Extract Becoming a Penal Colony

(1) Convicts: Punishment & Transportation
(2) Convicts: Working for Freedom
(3) Convict Systems: Assignment, Probation & Exile
(4) Hulks and Macquarie Harbour
(5) Convict resistance
(6) Port Arthur
(7) Point Puer: boy convicts

These extracts are from an earlier version of Becoming Tasmania. They were edited out so that the published book was a manageable size and did not become a 'general history.' However, by making these 'general' elements available online it should assist readers to further interpret the published material.

Please note: a 'lace doily view' of convict history is not intended, because one cannot ignore the 'drama of justice' nor the pain and punishment that operated on VDL while it was predominantly a prison island.

Background: General
What was Van Diemen’s Land’s European encampment to become because of convict transportation? While this is an interesting question, its huge scope requires that the focus here is restricted to ‘getting the convicts onto the island’. This is central to it’s becoming a penal colony, for as Lloyd Robson noted ‘at the heart of the society and economy of VDL … was the convict labourer and his treatment, dispersal, punishment and reward.’

Background: Penal Plan
Van Diemen's Land becoming a penal colony was a matter of British political and legal policy. As a result of these repressive socio-political and legal policies John West and R. W. Giblin both suggest that by sending its criminals to the island the UK government had used VDL merely as the ‘dust-hole of the Empire’ and a ‘dust heap’. Contradicting these widely held views, Geoffrey Blainey considered that Australia was too far away from the UK to have been used just for this purpose. Yet governmental expectations of convict reform meant that the bureaucracy hoped that the convicts would become ‘peasants’ after their penal sentence had expired. They were not expected, nor were many even eligible, to return to the UK.

Alternative views of convict history have stressed that trade and sea power were the vital selection factors involved not simply ridding Britain itself of convicts. Dallas encapsulated this fundamental feature of British colonial policy

‘Slavery’ and ‘Civilization’ are subjective terms, although Dallas has remarked, when discussing so-called convict slavery, that many colonial masters treated their convicts like horses to be broken in, fed and watered. Conversely, Australian masters could not legally flog their convicts: only magistrates
could order the lash, although many masters were close friends of local magistrates. On balance Dallas noted that the same work practices often applied in England.\textsuperscript{5}

**Becoming Tasmania Extract (5): Convict Resistance**

The lash sought compliance, but even with or because of it, convicts did not always comply with the system. Why? In part because, as Macintyre mentioned, ‘Gaoler and goaled communicated across a gulf of antagonism’. However, exploitation was a two-way street and many male convicts, the Point Puer boys included, operated a black market of extra goods such as clothing that they manufactured while under punishment, or after their daily duties had ceased. They then traded such goods for food, or tobacco. Stolen items too - perhaps tools or even food such as potatoes from the Point Puer garden - formed part of this clandestine economy, as did illegal weapons, such as knives.\textsuperscript{6}

Equally ‘underground’, the convicts created a ‘flash’ language behind which to hide.\textsuperscript{7} Amanda Laugesen confirms this in her work on the ‘vocabulary of convict Australia’.\textsuperscript{8} For example, a ‘trap’ was slang for a police officer, although admittedly, such ‘code’ could easily become well known. Nevertheless, used by many were words such as ‘canary’ or ‘magpie’ for the hated harlequin uniforms often made at Point Puer. Protest was not only verbal. Absconding, either alone or in large ‘gangs’, was common, especially in summer when suitable conditions and potential food abounded. A ‘high degree of social cohesion’ was ‘displayed amongst bushrangers’ when 14 made off from Macquarie Harbour in 1824 and 21 bolted from a Deloraine work party in 1845.\textsuperscript{9}

