governments and societies of the world would become 'British.' The utopians of the early nineteenth century arguably sought to implement their plans for the creation of a 'new' society on at least some form of global scale. Fourier, for example, did not confine his critique of social ills to the problems afflicting France or Europe alone. As Guarneri points out, 'Fourier's theory repudiated the idea of national distinctiveness in the name of a "scientific" analysis of human nature and social organization.' For Fourier, the entire world was in need of reconstruction and 'when Fourier indicted the brutal competition of laissez-faire, he believed he was describing the social order in which much of the populated world was enmeshed and toward which the remainder was evolving by an inexorable law' (Guarneri, 1982, p. 589). Cabet similarly sought to elicit 'total social transformation' on a global scale through the implementation of Icarian communism (Johnson, 1974, p. 17). The importance that Wakefield placed upon the spread of civilization through the process of systematic colonization shows us that his plans did have a globalizing component similar to the 'real' utopians of the early nineteenth century. Wakefield was an advocate of British imperial expansion so this comes as no surprise. For example, in 1849 he argued that the implementation of systematic colonization in Britain's colonial policy 'would be to accelerate immensely the rate of colonization, and to augment more quickly than by any other disposition of the fund, the population, wealth, and greatness of the empire' (Wakefield, 1849

(1914), p. 380). This is not to say that Wakefield's plans for the expansion of the British Empire were conceived as a utopian project directly comparable to Fourier's plans for global reorganization; such a claim and consideration is not only inaccurate, it raises questions and fields of study that are beyond the scope of this thesis. Nonetheless Wakefield argued for the global spread of British civilization not only because he believed British society and 'civilization' should exist within as much of the world as possible, but also because he believed the British version of 'civilization' to be a form of social organization that other societies and cultures should adopt. As June Phillips argues, 'in spite of its many defects, that England in which he lived represented for Wakefield the embodiment of a most cherished and difficult goal – civilization' (Phillips, 1971, p. 23).

As an advocate of British imperial expansion, Wakefield was not alone in his desire to spread British civilization around the world. Ronald Hyam, for example, has discussed the broader motives for imperial expansion that dominated the Victorian era of the British Empire. Hyam argues that 'ideologically the Victorian desire was to *improve* the rest of the world by a programme of Christian regeneration, spreading civilization on the British model. This was, they believed, the only perfection open to mankind, and it was God-ordained' (Hyam, 2002, p. 90). To suggest that Wakefield was the only figure who promoted the civilizing mission of the British Empire is obviously completely inaccurate. The extent to which other political figures advocated similar ideas to Wakefield, however, is not crucial to the argument of this thesis. It is clear that the drive to expand the British Empire for economic, ideological, strategic and religious reasons was shared by many British politicians and religious leaders, and that Wakefield was but one small component of a much wider, and complicated, imperialist discourse. The global component of Wakefield's views on British imperial expansion is also important because it raises the issue of whether or not Wakefield's promotion of Britain as the ideal society was intended to foster the belief that British social, political and economic arrangements were the only form of such arrangements that should exist in the entire world. It is unlikely that Wakefield or the wider British colonial reform movement would have supported such a view completely, and despite Wakefield's advocacy of the primacy of British culture and civilization it would be inaccurate to claim that he sought to turn the entire world into 'Britain.'

There are, nevertheless, certain points of similarity between Wakefield's views on the global nature of British colonization and the ways in which at least some utopian authors looked to create a perfected, worldwide utopian society. The process through which the world would eventually be changed into an ideal society was important to the utopians and the role of experimental or 'exemplary' colonies in the thought of these authors was important. Fourier and his followers, for example, believed that if the wider world could see a working example of social perfection, all of the societies and governments of the world could not help but be persuaded of the superior qualities of their utopian social orders, thus facilitating the global creation of an ideal social order. Owen and Cabet also believed that once the members of the wider world had seen the success of their experiments and recognised the inherent superiority of their alternative social, political and economic arrangements, they would choose to remodel themselves upon the example of such colonies. As Judith Shklar argues in her discussion of Etienne Cabet's attempt to establish a model Icarian colony in Texas, 'the purpose of Cabet's expedition to set up Icaria in America was not simply to establish a small island of perfection; it was to be a nucleus from which a world of Icarias would eventually spring' (Shklar, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 109). Robert Owen had similar intentions for the New Lanark colony in North America. For Owen America was an ideal location to attempt to create an ideal colony because it 'provided the conditions within which to model a "New Moral World" that was to progressively transform society on a global scale by enlightened example' (Grant, 2005, p. 41).

Wakefield had a similar view of the ways in which systematic colonization would not only create ideal British colonies, but would also inspire the creation of other systematically planned, ideal (and in that sense British) colonies. As discussed in relation to Wakefield's plans for the colonization and assimilation of the Maori in New Zealand, he did in fact argue that British colonies would be attractive to other societies (in his terminology the 'savage' societies of the Pacific, for example). Such societies, upon seeing the example of British colonization, would also seek to become colonized. This is not exactly comparable with Owen and Cabet's argument that the example of one functioning utopian colony would inspire the creation of a worldwide utopian social order. Wakefield did not have universal intentions of the same scale as other utopian authors, but he did argue that the exemplary nature of his colonies

would facilitate the global spread of an idealised version of colonial British society. The exemplary vision Wakefield had for the colonies of his imagination is further demonstrated in his arguments in favour of colonial self-government.

The ways in which new British colonies would model themselves on the political apparatuses of Britain is raised in Wakefield's discussion of colonial self-government. Wakefield was an advocate of colonial self-government, but also argued that colonies such as South Australia and New Zealand should remain distinctly 'British' entities.[112] In *England & America* Wakefield argues that 'with the capacity for self-government comes the power to exercise it.' Wakefield believed that colonies that were not fit for self-government, such as South Africa, 'could not but submit patiently to the oppression, the sportive injustice, and fantastic cruelty of an English lord, sent across the world to do with them as he pleased' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), pp. 579-580). Since the colonies Wakefield sought to establish would be exemplary, he argues that they would never agree 'to be managed by an authority residing at a great distance from them.' In a letter from 1850, whilst he initially argues that 'even now if I could please myself, I would have England make English constitutions for English colonies', Wakefield maintains that since 'England won't take the trouble' to do so, 'those here who engage in constitution-making for distant colonies are sure to make sad blunders.' In Wakefield's estimation, since 'no community will ever be very fond of a constitution made *for* them without their participation … if we don't make haste to do that which we are sure will be acceptable to the colonies, they will make their own constitutions with a vengeance.' Whilst Wakefield argued that the British government would not take the time to adequately tailor colonial constitutions to meet the interests of the colonists, he nonetheless maintains that he does 'not *like* [colonial self government] as well as my old dream of moulding colonies to the British form by means of British-made constitutions' (Wakefield, 1868 (1973), letter of January 1850,

---

[112] Wakefield emphasizes the distinction between chartered and crown colonies to further his arguments in favour of self government. He argues that 'those English colonies which govern themselves in local matters, are distinguished by the name of *chartered colonies*, while the others are called *crown colonies*. The crown colonies, such as New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land, and South Africa, being governed in local matters from Downing-street, London, and affording a vast deal of patronage to the noblemen and gentlemen who live in that street, are most sincerely preferred by the English government … The chartered colonies of England, governing themselves from the beginning, in local matters, have usually defrayed the whole cost of their local government: the cost, on the contrary, of governing two crown colonies has generally fallen upon England. Here are two reasons against crown colonies: first, the expense which they occasion to the country whose rulers hold them in subjection secondly, the absence of any motive in the government of the colony for letting the colonists be rich enough to bear taxation' (Wakefield, 1833 (1968), pp. 582-583, emphasis in original).

p. 194). Wakefield clearly felt that there was a conflict between his desire to model the colonies of his imagination upon British systems of government, and the reality of the imperfections and antagonisms that existed between the colonial reform movement's advocacy of self government and the British government's views on this question.

Radical difference

Numerous scholars have suggested that a text must propose fundamentally radical changes to the social order if it is to be considered to be truly 'utopian.' Simply by aiming to create miniature versions of British society in the colonies of South Australia and New Zealand, Wakefield was not projecting a vision of a perfected social order that included some kind of radical alteration or change. However, it is the argument of this thesis that scholarly analyses of utopian thought that argue in favour of radical change as a necessary component for utopian categorization have not provided sufficient breadth and depth in their conceptions of what constitutes a utopian project.

Scholars of utopia who insist that a text or idea can only be regarded as utopian if it proposes a radical change to the established social order include Frank and Fritzie Manuel, who claim that 'if a utopia is merely or primarily reflective of existing reality it is trivial' (Manuel and Manuel, 1979, p. 29). By this reasoning, Wakefield's plans for colonization, concerned as they were with replicating a perfected version of the 'existing reality' of British society throughout the world, might not be considered to be utopian. Fredric Jameson's similar claim that utopian politics 'aims at imagining, and sometimes even realising, a system radically different from this one' (Jameson, 2005, p. xii) suggests that the presentation of an alternate 'system' is a necessary prerequisite for a text to be considered utopian. Jameson argues that any utopian projection of an ideal society must:

> Respond to specific dilemmas and offer to solve fundamental social problems to which the Utopian believes himself to hold the key. The Utopian vocation can be identified by this certainty, and by the persistent and obsessive search for a simple, a single-shot solution to all our ills. And this must be a solution so obvious and self-explanatory that every reasonable person will grasp it: just as the inventor is certain his better mousetrap will compel universal conviction. (Jameson, 2007, p. 11)

The suggestion that such 'single-shot solutions' must create social worlds that are 'radically different' from the existent social world does suggest that Wakefield is not utopian in the same sense as authors such as Fourier or Owen, who argued that certain aspects, or indeed the entirety, of the social, economic and political systems of nineteenth century Europe needed to be changed. However, the question of whether Wakefield qualifies as a utopian author simply because his plans were not predicated upon opposition to existent social and economic structures is a complicated one. Wakefield was looking to remove what he believed were the causes of the distress, uncertainty and potentially revolutionary social and economic problems Britain was facing and in this regard his ambitions coincided with figures such as Robert Owen. Whilst the means Wakefield sought to employ in order to facilitate this ambition were different to Owen and the other utopians of the early nineteenth century, and whilst it is true that Wakefield was biased in favour of the middle class and the aristocracy, as we have seen with figures such as Owen contradictions and inconsistencies within the thought of such individuals does not diminish the utopian qualities of their plans.