What other forms of protest did the convicts have available to them? Alan Atkinson has developed a typology of the various forms that it might take.\textsuperscript{10} While his information was not solely based on VDL, similar examples of protest activity were manifest in VDL, as the Archer example below attests. This model does not include, malingering or self-mutilation to escape physical labour and ‘passive’ protests such as hunger strikes are hard to fit into this typology. Court records also supply an example of a case in Campbell Town where a convict refused to work until a sheep had been caught and killed for fresh meat.\textsuperscript{11} But, for convenience, Atkinson’s discussion of four types of protest has been converted into tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Convict Protest</th>
<th>Manifestations or Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attack: physical or verbal as a rejection of authority</td>
<td>Against anyone or anything as an ‘attack’ upon the convict’s system generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appeal to Authority: instituted after a perceived invasion of a convict’s rights</td>
<td>Rules and conventions of conduct for convicts otherwise seen as ‘half-citizens’. Inc. complaints about delays of ticket-of-leave when overdue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Withdrawal of Labour: often used as a form of bargaining</td>
<td>Used for example to protest about a loss of ‘free time’ or ‘demand’ better food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compensatory Retribution: to get revenge or punish their master[s]</td>
<td>Ranging from fighting with non-convicts to rick or hay burning; mostly a form of vengeance against individual master[s].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Atkinson

The deliberate destruction of government property, tools and crops, also deserves mention, except that Atkinson dealt mainly with ‘private’ protest. In VDL, a trivial Type 3 event occurred in VDL in 1835. A master complained that after three hours his male convict still delayed his family’s breakfast despite being pushed into the kitchen where he stood with his arms folded and said ‘If you promise me tea and tobacco I’ll do your work’. The convict was taken before the local court for ‘insolence’ but luckily his master interceded to save him from punishment. The convict only just got the better of this particular bargaining gambit.\textsuperscript{12}
Maxwell-Stewart mentions a relevant incident on Maria Island. This beautiful island served as a convict settlement twice, from 1825-1832 and 1842-1850 and was a source of woollen blankets manufactured there. In November 1826 Arthur was forced to issue a Government Order, which falls within Type 2, clarifying the powers of superintendents of road gangs because too many convicts were wandering off or ‘absenting themselves’ to complain to a Magistrate about harsh treatment. This level of protest was interesting because in theory they had to ask permission to stop work before finding a magistrate.

Robson also provides some other VDL examples that fit this typology. Type 1 - ‘disturbing the family late at night and refusing to put out the light’, and ‘throwing a sickle at an overseer. Type 3 - ‘Neglect of duty and going to bed in the middle of the day’ and Type 4 - ‘Suspicion of placing gunpowder in the blacksmith’s forge with an intention of blowing it up’. Even the well-known VDL gentry, the Archers, were not immune from an incident involving the second suspicious burning of their haystacks in 1831. The incident involved a convict who after being denied new clothing, merely stood by smoking his pipe as his master’s asset went up in smoke. The case was not proved, but Archer suspected that his assigned servants had a part in it.

Women were rarely violent, but they were not totally passive. One female convict at New Norfolk fits ‘Type 2’ defiance. She took her mistress to the New Norfolk court in 1838 for using bad language. She won this case and no penalty went against her, although she was returned to the depot for a fresh assignment. Another more serious case occurred in February 1843. A riot was staged at the Launceston Female Factory during which the women wielded ‘spindles from spinning wheels’ as weapons to beat back the police. But despite their protestations over harsh treatment of one of their fellow inmates most of the ringleaders were sentenced to hard labour. On a less violent tack female convicts frequently made use of ‘malingering’ as Type 3 protestation to avoid compliance with the convict system. While countless other examples could be presented that fit Atkinson’s four forms convict protest here, these must suffice.

**Canadian Convicts**

While VDL was becoming a penal colony, amongst the criminals were political prisoners. They too protested the system and offer us an example of ‘convict resistance’ in VDL between the Canadian rebels of 1839 and their prison guards. During the 1840s these ‘convicts’ staged refusals to work; they would not pull over-loaded carts until they were lightened. They also either destroyed or stole several whipping tripods until convict authorities simply abandoned plans to whip one of their fellows.

From the general body of convicts quasi-collective action also took the form of collective absconding and setting fire to barns. Active protest against the penal system was thus not unknown. During the early colonial period perhaps humanitarian colonial surgeons colluded with convicts to help them ‘frequently feign sickness’ as Commissioner Bigge put it. However this was a limited form of resistance and in Atkinson’s view Australian convicts did not rise up and rebel en masse because they did not consider, or could not effectively enact, joint protest. Setting aside several mutinies attempted on convict ships, this was true except for a few celebrated instances, such as ‘Vinegar Hill’ mentioned in Chapter Four.

Criminals and convicts naturally assimilated an intimate knowledge of the rules of the convict system and of their own and their collective ‘rights’ within it. They may have been only ‘half-citizens’ without all of their British civil liberties but they did not forget what these rights were. Therefore, each of these forms of protest was, although isolated, their way of chipping away at the monolithic convict system per se. Passive resistance or active antagonism towards convictism was not to be found exclusively amongst the freecomers; the felons felt it too and, for example, some refused to work after sunset.
Port Arthur

Port Arthur, established in 1830s, was named after the incumbent Lieutenant Governor, although he departed VDL in 1836. Yet, Arthur’s name has become synonymous with convicts, although he probably asked for it. By presenting London only selective information, Arthur by somewhat ‘devious’ means had created a settlement on Tasman Peninsula because shipping access there was better than for Macquarie Harbour. At least he admitted it was to be for the ‘severe punishment of the vicious’. By 1847 a decade after Arthur’s departure, it was still planned to ‘make Port Arthur a place of severe and dreaded secondary punishment’.23

Concerned about the cost of Macquarie and Maria islands, Arthur had asked for a report on which could be closed and retain an effective punishment regime.24 As a result Maria Island, a secondary penal site since 1825, was closed in 1832, although it did serve as such again from 1842-1852. That is, while VDL was a prison without walls, two isolated secondary punishment stations operated on VDL to contain convicts sentenced by local Magistrates for transportation but considered as ‘delinquent as those sent to Macquarie Harbour’.25 When the latter closed the focus for the administration of felons shifted to Port Arthur. So too local and international dissatisfied concerning the system shifted further against convictism as this site’s reputation spread.

Port Arthur as a place of secondary punishment meant hard work and pain, physical or psychological. Therefore, its reputation is infamous. Deserved or not, we cannot either ignore it or encompass a great deal of it here. It’s scenic setting became described as the ‘final cage for incorrigibles’, and as a place of ‘unvarying and unmitigated misery and desolation’, or of ‘all-consuming misery’.26 Even James Calder, a contemporary surveyor, who found convict punishment repulsive, dubbed Port Arthur an ‘abode of evil-doers’. He was also reluctant to endlessly ponder it and so refused to ‘wear out his brains over the place’.27 We shall show in subsequent chapters that other settlers were not so wary of wearing out their brains!

Port Arthur and Punishment

Descriptions of convicts often focus on the tripod and the whip. But solitary confinement and or the dreaded treadmill eventually replaced the whip. And yet John Frost, a convict clerk employed at Port Arthur, for one, told his international audiences that the ‘flogger was the most powerful man at Port Arthur’, by which he meant his physique not his authority. Contradictory to this and most assessments of flogging, one-time Port Arthur Commandant James Boyd noted that ‘the more unflinchingly a prisoner endured flogging the more he was looked up to an applauded by the mass of his associates’.28 One convict flagellator, an ex-soldier transported to VDL for desertion, apparently used his position to gain sexual favours [associating indecently] from other inmates of Port Arthur.29 This case alone illustrates that so-called ‘unnatural’ practices were not merely between women-starved men, but were done by overseers who abused their positions.