In his discussion of British utopian texts published between 1815 and 1848, Gregory Claeys provides one possible reason why Wakefield's works have not been discussed by scholars of utopia, whilst also providing us with a way to support our argument in favour of Wakefield's utopian qualities. Claeys argues that between 1815 and 1848 British utopianism functioned 'as a critique of the unifying ideal of the age, "progress".' In Claeys' estimation, whilst 'trade and industry brought palpable benefits to many consumers' in the early nineteenth century, 'after 1820 [they also brought] massive disruption to the lives of the majority.' British utopians thus adopted a critical attitude towards the commercial and industrial upheaval of the early nineteenth century and, according to Claeys, 'what the utopian genre so frequently indicates, against this background, is the desire to recreate a simpler and more moral society' (Claeys, 1997, pp. xxviii-xxix). The problems that were arising in Britain because of 'a seemingly pathological desire for novelty as well as opulence which infested all social ranks' were a primary concern of the utopians of the time and Claeys argues that 'utopists thus had two major problems to solve: how to inhibit the passion for novelty and luxury; and how to restrain the desire to oppress' (Claeys 1997, p. xxx). Since Wakefield was an advocate of 'civilization', progress and commercial colonial expansion, it seems that it would be difficult to classify his work

as 'utopian' in the same sense as the authors Claeys discusses, figures such as Benjamin Disraeli, John Trotter, and John Minter Morgan *et al.*[113] Wakefield's schemes for the expansion of the British colonial empire might initially seem contrary to such ambitions, since he was looking to expand Britain's commercial empire through a system that maintained the social and economic divisions of nineteenth century Britain and arguably limited the economic and political rights of labouring colonists. However, it is clear that Wakefield did have an idealized view of the colonization process, and also argued that systematic colonization, to use Jameson's terminology, was a 'single-shot solution' to Britain's domestic problems. Indeed Ged Martin's argument that Wakefield 'was capable of arguing as though present and future were wholly unrelated, insisting unrealistically upon instant solutions to complex problems' (Martin, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), 1997, p. 23) suggests that systematic colonization was indeed intended to provide a 'single-shot solution' for Britain's domestic and colonial problems. Whilst Wakefield might not have proposed a radical alteration to the systems of British society and government, to say that his schemes were not utopian simply because of this ignores not only the utopian basis of his plans for colonization, but also the ways in which Wakefield's plans and ideas resembled those of the utopian authors of the early to mid nineteenth century.

Pragmatism, not idealism

Whether or not Wakefield can be considered to be a utopian author due to the potentially too 'practical' or 'realistic' focus of his schemes is another important consideration, since a significant proportion of utopian authors, or utopian movements, who have attempted to implement their schemes in reality have failed.[114]

---

[113] Early nineteenth century British utopian texts that Claeys discusses include Morgan, Minter John, *Revolt of the Bees* (3rd edn., 1839) and Disraeli, Benjamin, *The Voyage of Captain Popanilla* (1828) and *The History of Bullanabee and Clinkataboo* (1828).

[114] The colonies that utopian figures such as Robert Owen created can be considered to have 'failed' in that they either did not achieve the goals that their founders had for them (in relation to the role such colonies were intended to play in creating a new social order), or they simply stopped existing as intentionally created utopian colonies founded upon specific social, political and economic lines. As Keith Taylor points out, 'so many of [these kinds of colonies] failed in the specific sense of having come to an end' and that such endings are 'the usual fate, in particular, of utopian communities' (Taylor, 1982, p. 54). Owen's attempt to create the ideal colony of 'New Harmony' in the United States of America in 1825 has been described by scholars as 'a debacle of production and distribution from its very beginning' (Negley and Patrick, 1952, p. 14). Not all attempts to create utopian communities in the nineteenth century were complete failures, however. As Robert Sutton points out, Etienne Cabet's efforts to found an ideal utopian colony (also in the United States) were not entirely unsuccessful: 'at five different locations between 1848 and 1898, [Cabet] and his followers created one of America's longest-lived nonreligious communal experiments, a perfect society first described in his best-selling

Scholars have debated the extent to which Wakefield can be considered a 'practical' or 'idealistic' author. Such debate has mostly occurred in relation to whether or not Wakefield favoured imaginative conjecture over practical political action. Richard Garnett, for example, argued that 'the practical side of Wakefield's work seems second to the ideal, the conception of a system which methodized the previously irregular and haphazard attempts at colonization, and made it a department of statesmanship' (Garnett, 1898, p. 373). Contrariwise, R.C. Mills posited that 'the practical side of life remained Wakefield's chief concern' and that Wakefield 'devoted the whole of his extraordinary talents and energy to the task of putting his plan into practice' (Mills, 1914, p. xi). Other scholars have suggested that Wakefield would have found descriptions of his work as 'utopian' to be objectionable. In Erik Olssen's estimation, Wakefield was solely concerned with the practical application of his schemes and 'like [Adam] Smith, [Wakefield] used utopian and arcadian as synonyms for "useless" and "chimerical"' (Olssen, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), 1997, p. 61).

As John Gray has pointed out, 'visions of an ideal world are never realized' (Gray, 2007, p. 17). Wakefield, like most other utopian authors, maintained that his vision of an ideal colonial society was never implemented according to the letter of his vision. Whilst it is obviously inaccurate to argue that South Australia and New Zealand 'failed' as exercises in British colonial expansion Wakefield nonetheless lamented what he perceived to be the lack of success his schemes had experienced. In *A View of the Art of Colonization* (1849) he wrote that, in regards to the ways in which South Australia's actual colonization mirrored the plans he had drawn up for the colony, 'it must be admitted, that not one of the objects of the theorists of 1830 has been fully accomplished. South Australia, as an experiment of their economical theory, has rather failed than succeeded: the experiment did not attain the success of being fairly tried' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 58).

Wakefield had a similar view of the way systematic colonization had been implemented in New Zealand and he argued that 'New Zealand altogether, as respects

romantic novel *Voyage en Icarie* (*Travels in Icaria*)' (Sutton, 2003, p. vii). Sutton notes that despite the success of Cabet's American colonies in comparison to the 'the average fifteen-year life span of other nineteenth-century nonreligious communities', Cabet's Icarians 'were plagued with problems that appeared even before they started their community' and that the blueprint for Cabet's ideal colony, *Voyage to Icaria*, 'was simply irrelevant to the American environment where all but one colony was established' (Sutton, 2003, pp. xlv-xlvi).

both colonization and government, is a miserable mess. There is no part of the colonial empire of Britain, no portion of the colonizing proceedings of the mother-country apart from government, still less any instance of colonial government, which the theorists of 1830 can regard without disappointment and regret' (Wakefield, 1849 (1914), p. 58). This is significant because it shows us, firstly, that Wakefield did not believe that his theories were implemented as he intended. It also demonstrates that his plans for the creation of new colonies could not be reconciled with the practical necessities of reality. True, Wakefield often expressed this view in relation to the more practical, economic aspects of his theory rather than the idealized program of social engineering that he sought to implement, but the fact remains that the plans that Wakefield formulated were never actually implemented to their full extent.

Scholars have indeed argued that it is not only impossible, but both normatively and philosophically undesirable, for a utopian vision to be created in reality. Lewis Mumford has argued that whilst 'nothing could be more fatal to human society than to achieve its ideals … fortunately nothing is less likely to happen.' Mumford's argument that 'it is provided in the nature of things that from every consummation will spring conditions that make it necessary to pass beyond it' (Mumford, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 7) finds resonance with Fredric Jameson's claim that 'utopia's deepest subject, and the source of all that is most vibrantly political about it, is precisely our inability to conceive it, our incapacity to produce it as a vision' (Jameson, 1977, p. 21). This suggests that utopian speculation is more important for its ability to provide political inspiration and hope, or for its ability to critique existent social and political problems, than it is as a formula for practical political action. Naturally it is not being suggested that the lack of success Wakefield perceived within the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand is comparable to the kinds of problems and ultimate failure that schemes such as Owen's New Harmony experienced.[115] Experiments such as these generally failed in their entirety and South Australia and New Zealand were successful attempts at colonization, despite Wakefield's misgivings. Wakefield's disappointment with the practical realities of South Australia and New Zealand was demonstrative of his concern that fewer people would invest in such schemes if they were consistently proven to be

---

[115] For further analysis of the histories of several nineteenth century utopian communities, including Owen's New Harmony and the Icarian communities founded by Cabet and his followers, see Seymour Kesten's *Utopian Episodes: Daily Life in Experimental Colonies Dedicated to Changing the World*, (1993).

unsuccessful. For Wakefield the distortions his schemes had undergone once they were implemented was responsible for their failures. The need to obtain sufficient investment was a very real practical concern for Wakefield and the broader colonial reform movement and as Michael Turnbull has pointed out, 'the Wakefield system was designed for colonising new places, and Wakefield had to find a way of making people buy land they had never seen' (Turnbull, 1959, p. 17). Whilst A.G.L. Shaw has also argued that 'Wakefield and the so-called colonial reformers are well recognized as propagandists' (Shaw, 1969, p. 71), Wakefield's work is not illegitimately utopian because he used utopian idealizations to sell a practical concept. Wakefield's promotion of systematic colonization as a 'golden mean' and a 'perfect rule' for the creation of perfected British colonies was undeniably driven by his need to sell systematic colonization as a commercial venture but the fact that Wakefield proposed his scheme as a commercial venture does not lessen its utopian ambition. It is important to remember that utopian authors such as Owen and Cabet were also driven by the practical need for investment in their schemes. The utopians of the nineteenth century were equally motivated to 'sell' their schemes of utopian colonization as Wakefield and the British colonial reformers were motivated to sell the land of South Australia and New Zealand. For example, Judith Shklar has argued that the utopian visions of Etienne Cabet, Edward Bellamy and Theodore Hertzka[116] 'were all vulgarisations … devised solely to reach the largest possible audience' (Shklar, in Manuel (ed.), 1973, p. 109). According to Shklar, Hertzka placed his plans for social and political change within a literary framework simply because he believed it to be the most accessible means to successfully promote his schemes: Hertzka 'declared frankly that the imaginary society was merely a device to popularise social ideas which he regarded as practical and scientifically sound' (Shklar, 1973, p. 109). Whilst their plans had different ends, the necessity of large scale public acceptance, and investment, was recognised by both the utopians and Wakefield.

Claims against Wakefield being considered a utopian because of the overly practical, or 'realistic', focus of his works are counterbalanced by other commentators on the history of utopian thought. Roland Schaer, for example, argues that 'utopia in the first half of the nineteenth century … clearly seems to withdraw from the literary terrain to massively invest itself in political and social practice and to join forces with

---

[116] Theodor Hertzka was an Austrian author and political economist who published his utopian text *Freeland* in 1890.

reality or aspiring reality' (Schaer, 2000, p. 5). Russell Jacoby also argues that practical political thought and utopian scheming are inextricably linked. According to Jacoby, 'utopian thinking does not undermine or discount real reforms ... practical reforms depend on utopian dreaming – or at least utopian thinking drives incremental improvements' (Jacoby, 2005, p. 1). Robert Owen's support of the South Australian colonization scheme shows us that, at least in regards to Wakefield's own works, the intersection between what was practical political thought and what was considered a utopian program was also not entirely clear in Wakefield's own lifetime. Owen features as a commentator in the Appendix of *The New British Province of South Australia.* In the transcript of a meeting held at Exeter Hall in 1834, Owen is quoted as saying that he 'can conceive one reason, and only one, why emigration should be necessary; and that is, that the ignorance of the middling and higher classes does not allow productive employment to be given to the labouring classes within the islands of Great Britain and Ireland' (Owen, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, pp. 212-213). Although Owen commended the South Australian colonial promoters as being 'the first gentlemen in this country who have laboured hard solely for the benefit of the working classes generally', he believed that the problems facing Britain were not due to the potential terrors of overpopulation.[117] Rather, Owen argued that 'nothing but the ignorance which reigns in this country makes it necessary that one man should be forced to emigrate.' If Britain was reorganized so that its labouring poor could find employment within Britain itself, Owen believed that emigration and colonization would no longer be necessary, since 'under a proper system, the greatest number mentioned would be in full security of greater advantages than can be enjoyed by the emigrants who go to those remote regions which they propose to colonize' (Owen, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, pp. 212-213). Not surprisingly, Owen insinuates that his system of universal education was the only means by which Britain's problems could be resolved permanently. However, he is also quoted as saying that he 'heartily approve[d] of the present plan, as it will, in the mean time, tend to relieve the suffering people, and give time to the public mind to get sounder views of the subject'

---

[117] Although Owen did have a fear of a working class revolution in Britain, he did not believe that Britain or, indeed the world at large, was in danger of being overpopulated. In a letter to the Earl of Liverpool, Owen argued that 'this dread of an excess of population has no better foundation than exists for the nursery terrors of ghosts and hobgoblins … the earth is a comparative desert [and] all its present inhabitants are suffering for the want of a much more extended population; and that when the subject comes to be properly understood, no real evil will ever be apprehended from this source. (Owen, (date of original publication unspecified in text), 1927, p. 138).

(Owen, quoted in Wakefield, 1834, pp. 213-214). Although we do not want to overstate the significance of Owen's support for the South Australian scheme,[118] it remains important because it demonstrates that utopian figures such as Owen were not only interested and aware of Wakefield's schemes but supported them as a practical means to alleviate at least some of the social and economic problems of Britain. As we have seen, the vast majority of utopian thinkers in the nineteenth century intended for their schemes to be implemented in reality and did not consider themselves to be utopian or impractical thinkers. Wakefield's argument that the attempts to implement his theories were failures is more significant than whether or not the colonies themselves were failures; this shows us that Wakefield was perhaps more interested in the idealization of his theory than he was in its practical implementation.

Scholars who argue in favour of Wakefield's inherent impracticality have also suggested that Wakefield did not have a coherent vision for a future political state in the colonies. Ged Martin, for example, who has suggested that 'the Wakefieldian notion of the future seems unstructured and opaque'. According to Martin 'overall, Wakefield seemed determined to abolish the future, to blanket it beneath a continuation of the past. His aim was to ensure that the colonies "would no longer be new societies" but "so many *extensions* of an old society" (Martin, in Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), 1997, p. 21). Martin's suggestion that Wakefield's vision of the future was static and unchanging directly supports our argument in favour of his utopian qualities. Many utopian projections in the nineteenth century envisaged a social state whose perfection could not be surpassed; some kind of an 'end of history' wherein humanity could not, and would not seek to, improve its social and political arrangements. Some scholars have argued that Wakefield's plans were so far removed from the necessities and realities of colonial expansion that cannot be considered to be anything but utopian designs. Philip Temple has offered this appraisal of the utopian qualities of Wakefield's plans for systematic colonization:

---

[118] Promoters of the South Australian scheme, such as Robert Torrens, openly denounced Owen's plans for universal education and reform. According to Torrens, Owen's 'vaunted system would create a population so redundant, that the whole of the net revenue of the country would be required to supply the merely animal wants of the people: that arts, literature and science would be abandoned; and a more than Gothic ignorance prevail' (Torrens, *Colonization of South Australia*, 1835, pp. 515-517, quoted in Robbins, 1958, pp. 149-150). Torrens argued that Owen's 'new system, with all its complicated and enormously expensive apparatus, is unnecessary and superfluous.' Torrens' denunciation of Owen's plans for universal educational reform indicate that the planners of South Australia were aware of Owen's works, even if they did not agree with them.

The concept [of systematic colonization] was astounding: to manufacture kitset Little Englands, complete down to every nail and knock-down frame house, and ready to assemble after three – or four – month voyages round the world to lands that Captain Cook had first sighted only 60 years before. Astounding, or absurd. Because EGW's colonies in the air not only took no account of aboriginal peoples in waste lands for which Britain had no sovereignty, they also overlooked the fact that they had never been explored or surveyed, and paid no real attention to geography and climate or the practical, technical difficulties of translating theory into action. (Temple, 2002, p. 134)

As discussed previously, many scholars of Wakefield's life and works, and the history of South Australia and New Zealand, discuss Wakefield's status as a 'visionary' or 'idealist'. Michael Langley, for example, demonstrates the utopian aspirations Wakefield had for South Australia when he argues that 'as with Plato's conception of Sicily, [Wakefield] had found his own republic, albeit economic and social rather than philosophical. Here, a new kind of colonization could be implemented' (Langley, 1969, p. 709). Douglas Pike also argued that 'like Plato, Wakefield had a vision of a perfect pattern of society laid up in the heavens' (Pike, 1957, p. 79). According to Pike Wakefield's vision 'of a perfect pattern of society' was to be created using means that were 'few and simple': for Wakefield, 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number could be achieved, not by redistributing wealth already in existence, but by removing the restrictions which prevented prudence from creating new wealth from unused national resources of land, labour and capital' (Pike, 1957, p. 79). Such views demonstrate that scholars of Wakefield's life and works have believed him to be a utopian figure, even if his works have been ignored by scholars of utopia. Indeed the argument that scholars have made regarding the disconnection between Wakefield's ideas and the practical realities of colonization does find resonance with arguments that scholars have made regarding the ways in which the utopian desire to create a harmonious social environment is a fundamentally unreal aspiration. John Gray, for example, has argued that 'the pursuit of a condition of harmony defines utopian thought and discloses its basic unreality' (Gray, 2007, p. 17) and it can be argued that Wakefield himself sought to create a 'condition of harmony' in the colonial societies of South Australia and New Zealand, thus rendering his plans for these colonies utopian.

Further support for our argument that Wakefield's plans for South Australia and New Zealand had a basis in utopian thinking is found in Sargisson and Sargent's

argument that 'overwhelmingly utopianism is … "social dreaming", dreaming or desiring of a better life, a life that corrects the worst problems of the present.' According to Sargisson and Sargent, utopian thought does not necessarily conceive of an ideal world as a monolithic, unchangeable 'perfect' society:

> In most cases utopias do not suggest that every problem will be solved; most utopias, and probably *all* contemporary ones, recognise that while the worst problems can be identified and radically improved, perhaps even completely solved, issues will remain that will need to be dealt with through the processes of education, the law, and political decision making. (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, p. 159)

Utopian thought does not have to consist of programs that look to reinvent or reorganize the totality of social institutions. Wakefield's plans for utopian colonial societies can be considered to be utopian despite the fact that their creation was not necessarily intended to have as many wide ranging effects as the plans of figures such as Owen and Fourier.

Having said that, one way in which Wakefield's plans *can* be considered to be 'totalizing' social projects lies in their colonial basis. Although the perfected colonial society Wakefield sought to create had British society as its blueprint, the colonies that Wakefield sought to create would also be 'new' societies, in that the colonies would be 'new' social constructions based upon the social, economic and political structures of nineteenth century Britain. What is important in regards to the utopian qualities of these colonies, despite their similarities with Britain, is that the colonies would be entirely 'new places.' Wakefield argued that the colonies should be conceptualised as 'new' societies (temporally speaking) populated with 'old' people, by which Wakefield meant civilized, orderly members of British society (Wakefield, 1829 (1968), p. 151). The simple fact that the colonies would be new places where a perfected form of British society could potentially be created remains important, least of all because the realities of colonial expansion did mean that the people who removed to the colonies would experience significant changes in their lives. According to Alex Calder and Stephen Turner, Wakefield's dystopian portrayal of the barbarous 'new' people living in the existent British colonies of the early nineteenth century was not an entirely disproportionate reaction to the potentially polarising effects colonization could have upon the colonizers themselves. In Calder and Turner's estimation:

When peoples and goods are transplanted, the likelihood of irreversible change underpins and explains the dubious legacy of experiments in settlement: these new people, as Wakefield called them, might give rise to utopian social and political orders, but they might also constitute a degenerate creole scum. Both ends of the spectrum haunt settler societies. Settlers are people who have undergone an irreversible change, who can't go back; as such, they may be distinguished from members of a diaspora for whom the return home is still a star to steer by. (Calder and Turner, 2002, pp. 9-10)

Jonathan Lamb makes a similar point regarding what he calls the irreversible 'metamorphosis' settlers experienced when they permanently relocated their lives to lands that were entirely new to them. Lamb argues that 'in settler metamorphosis there is no loyalty to home, or the ground of a previous identity, to anchor alterations of the self within the boundaries of will and intention because the irrefutable fact of change prevents any turning back, or any management of what has happened' (Lamb, 2002, p. 33). Colonial societies have clearly been conceptualized by scholars as places where lasting and permanent transformation *can*, and did, occur. Whilst this transformation might only be relevant to the settlers themselves and the changes they underwent because of the knowledge that they might never return to their place of origin, it nonetheless shows us that utopian concepts of transformation and social reorganization have been discussed by scholars in relation to Wakefield's works and that to discuss Wakefield as a utopian author is a credible intellectual task.