Port Arthur’s now famous ruins include the Separate or Model Prison constructed between 1848 and 1854. Here were the cells, 9 feet by 6 feet, where strict silence reigned and within which the probationers exiles began their island-based tenure, unless they were sent to the smaller ‘dark’ or ‘dumb cells’. Such solitary cells aside, the implementation of punishment-versus-incentive regime fluctuated at Port Arthur depending on its Commandant and level of economies. Flogging, for example, witnessed an overall decline from 38 percent of convicts in 1840, to a mere 4 per cent following the implementation probation.30 Punishment moved from the back to the brain.
As background, international usage of silent cell isolation methodology was widespread. Overall its aim was to help contain society because those in power felt that ‘crime was sustained in society by the spread of irreligion and immorality’, which they perceived was rampant amongst the lower classes. Therefore, using absolute silence ‘separated the convict for long hours in his own cell to commune with his conscience’ and this separation ‘prepared the mind to receive better impressions and the soul to hear the message offered by the chaplain’. Before being sent to these cells, other punishments were used at Port Arthur and throughout VDL. Humiliating, and doubtless sometimes painful, stocks were also used. But, for example, Button recalled that the public stocks used in Launceston were rather tame and that ‘this petty ridicule was often endured in silence’. He also recorded that the originally horrendous torture of the local Launceston treadmill was eventually converted into a stable for the mounted police.

Indeed when solitary or ‘dark’ cells, with absolute silence regimes, were introduced in VDL they were designed to provide ample time for personal reflection on a convicts’ ‘sins and reform’, and minimal rations were also used to help make the point. An 1849 interpretation of VDL’s prison regulations considered that solitary confinement ‘produces a powerful effect in changing the evil tendencies of the convicts minds’. The eerily silent Chapel at Port Arthur was part of this system; albeit often seen as quirky rather than targeted at ‘improving’ the convicts before their release.

Returning to the decline in blood-producing flogging and beatings, an 1846 report shows that only 516 of 24148 convicts were flogged that year. Robson, however, suggests that a bare 10 per cent of convicts were never victims of the harsh corporal punishment system. Regardless of this decline the previous ‘horrors’ of Port Arthur perpetuated VDL’s bad image. Was there no chance of a ‘cure’ for exaggeration? After cessation, horrendous tales of cannibalism especially during escapes from Macquarie Harbour became prevalent, as did tales of agreements to murder a fellow convict after drawing lots. Was this limited but cruel lottery a form of sequential suicide? Did one convict supposedly agreed to kill another in order that they might be hanged? We cannot settle this matter here, but many such sad stories come to rest on Port Arthur, although they may be inaccurate.

Vicious and varied tales certainly did come from the convict stations of Macquarie Harbour and Sarah Island, some from its ex-convicts. Such remarks as quoted here were written by swashbuckling seaman-convict Jimmy Porter and appeared in a ‘memoir’ written by him to save himself from execution. Of Macquarie Harbour he wrote that ‘nothing but misery, flogging and starvation - murders were frequently committed - twice or three times a month - with a view to ridding themselves of a wretched existence. Similar stories abounded and formed part of Porter’s tall tale, which became very popular and appeared in print internationally and thereafter, was published in VDL.
Port Arthur Data

Stories aside, the number of convicts at penal settlements within a penal colony rose quickly, as illustrated in Table 6.9. Point Puer numbers climbed because boys began to arrive directly from the UK, an additional barracks was built to accommodate them in 1837.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Port Arthur 1830-1878 [Male and Female]</th>
<th>Point Puer 1834-1849 [Boys 9-18 years, then Remarks]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>412*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>315 [accommodation wing added]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1100*</td>
<td>706 [NB: henceforth under 15 years only]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>162 [NB: Point Puer Closed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Year of Cessation</td>
<td>Remarks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>NB: only 50% able-bodied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>888 [only 100 were convicts, i.e. lifers]</td>
<td>NB: Inc. time served invalids; Lunatic Asylum was built for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867-68</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Adult convicts removed to Hobart Gaol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>283 [192 were paupers]</td>
<td>NB: Tasmanian Govnt. assumes full control of Port Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>NB: removed to Hobart Gaol etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-78</td>
<td>64 [and 126 paupers, 79 lunatics]</td>
<td>Final annual report adds 5 felons; NB: Pauper facility temporarily reopened: See Chapter Nine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adapted from VDL Statistics 1838 Table 38 & PP 48/1878