What is also important is the argument made by scholars that utopian works are not only looking to create an ideal society, but that their authors are looking to end debate over what possible form that ideal society should take. It is questionable whether Wakefield saw systematic colonization and the creation of ideal British colonies as a means through which he could engage in what scholars such as J.C Davis have described as one of the central aims of all utopians, to 'end the social debate, the struggle over sacrifice and reward, over opportunities and restrictions, over the distribution of justice, which is politics' (Davis, 1981, p. 372). Charles Turner has argued that what humanity 'cannot renounce without renouncing [its] humanity is the tension between the ideal and reality which gives rise to utopian thinking' (Turner, 2003, p. 39) and it would be exaggeration to suggest that Wakefield sought to 'renounce' his humanity through the creation of ideal British colonies. Wakefield cannot really be portrayed as a figure who looked to 'end politics'

altogether, even if his vision of colonial life was one whose simplicity suggests that, perhaps, he did seek to remove some of the 'conflict over values and institutions' that was occurring in Britain and Europe in the early nineteenth century (Davis, 1981, p. 372). A final salient point that is raised by this discussion of Wakefield's desire to limit conflict and change in the colonies is whether or not a utopian program needs to be normatively acceptable in order for it to be considered 'utopian' by scholarly criteria.

Does utopia need to be normatively acceptable?

Wakefield's plans to colonize South Australia and New Zealand have been condemned for being exploitative of both the British working classes and the indigenous populations of South Australia and New Zealand. On these grounds, the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand can be considered to be a normatively unacceptable act, in that British imperialism was deleterious for both indigenous populations and certain emigrants from lower socio-economic orders. However, whether or not Wakefield's plans can, in and of themselves, be disregarded as examples of a particular kind of imperial utopian theorizing because they are normatively unacceptable by contemporary political and ethical standards is another matter.

The emphasis Wakefield placed on maintaining class divisions in his vision of an ideal colonial society can be considered to be exploitative of the working classes, since he argued that such stratification and economic inequality was crucial to the effective and profitable advance of British colonial development. This element of Wakefield's program would arguably be unacceptable as both a political and economic concept, and as an example of utopian theorizing, to contemporary scholars of utopia such as Fredric Jameson. Jameson (2007) has argued that there is a fundamental distinction between the social and political goals of utopians and advocates of liberal political theory who were looking to provide 'positive' answers to the world's political problems, rather than offering negative, reconstructive utopian visions. According to Jameson 'it is a mistake to approach Utopias with positive expectations, as though they offered visions of happy worlds.' For Jameson there is a dichotomy between 'the attempt to establish positive criteria of the desirable society [which] characterises liberal political theory from Locke to Rawls' and 'the diagnostic interventions of the Utopians.' For Jameson the primary difference between the aims

of the utopians and those of liberal political theorists lies in the fact that the utopians 'like the great revolutionaries, always aim at the alleviation and elimination of the sources of exploitation and suffering, rather than at the composition of blueprints of bourgeois comfort' (Jameson, 2007, p.12).[119] Even if one views his arguments that poor labourers in the colonies would one day 'become masters' with the healthiest of scepticism, it seems difficult to argue that Wakefield was not, in some ways, attempting to do both. He was not looking to eliminate the 'sources of exploitation and suffering' in the same manner as Fourier, Cabet or, indeed, Marx, but he did argue that systematic colonization presented both the British government and poor labourers with the best available option to alleviate their economic and social distress. Obviously one can argue on a very simple level that capitalist plans for social and economic redress would only ever serve to benefit capitalists, and not any class of non-owning citizen. However, such a position does ignore the fact that figures such as Wakefield (who had the support of 'real' utopians like Owen) can be considered to have been interested in assisting all classes of society, even if such assistance was ultimately not realized in the colonial societies of South Australia and New Zealand or, indeed, in the history of Britain itself. Whilst Wakefield was not looking to mirror 'the divine hierarchy of the cosmos … in a functional specialization of tasks' (Kumar, 1991, p. 13) as Plato was seeking to do, maintaining class stratifications and divisions of labour was crucial to his designs. It is not being suggested that we should view Wakefield's encouragement of class mobility within the colonies without a certain amount of cynicism; given the importance Wakefield placed upon maintaining sufficient levels of labour within the colonies, he would never have sought to

---

[119] Given the imperial and commercial nature of Wakefield's vision, it would be an error of understanding to suggest that Wakefield's utopianism would be commensurable with Jameson's views on the subject. Jameson's utopian theorizing is emphatically anti-capitalist and, in his estimation, utopianism as a school of thought is intended to provide alternatives to the economic, social and political structures of capitalism. For Jameson: 'It is not only the invincible universality of capitalism which is at issue … what is crippling is not the presence of an enemy but rather the universal belief, not only that this tendency is irreversible, but that the historic alternatives to capitalism have been proven unviable and impossible, and that no other socio-economic system is conceivable, let alone practically available' (Jameson, 2007, p. xii). The most obvious distinction between Wakefield's utopianism and Jameson's understanding of the subject is to be found in Wakefield's belief that a *capitalist* scheme could solve the social, economic and political ills of his contemporary society. One of Jameson's main arguments in favour of reinstating utopia as a relevant literary and political concept is its ability to remedy 'the growing incapacity to imagine a more perfect human society' (Burnett, 2006, p. 52). For Jameson, utopia is a political tool that should be used to combat the decline of the imagination and reinstate its role in facilitating progressive social change and Chris Burnett also argues that 'Jameson convincingly resurrects and imagines utopia as an adaptable tool of progressive politics and culture' (Burnett, 2006, 52).

eliminate the economic distinctions between colonial capitalists and labourers. However, this does not suggest that Wakefield's works were un-utopian simply because they sought to perpetuate existent class divisions.

John Gray has also questioned the normative acceptability of utopian plans when governments and political movements attempt to implement such ideas, arguing that 'utopias are dreams of collective deliverance that in waking life are found to be nightmares' (Gray, 2007, p. 17). Whilst such an argument might not be as applicable to South Australia and New Zealand as it is to Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia, the broader scholarly view of the impacts that the British Empire had upon indigenous populations would suggest that such views of the nightmarish qualities of implemented utopian visions can, to an extent, also be applied to Wakefield's utopian plans for British colonial expansion. Russell Jacoby has, for example, suggested that including the ideas that led to the installation of regimes such as Nazi Germany or the Khmer Rouge in discussions of utopian thought is a fundamental misrepresentation of what Western utopian thought should encompass. Jacoby argues that 'today most observers judge utopians or their sympathisers as foolhardy dreamers at best and murderous totalitarians at worst', and in Jacoby's view the inclusion of figures such as Hitler and Stalin in the Western utopian tradition is fundamentally flawed. According to Jacoby, situating such 'murderous totalitarians' alongside figures such as Charles Fourier 'relies on a reading of the historical record … that is profoundly amiss. It relies on distending the category "utopian" to include any idea for a future society no matter how vicious or exclusionary' (Jacoby, 2005, p. ix-x). In Jacoby's view, none of the violence and bloodshed caused by totalitarianism or any of the other large-scale conflicts of the twentieth century can be rightfully attributed to true 'utopian' motivations. For Jacoby, 'the human community has much more reason to fear those with an ethnic, religious, or nationalist agenda than it has to fear those with utopian designs … primal attachments of blood, clan, and religion [have enflamed and continue to enflame] global slaughter' (Jacoby, 2005, p. 22). Although we do not want to extrapolate too much from Jacoby's claims, his argument that thinkers or movements whose 'utopian' plans have had excessively violent and detrimental real life impacts should not be considered to be 'utopian' is important to consider, since the British Empire has been viewed by many scholars as being a violent and detrimental process for the majority of the indigenous peoples who came under its

subjection. However, it seems difficult to argue that any idea that is not entirely conscionable by contemporary moral standards is thus not a 'utopian' idea. It is questionable whether many utopian schemes, such as Owen's or Cabet's, that required significant amounts of conformity, regulation and imposed control in order to function, would be acceptable as social programs today. Such a distinction would render a considerable proportion of the Western utopian canon 'un-utopian', if we are to consider a project legitimately utopian only if it does not possess exclusionary, regulatory or discriminatory elements. The utopian aspects of Wakefield's thought should not be rejected outright simply because he has not been considered to be utopian by scholars in the field, or because his plans for imperial expansion are normatively questionable by contemporary standards. Wakefield's vision of Britain itself being the ideal society, along with the theory of systematic colonization being the 'perfect' means to proliferate this ideal society around the world, has no less claim to intellectual veracity as a utopian project than any other example from the utopian canon. As Paul Monod Kleber has recently contended, Wakefield's plan to 'make the idea of a global empire more attractive to the British public … was a utopian vision' (Kleber, 2009, p. 374) and it is the argument of this thesis that Wakefield's works are a compelling and noteworthy contribution to the history of Western utopian thought.

Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated that Edward Gibbon Wakefield's plans to colonize South Australia and New Zealand were informed by utopian visions of an ideal society. Wakefield's plan to create miniature, perfected versions of British society is a different form of ideal society thinking to those that have been countenanced by most scholars of utopia. He did not seek to elicit radical transformative change within the society of his day, and his plans were more socially and politically conservative, and generally not as far reaching, as other contemporaneous utopian schemes for social redevelopment. However, to deny that Wakefield's plans were utopian is to deny a crucial component of the political planning and thought that ultimately led to the colonization of South Australia and New Zealand. Perhaps one of the most telling reasons why South Australia and New Zealand have not been discussed extensively by scholars of utopia lies in the fact that they were success stories. The details of their colonial birth throes and the impact that the broader legacy of European imperialism had upon indigenous populations notwithstanding, South Australia and New Zealand lack one ingredient shared by most of the utopian experiments that have been attempted in practice: failure. Although the history of intentional, utopian communities does include numerous success stories (many of which have occurred in New Zealand itself) the number of failed efforts to create an ideal society far outnumber the success stories.

To include imperial capitalist speculations such as Wakefield's into the history of Western utopian imaginings is to not only broaden our understanding of what kinds of social arrangements have been considered to be ideal (at least in the nineteenth century) but to also broaden the political basis of Western utopian thought. Utopian political speculation does not necessarily have to offer a social or political vision that is radically alternative to be utopian and, indeed, scholars today have suggested that plans that offer the promise of some form of 'better life', rather than a better life whose improvement is fundamentally linked to the implementation of radical change, are as utopian as their more radical counterparts. As Sargisson and Sargent argue 'many contemporary scholars take a more nuanced view of utopia as the desire for something better, rather than something perfect. This means that utopia remains just around the corner, just over the horizon. The utopian ship sails ever onwards' (Sargisson and Sargent, 2004, pp.157-158). Whilst the colonization of South Australia

and New Zealand was undeniably not utopian for all of those involved, for indigenous populations and less fortunate Europeans alike, the utopian basis of Wakefield's literature and the literature of so many promotional colonial texts shows us that such works can be considered utopian in a modern scholarly context. Suggestions made by scholars that Wakefield sought to recreate a past Golden Age of Britain in the colonies are also undeniable evidence of the utopian traits of Wakefield's schemes. As John Gray has argued 'utopia is a projection into the future of a model of society that cannot be realized, but it need not be a society that has never existed. It may be a society that one did exist – if not exactly in the form in which it is fondly remembered – but which history has passed by' (Gray, 2007, p. 77).

The capitalist basis of Wakefield's plans for the creation of an ideal colonial society could be construed as an argument against them being considered 'utopian' if one takes capitalist visions of an ideal society to be antithetical to scholarly interpretations of what constitutes an 'authentic' or 'genuine' utopian vision. However, such a view discounts not only a wide range of utopian speculations besides Wakefield's own, it also ignores the fact that the dominant school of nineteenth century utopian thought, utopian socialism, was primarily concerned with changing the economic basis of nineteenth century European society. As Glenn Negley and J. Max Patrick argue, 'the most obvious and widespread change in the construction of utopia [in the nineteenth century] was the arrogation of the economic to a position of primary and determining importance' (Negley and Patrick, 1952, pp. 12-13). Utopian socialists obviously had a different view to Wakefield of the kinds of economic changes that were necessary in order to create their version of an ideal society, and, as with Wakefield, economic changes were not the sole focus of their thought. However, economic reorganization was crucial to their visions of social change and whilst Wakefield was not looking to fundamentally alter the existent economic systems of his day, but to reform and improve their existent mode of operation, economics and economic reforms were still crucial to his vision.

Although their visions for utopian social change had a similarly systematic and regulatory approach, an important point of conceptual difference that arises between Wakefield and the utopian authors is the way in which they sought to create a 'new' society that would replace and supplant the 'old.' Wakefield's advocacy of the systematic control of colonial land sales (and especially his arguments in favour of

limiting the abilities of labourers to buy their own land) demonstrates that for Wakefield restrictions and controls were both economically and morally imperative for the success of Britain's colonial ventures. While it can in some senses be argued that Wakefield was not engaged in 'the fictional practice of imagining ideal worlds' (West-Sooby, 2008, p. 1) in the same sense as the 'real utopians', the systematically ordered colonies of Wakefield's imagination *were* ideal worlds for Wakefield. It is the argument of this thesis that the system of order and regimentation by which he sought to create these ideal worlds is similar to the disciplinary and ordered schemes of the utopian authors of this period. Scholarly support for this line of reasoning is readily available. Claeys, for example, has argued that in the early nineteenth century, 'the dependency of order upon social regimentation and uniformity [emerged] as an essential attribute of utopia' (Claeys, 1997, p. xxxi). J.C. Davis also argues that the idealization of regulation constitutes the defining quality of any form of utopian thought. According to Davis, 'totality, order, perfection … are cardinal characteristics of the utopian form' and, as such, 'the perfection of utopias must be total and ordered; the totality, ordered and perfect. In order to achieve this, without denying the nature of man or society, there must be discipline of a totalitarian kind' (Davis, 1981, pp. 38-39). Krishan Kumar also points to one consistent theme in utopian thought that lends further strength to our study: the prioritisation of planning and regulation. In his discussion of the 'Ideal City' genre of utopian literature, Kumar argues that 'rational planning, rational regulation and rational administration were essential to the good order of the city' (Kumar, 1991, pp. 12-13). Kumar argues that 'the ideal city is systematically organised … [and] there is often an elaborate social hierarchy.' Whilst Wakefield might not have sought to use 'discipline of a totalitarian kind' in order to create the colonies of his imagination, an emphasis on order and regulation pervades the works of both the 'real' utopians and Wakefield.

In regards to the generic characteristics of Wakefield's utopian thought and the ways in which his works compare to the texts of the Western utopian canon, it is difficult to compare Wakefield's thought to either the ideal-city tradition of utopian thought or the more pastoral, 'Golden Age' tradition of utopianism. This is because Wakefield's thought ultimately straddles the two worlds. Wakefield sought to transplant British society in its entirety to the colonies and sought to create settlements, i.e. townships, upon reaching the new sites of development. Since the

basis of his system of colonization was a system of land sales, he was also concerned with advocating agriculture as the preferred means of economic development. Wakefield was not advocating either the town or the country as the preferred place to establish his ideal British colony; his colonies were intended to be a combination of the two. This is not entirely surprising, given that agriculture would be easier and quicker to establish and would not need the infrastructure of urban life to make such a system profitable in a relatively short timeframe. However despite the fact that Wakefield sought to combine the developments of civilization and the bourgeoning urban life of England with a primarily agriculturally based economic system does not render his work any less utopian. As Kumar argues in his history of the ideal city as it developed from Plato's *Republic* to Walt Disney's city of Epcot, 'both the Republic and Epcot share the essential feature of being systematically designed environments' (Kumar, 1991, p. 16). Whilst Wakefield's plans might not be 'a representational meditation on radical difference', (Jameson, 2007, p. xii), Wakefield's writings on the subject of systematic colonization and British colonial expansion contain significant and recognizable utopian traits that should be considered alongside the established texts and ideas of the Western utopian tradition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Peter, *Fatal Necessity: British Intervention in New Zealand 1830-1847*, Auckland University Press; Oxford University Press: Auckland, 1977.

Alessio, Dominic, 'A conservative Utopia? Anthony Trollope's the fixed period (1882)', *Journal of New Zealand Literature*, Vol. 22 (Summer), 2004, pp. 73-94.

Appleyard, R. T. and Manford, Toby, *The Beginning : European Discovery and Early Settlement of Swan River, Western Australia*, University of Western Australia Press: Nedlands, Western Australia, 1979.

Archer, Joanne, 'Wakefield's Theory of Systematic Colonization', *NLA News*, Volume XII Number 9, June 2003, http://www.nla.gov.au/pub/nlanews/2003/jun03/article2.html, accessed June 2010.

Atkinson, James, *Account of the state of agriculture and grazing in New South Wales: including observations on the soils and general appearance of the country and some of its most useful natural productions: with an account of the various methods of clearing and improving lands, breeding and grazing livestock, erecting buildings, the system of employing convicts, and the expense of labour generally : the mode of applying for grants of land: with other information important to those who are about to emigrate to that country: the result of several years' residence and practical experience in those matters in the colony*, J. Cross: London, 1826.

Banivanua Mar, Tracey and Edmonds, Penelope (eds.), *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke; New York, 2010.

Barthes, Roland, *Sade, Fourier, Loyola*, Johns Hopkins University Press: London and Baltimore, 1997.

Bartkowski, Frances, *Feminist Utopias*, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, 1989.

Beasley, Edward, *Mid-Victorian Imperialists: British Gentlemen and the Empire of the Mind*, Routledge: London and New York, 2005.

Beaumont, Matthew, *Utopia Ltd.: Ideologies of Social Dreaming in England, 1870-1900*, Brill: Leiden; Boston, 2005.

Beecher, Jonathan, *Charles Fourier: the Visionary and his World*, University of California Press: Berkeley, 1986.

Belich, James, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 2001.

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

Bell, Duncan, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, Princeton University Press: Princeton and Oxford, 2007.

Bell, Duncan, 'The Idea of a Patriot Queen? The Monarchy, the Constitution, and the Iconographic Order of Greater Britain, 1860–1900', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* Vol. 34 No. 1, March 2006, pp. 3-21.

Bell, Duncan, 'John Stuart Mill on Colonies', *Political Theory,* vol. 38 No. 1, February 2010, pp. 34-64.

Bentham, Jeremy, *Collected Works: Colonies, commerce, and constitutional law: Rid yourselves of Ultramaria and other writings on Spain and Spanish America*, edited by Philip Schofield, Clarendon Press: Oxford; Oxford University Press: New York, 1995.

Bentham, Jeremy, *Colonization Society proposal, being a proposal for the formation of a Joint Stock Company by the name of the Colonization Company on an entirely new principle intituled the vicinity-maximizing or dispersion-preventing principle*, manuscript, photostat reproduction from the microfilm copy of original manuscript in the Bentham Collection, University College London, Files 149-192, mounted on foolscap paper and transcribed by D. H. Pike; University College: London, August, 1831.

Berryman, Ian (ed.), *Swan River Letters*, Swan River Press: Glengary, Western Australia, 2002.

Bloomfield, Paul, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield: builder of the British Commonwealth*, Longmans: London, 1961.

Booth, Jenny, 'Emigration, Economics or Strategy? The British Government and the *South Australia Act 1834*', *Journal of Australian Studies* Vol. 80, January 2004, pp. 157-168.

Booth, Jean, 'Rethinking South Australia 1829 – 1841: Aspects of Governance and Empire', Ph.D. Thesis, Social Sciences, University of South Australia, July 2004.

Bourassa, Steven C. and Strong, Louise Ann, 'Restitution of Land to New Zealand Maori: The Role of Social Structure', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 2 (Summer), 2002, pp. 227-260.

Bruce, Susan, (ed.) *Utopia; New Atlantis; The Isle of Pines,* edited with an Introduction and Notes by Susan Bruce, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2008.