1 Brand Penal Peninsula, and Hooper Prison Boys of Port Arthur, and
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Men and Boys

A cruel life or not, apart from punishment what were the males, whether juvenile or adult likely to endure during their sentences? Convict duties in and around Port Arthur centred on timber getting, making shingles, firewood and coal mining. There were also six foundry forges for metalworking by 1848, from which appeared not only convict leg-irons but also inkpots and saucepans, et cetera. There was also manufacture of bricks, barrels, coach wheel spokes, shoes and extensive shipbuilding, to name just a few.
In fact, shoemaking, with leather from a tannery on site, was to become an ‘export’ industry from Port Arthur, where work was partly seen as retraining of the felons, say from rural worker to shoemaker. In 1835 ‘2903 pairs of men’s boots, 4 pairs of Wellington boots, 200 pairs of boys’ boots, 2130 pairs of women’s and girls’ shoes and 5485 pairs of mens’ shoes’ were produced. In 1846 3000 pairs of boots of ‘superior description’ appeared, and in 1848 58 shoemakers laboured there producing boots ‘worth nearly two pairs of those sent out from England’.41

The coal-mining alone provided a harsh even savage working environment for the convicts, who were lowered down the shafts to grub away in often water-logged tunnels within which they could not even stand up. In addition, they had to push the coal-laden carts out themselves. Many of these miners might, however, have been semi-skilled having undertaken similar work before their transportation. On the other hand, along with accusations of lax administration of these mines, convicts undertaking clerical duties for them gained ‘private’ sleeping quarters and the ability to cook their own meals in ‘comparative leisure’. Of note, the presence of boys at the mines was, in a report dated 1847, considered ‘objectionable’. This followed a similar requirement in 1842 for a Hiring Depot at New Town Farm to separate them from the adults while they awaited employment after training at Point Puer. So, VDL’s social evolution extended to concern for boy convicts?42

Indeed, we cannot leave Port Arthur without briefly mentioning the juveniles.43 In 1803 Bowen brought only three children with him, yet as ever it was the young who were to inherit what VDL had become. Two of the 1803 children were with the handful of free settlers and one was amongst the small military establishment. Besides, one of these poor children died as early as 27 April 1804.44 What this means is that neither young criminals nor any children of convicts initially ‘invaded’ VDL. The young, who were, we shall see in Chapters Eight and Nine, frequently called ‘native-born’ came after the first convicts. VDL soon become a place for European babies though, at least two of them John Bowen’s.

While British prisons housing juveniles with adults had as early as 1818 been termed ‘nurseries of crime’, in May 1829 the number of boys on board the Georgiana shocked George Arthur. Also by mid-1830s a ‘baby boom’ in Britain had resulted in a multitude of young criminals.45 Therefore, British prison administrators invoked the separation of adult and juvenile or ‘urchin’ transportees. Consequently, certain convict transportation vessels carried only boy convicts to VDL.46

Despite a mistaken belief that Arthur had a ‘whim’47 to create an experimental separation of juveniles from adults, he was required to implement the revised British practice in VDL. He had earlier once argued that boys ought to be transported quickly rather than become ‘vicious’ after years of exposure to adult criminals on the hulks.48 Even so, it was hoped that separation would save the young boys from criminal or sexual corruption, or both, by the adults. Young convict females were more often directly assigned as servants and few adult and especially not juvenile females were to be found on the Tasman Peninsula, where the men and boys were.