Buckley, Ken and Wheelwright, Ted, *No Paradise For Workers: Capitalism and the Common People in Australia 1788 – 1914*, Oxford University Press: Melbourne, 1988.

Burnett, Chris, 'Archaeologies of the Future: the Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions' (review), *Afterimage*, Vol. 33, Issue 4 (Jan./Feb.) 2006, p. 52.

Burns, Patricia, *Fatal Success: A History of the New Zealand Company*, Heinemann Reed: Auckland, 1989.

Burroughs, Peter, 'Introduction', in Wakefield, Edward Jerningham (ed.), *The Founders of Canterbury,* With a New Introduction by Peter Burroughs, (1868), Dawsons: Folkestone & London, 1973.

Butler, William Francis, *Sir Charles Napier*, Macmillan and Co.: London and New York, 1894.

Butt, John (ed.), *Robert Owen: Prince of Cotton Spinners*, David & Charles: Newton Abbot, 1971.

Cabet, Etienne, *Travels in Icaria*, translated by Leslie J. Roberts; with a critical introduction by Robert Sutton, Syracuse University Press: Syracuse, New York, 2003.

Cain, P.J. and Hopkins, A. G., *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion 1688-1914,* Longman: London and New York, 1993.

Calder, Alex and Turner, Stephen, 'Introduction: Settlement Studies', *Journal of New Zealand Literature,* Vol. 20 (Summer), 2002, pp. 7-17.

Cameron, J.M.R., *Ambition's Fire: the Agricultural Colonization of Pre-Convict Western Australia*, University of Western Australia Press: Western Australia, 1981.

Cameron, J.M.R., 'Western Australia, 1616-1829: An Antipodean Paradise' *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 140, No. 3 (October), 1974, pp. 373-385.

Carter, Max, *No Convicts There: Thomas Harding's Colonial South Australia*, Trevaunance P.L.: Adelaide, South Australia, 1997.

Carrington, Charles E., *John Robert Godley of Canterbury*, Cambridge University Press: London, 1950.

Cazdyn, Eric, 'Anti-anti: Utopia, Globalization, Jameson', *Modern Language Quarterly*, Vol. 68, Issue 2 (June), 2007, pp. 331-343.

Cholmondeley, Thomas, *Ultima Thule; or, Thoughts Suggested by a Residence in New Zealand*, Chapman: London, 1854.

Claeys, Gregory, *Citizens and Saints: Politics and Anti-Politics in early British Socialism*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1989.

Claeys, Gregory, 'Introduction', in *Robert Owen: A New View of Society and Other Writings*, edited with an introduction by Gregory Claeys, Penguin Books: London, 1991.

Claeys, Gregory, 'Introduction', in Claeys (ed.), *Modern British Utopias 1700-1850*, vol. I, Pickering and Chatto: London, 1997.

Collier, James, 'Introduction' in Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *A View of the Art of Colonization, In Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist,* with an Introduction by James Collier, first published: London: John W. Parker, 1849; this edition Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1914.

Copland, Gordon, 'A House for the Governor: Settlement Theory, the South Australian Experiment, and the Search for the First Government House', Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Archaeology, Flinders University of South Australia., May 2006.

Cole, G. D. H., 'Introduction', (1927) in Owen, Robert, *A New View of Society and Other Writings*, Dent: London; Dutton: New York, 1966.

Corcoran, Paul (ed.), *Before Marx: socialism and communism in France, 1830-48*, Macmillan: London, 1983.

Cowan, Peter, *A colonial experience : Swan River 1839-1888, from the diary and reports of Walkinshaw Cowan, secretary to Governor Hutt - clerk of the Councils, Perth, guardian of Aborigines, resident magistrate*, P. Cowan: Claremont, Western Australia, 1978.

Cunningham, Miller Peter, *Two years in New South Wales: comprising sketches of the actual state of society in that colony; of its peculiar advantages to emigrants; of its topography, natural history, &c., &c*, H. Colburn: London, 1827.

Curr, Edward, *An Account of the colony of Van Diemen's Land ... for the use of emigrants*, George Cowie: London, 1824.

Davis, J.C., *Utopia and the Ideal Society: A Study of English Utopian Writing 1516-1700*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981.

Dickey, Brian and Howell, Peter (eds.), *South Australia's foundation: select documents*, edited and introduced by Brian Dickey and Peter Howell, Wakefield Press: Netley, South Australia, 1986

Dinwiddy, J.R., *Bentham*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York, 1989.

Donnelly, Dorothy, *Patterns of Order and Utopia*, St. Martin's Press: New York, 1998.

Durrer, Rebecca, 'Propagating the New Zealand ideal', *The Social Science Journal* Vol. 43, 2006, pp. 173-183.

Evans, Julie, Grimshaw, Patricia, Philips, David and Swain, Shurlee, *Equal subjects, unequal rights: indigenous peoples in British settler colonies, 1830-1910*, Manchester University Press: Manchester, UK; Palgrave: New York, 2003.

Fairburn, Miles, *The Ideal Society and Its Enemies: The Foundations of Modern New Zealand Society 1850-1900*, Auckland University Press: Auckland, 1989.

Ferguson, Niall, *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World*, Allen Lane: London, 2003.

Ferro, Marc, *Colonization : a global history*, translated by K.D. Prithipaul, Routledge: London; New York, 1997.

Finzsch, Norbert, 'It is scarcely possible to conceive that human beings could be so hideous and loathsome': discourses of genocide in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America and Australia' *Patterns of Prejudice*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 2005, pp. 97-115.

Fontanel, Jacques, Bensahel, Liliane, Coissard, Steven, and Echinard, Yann, 'French Utopian Economists of the Nineteenth Century', *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 19 (5), October 2008, pp. 339-350.

Foster, Robert, 'An Imaginary Dominion: the Representation and Treatment of Aborigines in South Australia, 1834-1911', Ph.D Thesis, Department of History, University of Adelaide, 1994.

Foster, Robert, Hosking, Rick and Nettlebeck, Amanda, *Fatal Collisions: the South Australian Frontier and the Violence of Memory*, Wakefield Press: Kent Town, South Australia, 2001.

Fox, William, *The Six Colonies of New Zealand*, London: John Parker and Son, 1851.

Francis, Mark, 'Review Essay: Settler Historiography in New Zealand: Politics and Biography in the Early Colonial Period', *Political Science*, Vol. 52, No. 2, (December) 2000, pp. 158-73.

Gane, Mike, *Auguste Comte*, Routledge: London; New York , 2006.

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

Ghosh, R. N., 'Malthus on emigration and colonization: letters to Wilmot Horton', *Economica*, vol. 30, 1963, pp. 45–61.

Godley, John, 'Introduction' (1950), in *Letters from early New Zealand,* edited, with notes, by John R. Godley, Whitcombe & Tombs: Christchurch, 1951.

Godley, Charlotte, *Letters from early New Zealand,* edited, with notes, by John R. Godley, Whitcombe & Tombs: Christchurch, 1951.

Godley, John Robert, *Letters from America*, J. Murray: London, 1844.

Godley, John Robert, *Selection from the writings and speeches of John Robert Godley*, collected and edited by James Edward FitzGerald, Press Office: Christchurch, New Zealand, 1863.

Gouger, Robert, *The founding of South Australia: as recorded in the journals of Mr. Robert Gouger, first Colonial Secretary,* edited by Edwin Hodder*,* Sampson Low, Marston, and Company: London, 1898.

Gourlay, Robert, *A Statistical Account of Upper Canada, Compiled with a View to A Grand System of Emigration*, Simpkins & Marshall, Stationers Court: London, 1822.

Grant, Robert D., *Representations of British emigration, colonization, and settlement:*

imagining empire, 1800-1860, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke; New York, 2005.

Gray, John, *Black Mass: Apocalyptic Religion and the Death of Utopia*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, 2007.

Gross, David S.*,* 'Archaeologies of the Future: the Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions' (review), *World Literature Today*, Vol. 81 Issue 1, (Jan./Feb.) 2007, pp. 76-77.

Guarneri, Carl, 'Importing Fourierism to America', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 43, No. 4, (Oct. - Dec.) 1982, pp. 581-594.

Hampden, Jackson, J., *Marx, Proudhon and European socialism*, English Universities Press: London, 1958.

HC Deb 29 July 1834 vol 25 cc700-11.

Harrison, John F.C., *Quest for the New Moral World: Robert Owen & the Owenites in Britain and America*, Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1969.

Harrop, A.J., *The Amazing Career of Edward Gibbon Wakefield*, George Allen & Unwin: London, 1928.

Hart, H. L. A., *Essays on Bentham: studies in jurisprudence and political theory*, Oxford University Press; Clarendon Press: New York; Oxford, 1982.

Heffernan, Michael, 'The Limits of Utopia: Henri Duveyrier and the Exploration of the Sahara in the Nineteenth Century', *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 155, No. 3 (Nov.) 1989, p. 342.

Hertzler, Joyce Oramel, *The History of Utopian Thought*, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.: London, 1922.

Higgs, 'Review of Emile Lehouck, *Vie de Charles Fourier: l'homme dans sa verite*, Paris: Denoel/Gonthier 1978', *Letters in Canada*, Humanities, 1979, p. 441.

Hight, James and Straubel, C. R. (eds.), *A History of Canterbury*, Canterbury Centennial Association; Whitcome & Tombs: Christchurch, 1957.

Hill, Richard and Bönisch-Brednich, Brigitte, 'Politicizing the Past: Indigenous Scholarship and Crown-Maori Reparations Process in New Zealand', *Social & Legal Studies*, Vol. 16 Issue 2 (June) 2007, pp. 163-181.

Hodder, Edwin, *George Fife Angas, father and founder of South Australia*, Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1891.

Hoffman, Robert, *Revolutionary justice: the social and political theory of P.J. Proudhon*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana, 1972.

Holmes, T. Rice, *Sir Charles Napier*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1925.

Hursthouse, Charles, *New Zealand, or Zealandia, The Britain of the South With Two Maps and Seven Coloured Views*, 2 vols, Edward Stanford: London, 1857.

Hutchinson, T.W., 'Robert Torrens and Classical Economics', *The Economic History Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1958, pp. 316-321.

Hyam, Ronald, *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke; New York, Third Edition, 2002.

Hyams, Edward, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon: his revolutionary life, mind and works*, J. Murray: London, 1979.

Iggers, George G., *The cult of authority: the political philosophy of the Saint-Simonians, a chapter in the intellectual history of totalitarianism*, Nijhoff: The Hague, 1958.

Iggers, George G., *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition, First Year 1828-1829,* Schocken Books: New York, (1958), second ed., 1972.

Jaensch, Dean (ed.), *The Flinders History of South Australia: Political History*, Wakefield Press: South Australia, 1986.

Jameson, Fredric, *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*, Verso: London and New York, 2007.

Jameson, Fredric, 'Of Islands and Trenches: Naturalisation and the Production of Utopian Discourse', *Diacritics*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Summer), 1977, pp. 2-21.

Jenkins, Lloyd, 'Fourierism, Colonization and Discourses of Associative Emigration', *Area*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Mar.), 2003, pp. 84-91.

Johns, Alessa, *Women's utopias of the eighteenth century*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana, 2003.

Johnson, Christopher H., *Utopian Communism in France: Cabet and the Icarians, 1839-1851*, Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London, 1974.

Johnston, H. J. M., *British emigration policy, 1815–30: 'shovelling out paupers'*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1972.

Jones, E. G., 'Sir R. J. Wilmot Horton, bart., politician and pamphleteer', Masters thesis, Bristol University, 1936.

Kamenka, Eugene (ed.), *Utopias: Papers from the annual symposium of the Australian Academy of the Humanities*, Oxford University Press: Melbourne, 1987.

Kellner, Douglas and O'Hara, Harry, 'Utopia and Marxism in Ernst Bloch', *New German Critique*, No. 9, (Autumn), 1976, pp. 11-34.

Kenyon, Timothy, *Utopian communism and political thought in early modern England*, Pinter Publishers: London, 1989.

Keown, Michelle, *Pacific Islands writing: the postcolonial literatures of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Oceania,* Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2007.

Keown, Michelle, Murphy, David and Procter, James (eds.), *Comparing postcolonial diasporas*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke; New York, 2009.

Kesten, Seymour, *Utopian Episodes: Daily Life in Experimental Colonies Dedicated to Changing the World*, Syracuse University Press: New York, 1993.

Kittrell, Edward R., 'Wakefield's Scheme of Systematic Colonization and Classical Economics', *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 32, No. 1, (Jan.), 1973, pp. 87-111.

Kleber, Paul-Monod, *Imperial Island: A History of Britain and Its Empire, 1660-1837*, Wiley-Blackwell: West Sussex, 2009.

Kumar, Krishan, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*, Blackwell: Oxford, 1987.

Kumar, Krishan, *Utopianism*, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1991.

Lamb, Jonathan, 'Metamorphosis and settlement', in *Journal of New Zealand Literature*, Vol. 20 (Summer) 2002, pp. 18-38.

Lambrick, H. T., *Sir Charles Napier and Sind*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1952.

Langley, Michael, 'Wakefield and South Australia', *History Today*, Vol. 19, No. 10 (Oct.), 1969, pp. 704-712.

Lawrence, Rosamond, *Charles Napier: friend and fighter 1782-1853*, John Murray: London, 1952.

Leopold, David, 'The Structure of Marx and Engels' Considered Account of Utopian Socialism', *History of Political Thought*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (Autumn), 2005, pp. 443-466.

Lester, Alan, 'British Settler Discourse and the Circuits of Empire', *History Workshop Journal*, No. 54 (Autumn), 2002, pp. 24-48.

Lonie, John, 'South Australia: A Fading Bourgeois Utopia', *Meanjin*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (December), 1978, pp. 513-521.

Lovell, David, 'Marx's Utopian Legacy', in *The European Legacy*, Vol. 9, No. 5, 2004, pp. 629-640.

Macdonnell, Ursilla, 'Gibbon Wakefield and Canada Subsequent to the Durham Mission, 1839-42', *Bulletin of the Departments of History and Political and Economic Science in Queen's University,* Jackson Press: Kingston, No. 49, Dec. 1924-Feb. 1925, pp. 1-37.

Macphee, Graham and Poddar, Prem (eds.), *Empire and after: Englishness in postcolonial perspective*, Berghahn Books: New York, 2007.

Makdisi, Saree, *Romantic Imperialism: Universal Empire and the Culture of Modernity*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998.

Manning, Helen Taft, 'E. G. Wakefield and the Beauharnois Canal', *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. 48, Issue 1, 1967, pp. 1-25.

Manuel, Frank E. and Manuel, Fritzie P., *Utopian Thought in the Western World*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1979.

Manuel, Frank E. (ed.), *Utopias and Utopian Thought*, Souvenir Press: London, 1973.

Manuel, Frank E. and Manuel, Fritzie P. (eds.), *French Utopias: An Anthology of Ideal Societies*, The Free Press: New York; Collier-Macmillan Limited: London, 1966.

Manuel, Frank, *The New World of Henri Saint-Simon*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1956.

Marais, J. S., *The Colonization of New Zealand*, OUP: London, 1927.

Mariz, George, 'Sydney Olivier: Empire and Utopia', *Utopian Studies*, No. 1, 1987, pp. 61-78.

Markey, D., *More a symbol than a success: foundation years of the Swan River Colony*, Westbooks: Bayswater, Western Australia, 1977.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich, *Collected Works*, Volume 35, *Capital*, Vol.1., Lawrence & Wishart: London, 1966.

Markham, Felix (ed.), 'Introduction' in Saint-Simon, Henri de, *Social Organization, the Science of Man and other writings*, (1952), new edition, Harper Row: New York, 1964.

McClintock, Anne, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*, Routledge: New York, 1994.

McCormick, E. H., 'The Happy Colony', *Landfall*, 9 (4), 1955, pp. 300-334.

Meenai, S.A., 'Robert Torrens - 1780-1864', *Economica*, New Series, Vol. 23, No. 89 (Feb.), 1956, pp. 49-61.

Milani, Lois Darroch, *Robert Gourlay, gadfly; the biography of Robert (Fleming) Gourlay, 1778-1863, forerunner of the rebellion in upper Canada, 1837*, Ampersand Press: Thornhill, Ontario, 1971.

Mill, John Stuart, *Newspaper Writings: August 1831-October 1834, Collected Works*, vol. XXIII, Robson, Ann P. and Robson, John M. (ed.), Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press; Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

Mills, R. C., *The Colonization of Australia (1829-42): the Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building*, Sidgwick & Jackson Ltd: London, 1915.

Mills, R.C., 'Introduction' in Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *A Letter from Sydney, The Principal Town of Australasia: & Other Writings on Colonization by Edward Gibbon Wakefield*, J.M. Dent: London, 1929.

Mohanram, Radhika, *Imperial white: race, diaspora, and the British Empire*, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis; London, 2007.

Moon, Paul, *Fatal Frontiers: A New History of New Zealand in the Decade before the Treaty*, Penguin: Auckland, 2006.

Morris, William, *News from Nowhere or An Epoch of Rest*, edited by Redmond, James, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd: London, 1970.

Morton, Harry and Johnston Morton, Carol, *The farthest corner: New Zealand, a twice discovered land*, Century Hutchinson: Auckland, 1988.

Mumford, Lewis, *The story of Utopias, ideal common wealths, and social myths*, Harrap: London, 1923.

Moylan and Griffin (eds.), *Exploring the utopian impulse: essays on utopian thought and practice*, Peter Lang: Bern; Oxford, 2007

Nacci, Dominique, *Australian anti-colonialism*, Playground: Canberra, 2002.

Napier, Charles James, *Colonization, particularly in Southern Australia: with some remarks on small farms and overpopulation*, (1835), A. M. Kelley: New York, 1969.

Negley, Glenn and J. Max Patrick, *The Quest for Utopia: An Anthology of Imaginary Societies*, Henry Schuman: New York, 1952.

Neumann, Klaus, Thomas, Nicholas, and Ericksen, Hilary, *Quicksands: foundational histories in Australia & Aotearoa*, UNSW Press: Sydney, 1999.

O'Connor, Irma, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield: The Man Himself*, Selwyn & Blount Ltd.: London, 1928.

O'Donoghue, Lowitja, *Australian postcolonial dilemmas*, Institute of Postcolonial Studies: North Melbourne, 2002.

Oliver, W.H. with Williams, B.R. (eds.), *Oxford History of New Zealand*, Clarendon Press: Oxford; Oxford University Press: Wellington; New York, 1981.

O'Neill, Sally, *George Fife Angas*, Oxford University Press: Melbourne, 1972.

Owen, Robert, *A New View of Society and Other Writings*, with an introduction by G.D.H. Cole, Dent: London; Dutton: New York, 1966.

Owen, Robert, *Robert Owen: A New View of Society and Other Writings*, edited with an introduction by Gregory Claeys, Penguin Books: London, 1991.

Panter-Brick, K., 'Book Review of Markham, Felix (ed.), *Henri de Saint-Simon: Social Organization, the Science of Man and other writings*, New York: Harper Row, 1964', *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Jun.), 1954, pp. 174-175.

Pappe, H. O., 'Wakefield and Marx', *The Economic History Review*, New Series, Vol. 4, No. 1., 1951, pp. 88-97.

Pickering, Mary, *Auguste Comte: an intellectual biography*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; New York, 1993.

Pike, Douglas, 'The Utopian Dreams of Adelaide's Founders', *Proceedings of the Royal Geographic Society of Australasia, South Australian Branch*, Vol. 53, 1951-1952, pp. 65-77.

Pike, Douglas, 'Wilmot Horton and the National Colonization Society', *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 7, 1955-7, pp. 205-10.

Pike, Douglas, *Paradise of Dissent: South Australia 1829-1857*, Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd: London, 1957.

Pitts, Jennifer, 'Legislator of the World? A Rereading of Bentham on Colonies', *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No. 2. (Apr.), 2003, pp. 200-234.

Pitts, Jennifer, *A Turn to Empire*, Princeton University Press: Princeton and Oxford,

2005.

Plattel, Martin G., *Utopian and Critical Thinking*, Duquesne University Press: Pittsburgh, 1972.

Pollard, Sidney and Salt, John (eds.), *Robert Owen, Prophet of the Poor: Essays in Honour of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of his Birth*, Macmillan: London, 1971.

Porter, Andrew (ed.) and Low, Alaine (assoc. ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume III: The Nineteenth Century*, Oxford University Press: Oxford; New York, 1999 (2004).

Postema, Gerald J. (ed.), *Bentham: moral, political and legal philosophy*, Aldershot : Ashgate, 2001.

Poynter, J. R., *Society and pauperism: English ideas on poor relief, 1795-1834*, Melbourne University Press: Carlton, Victoria, 1969.

Price, Grenfell A., *The foundation and settlement of South Australia, 1829-1845: a study of the colonization movement, based on the records of the South Australian Government and on other authoritative documents*, Preece: Adelaide, South Australia, 1924.

Prichard, Lloyd, 'Introduction', in Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *The Collected Works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield,* Edited with an Introduction by M. F. Lloyd Prichard, Collins: Glasgow & London, 1968.

Proudfoot, Lindsay J. and Roche, Michael M. (eds.), *(Dis)placing empire: renegotiating British colonial geographies*, Ashgate Publishing: Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT, 2005.

Ramos-Gorostiza, Jose Luis, 'Socio-economic utopianism in Spain at the end of the nineteenth century: La Nueva Utopia by Ricardo Mella', *Utopian Studies*, Vol. 20.1, 2009, pp. 5-40.

Redmond, James, 'Introduction', in Morris, William, *News from Nowhere or An Epoch of Rest*, edited by James Redmond, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd: London, 1970.

Reed, A. H., *The story of Canterbury, last Wakefield settlement*, Reed: Wellington, 1949.

Rich, Paul B., *Race and Empire in British Politics*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; New York, 1986.

Richards, Eric, 'How Did Poor People Emigrate from the British Isles to Australia in the Nineteenth Century?', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3, (July), 1993, pp. 250-279.

Richards, Eric, *Britannia's Children*, Hambledon and London: London and New York, 2004.

Richards, Eric (ed.), *The Flinders History of South Australia: Social History*, Wakefield Press: South Australia, 1986.

Ritter, Alan, *The political thought of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1969.

Ritter, David and Byrnes, Giselle, 'Antipodean Settler Societies and their Complexities: the Waitangi Process in New Zealand and Native Title and the Stolen Generations in Australia', *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* Vol. 46, No. 1 (February) 2008, pp. 54-78.

Robbins, Lionel, *Robert Torrens and the Evolution of Classical Economics*, Macmillan: London, 1958.

Saint-Simon, Henri de, *Social Organization, the Science of Man and other writings*, (1952), new edition, Harper Row: New York, 1964.

Sanford, Elwitt, 'Politics and Ideology in the French Labor Movement', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (Sep.), 1977, pp. 468-480.

Salmond, Anne, *Between worlds: early exchanges between Maori and Europeans, 1773-1815*, University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 1997.

Sargent, Lyman Tower, 'Is There Only One Utopian Tradition', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 43, No. 4, (Oct. – Dec.), 1982, pp. 681-689.

Sargent, Lyman Tower, 'Utopianism and the Creation of New Zealand National Identity', *Utopian Studies*, 12.1 (Winter), 2001, pp. 1-18.

Sargisson, Lucy, *Contemporary Feminist Utopianism*, Routledge: New York, 1996.

Sargisson, Lucy and Sargent, Lyman Tower, *Living in utopia: New Zealand's intentional communities*, Ashgate Publishing Company: Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT, 2004.

Schaer, Roland, Claeys, Gregory, and Sargent, Lyman Tower (eds.), *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World*, New York Public Library; Oxford University Press: New York; Oxford, 2000.

Schmidt, Brent James, *Utopian communities of the ancient world: idealistic experiments of Pythagoras, the Essenes, Pachomius, and Proclus*, Edwin Mellen Press: Lewiston, NY, 2009.

Seguin, Rob*,* 'Fredric Jameson. Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions, (Book review)', *Utopian Studies*, Vol. 17 Issue 3, 2006, pp. 543-548.

Semmel Bernard, 'The Philosophic Radicals and Colonialism', *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 21, No. 4. (Dec.), 1961, pp. 513-525.

Shaw, A. G. L., 'British Attitudes to the Colonies, ca. 1820-1850', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1. (Nov.), 1969, pp. 71-95.

Sinclair, Keith, *A History of New Zealand*, Oxford University Press: London; Melbourne; Wellington; New York, 1961.

Smits, Katherine, 'John Stuart Mill on the Antipodes: Settler Violence against Indigenous Peoples and the Legitimacy of Colonial Rule', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Volume 54, Number 1, 2008, pp. 1-15.

South Australian Land Company, *Proposal to His Majesty's Government for founding a colony on the southern coast of Australia*, W. Nicol: London, 1831.

Spencer, Michael C., *Charles Fourier*, Twayne Publishers: Boston, 1981.

Standley, Arline Reilein, *Auguste Comte*, Twayne Publishers: Boston, 1981.

Stedman-Jones, Gareth and Patterson, Ian (eds.), *Charles Fourier: The Theory of the Four Movements*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; New York , 1996.

Steintrager, James, *Bentham*, G. Allen and Unwin: London, 1977.

Stephens, John, *The land of promise: being an authentic and impartial history of the rise and progress of the new British province of South Australia: including particulars descriptive of its soil, climate, natural productions, &c. and proofs of its superiority to all other British colonies. Embracing also a full account of the South Australian Company, with hints to various classes of emigrants, and numerous letters from settlers concerning wages, provisions, their satisfaction with the colony, &c. by one who is going,* Smith & Elder: London, 1839.

Stuart, Peter, *Edward Gibbon Wakefield in New Zealand: His Political Career, 1853-4*, Price Milburn for Victoria University of Wellington: Wellington, 1971.

Sutton, Robert, 'Introduction', in Cabet, Etienne, *Travels in Icaria*, translated by Leslie J. Roberts; with a critical introduction by Robert Sutton, Syracuse

University Press: Syracuse, New York, 2003.

Tapp, E. J., *Early New Zealand: a dependency of New South Wales, 1788-1841*, Melbourne University Press: Victoria, 1958.

Taylor, Keith, 'Socialist Utopianism as Theory and Practice', *Theory Culture Society*, Issue 1, 1982, pp. 50-62.

Temple, Philip, *A Sort of Conscience: the Wakefields*, Auckland University Press: Auckland, 2002.

The Friends of the Turnbull Library (ed.), *Edward Gibbon Wakefield and the Colonial Dream: A Reconsideration,* GP Publications: Wellington, 1997.

The Times, February 10, 1838.

Tilby, Wyatt A., 'Systematic Colonization', *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 223, April 1916, p. 456.

Torrens, Robert, *Collected works of Robert Torrens*, edited by Vivo, Giancarlo. 8 volumes, Thoemmes: Bristol, 2000.

Torrens, Robert, *Colonization of South Australia*, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman: London, 1835.

Torrens, Robert, *Emigration from Ireland to South Australia*, T. Brettell: London, 1839.

Torrens, Robert, *Self-supporting colonization*, Ridgway, and Smith, Elder: London, 1847.

Torrens, Robert, *Substance of a speech delivered in the House of Commons, 15th February, 1827, on the motion of Sir Robert Wilmot Horton, bart., for the re-appointment of a select committee on emigration from the United Kingdom, by Colonel Torrens*, (1827), Public Library of South Australia; Adelaide, 1962.

Turnbull, Michael, *The New Zealand Bubble: The Wakefield Theory in Practice*, Price, Milburn and Company Limited: Wellington, 1959.

Turner, Charles, 'Mannheim's Utopia Today', *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 2003, pp. 27-47.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *A View of the Art of Colonization, In Letters Between a Statesman and a Colonist,* with an Introduction by James Collier, first published: London: John W. Parker, 1849; this edition Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1914.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *A Letter from Sydney, The Principal Town of Australasia: & Other Writings on Colonization by Edward Gibbon Wakefield*, J.M. Dent: London, 1929.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *The Collected Works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, Edited with an Introduction by M. F. Lloyd Prichard*, Collins: Glasgow & London, 1968.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *The British colonization of New Zealand: being an account of the principles, objects, and plans of the New Zealand Association: together with particulars concerning the position, extent, soil and climate, natural productions, and native inhabitants of New Zealand*, John W. Parker: London, 1837.

Wakefield, Edward Gibbon, *The New British Province of South Australia; Or A Description of the Country, Illustrated by Charts and Views; With an Account of the Principles, Objects, Plan, and Prospects of the Colony*, Printed for C. Knight, 22, Ludgate Street: London, 1834.

Wakefield, Edward Jerningham (ed.), *The Founders of Canterbury,* With a New Introduction by Peter Burroughs, (1868), Dawsons: Folkestone & London, 1973.

Ward, John Manning, *Colonial Self-Government: The British Experience 1759-1856*, Macmillan: London, 1976.

Ward, John, *Information relative to New-Zealand for the use of colonists*, John W. Parker: London, 1839.

Ward, John, *New Zealand: Nelson, the latest settlement of the New Zealand Company*, Smith, Elder and Co.: London, 1842

Warren Adams, C., *A Spring in the Canterbury Settlement*, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans: London, 1853.

Wentworth, William Charles, *A statistical, historical, and political description of the colony of New South Wales, and its dependent settlements in Van Diemen's Land*, Printed for G. and W.B. Whittaker: London, 1820.

Westgarth, William, *Australia Felix; or, a historical and descriptive account of the settlement of Port Philip, New South Wales, including full particulars of the manners and conditions of the aboriginal natives, with observations on*

emigration, on the system of transportation, and on colonial policy, Oliver & Boyd: Edinburgh; Simpkin, Marshall & Co.: London, 1848.

West-Sooby, John (ed.), *Nowhere is Perfect: French and Francophone Utopias/Dystopias*, University of Delaware Press: Newark, 2008.

Widdowson, Henry, *Present State of Van Diemen's Land; comprising an account of its agricultural capabilities, with observations on the present state of farming, &c. &c. pursued in that colony: and other important matters connected with Emigration*, S. Robinson, W. Joy and J. Cross: London; and J. Birdsall, Northampton, 1829.

Winch, Donald, *Classical Political Economy and Colonies*, Bell: London, 1965.

Wolfe, Richard, *A society of gentlemen: the untold story of the first New Zealand Company*, Penguin Books: North Shore, N.Z.; New York, 2007.

Wrong, E. M., *Charles Buller and responsible government,* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926.

Wynter, James Cecil, *Hints on Church Colonization*, J.W. Parker: London, 1850.