**Convict Tattoos**

The mark of convictism was upon VDL and upon its convicts, in part as a form of passive protest against the convict system. Adults of both genders carried body markings, and even many Point Puer boys carried ‘pock pitting’ or tattoo markings.49 While self-mutilation may have been inflicted to avoid harsh labour, skin decoration was possible. Some tattoos also served as simply messages: convict’s initials with anchor meant ‘I have hope’, an inverted anchor meant lost hope.
Tattoos were, and are, both art and communication, although the full meanings of many convict tattoos remain a mystery. They could represent personal identification, and were often the only thing related to a loved one that a convict could take with them when transported. Samples of more common ones included: keys, anchors, fishes, pistols, hearts, wreaths, mermaids, a dog and a bird. In addition, one convict had the graphic image of a hanged man on his arm - had he been lucky to escape the gallows? The majority of convicts simply had initials tattooed somewhere on their bodies, and so they must be taken at face value and probably referred to a loved one.

Tattoos were often associated with sailors, some of whom became convicts. A perfect example of this was a certain convict working with VDL surveyor James Calder. This man apparently bore multiple tattoos: ‘for sailor-like his arms were tattooed all over with flags, stars, a variety of love-devices, bleeding hearts, darts and busts of girls’. This was certainly extensive tattooing, except that, as Calder noted, this amount of artwork made the convicts’ many escape attempts short-lived. On the positive side these extensive descriptions aided ex-convicts to prove that they were entitled to be ‘free’ or legitimately held ‘Tickets-of-Leave’ because their personal information was noted on the back of their certificates.

Neither way, the elusiveness of meaning may have been deliberate, and many particular tattoos remained little understood by the authorities. This was ever the case despite the fact that ‘considerable care was taken to record unusual or unique features, such as tattoos or deformities’. Authorities also maintained detailed ‘Description Lists’ to supplement the ‘Indents’ mentioned above. For each convict the description, which the convicts called being ‘mugged’, included: ‘trade, height, age, colour of complexion, hair, whiskers, eyebrows and eyes, shape of head, visage, forehead, nose, mouth and chin’. Yet more to the point, the lists noted ‘information of tattoos, deformities, scars, speech impediments, pigmented spots, birthmarks’.

With tattoos, the wearer, who knew the message being sent even if those who saw it didn’t, might gain a sense of rebellion, pride or remembrance of loved ones, et cetera. But undermining their personal, artistic or political value, government officials used such markings to maintain ‘surveillance’ on convicts. They helped fix individual identities in the detailed records noted above for each and every convict who arrived in NSW or VDL. A female convict was also profusely ornamented. When she escaped from Launceston her description was soon posted and it described her tattoos. She was adorned with an anchor, hearts, darts, TRHCDAWT [sic], on her right arm. Her other arm was likewise decorated with; ‘JJ-heart and dart, I love John Johnson, JBWH’. What these marks really mean is lost to us, although perhaps it was similar to the quaint acronyms once written on envelopes between lovers - ‘SWALK or ‘Sealed With A Loving Kiss’?

**Convict Heritage**

Having become a penal colony did convicts leave VDL with a ‘ruinous inheritance’? More on this appears in Chapter Nine, but here we now have the influx of convicts on the island. Thus, before concluding this chapter we might ask - for whom was the vast amount of convict labour expended? Because VDL was a portion of the British Empire amongst the main purposes of this labour, and of the convict system generally, was to assist in the general
economic development and independence of the island. Therefore, the main beneficiaries were the colonial authorities and undoubtedly close behind them came the free settlers. By default, the convicts themselves, after their sentences expired, also benefited from the roads, bridges and other public works created by massive amounts of convict labour. Lastly, many convicts, who were often skilled artisans, performed such labour. For example, Daniel Herbert the stonemason who carved much of the Ross Bridge: consequently, Tasmania’s convict inheritance is often culturally valuable, yet priceless.

Many convicts obviously resisted the full impact of the convict system. Eventually the majority of settlers resisted the system too, which is the focus of Chapter Nine because as Eldershaw said, the time came ‘when transportation was no longer practical politics’.\(^{58}\) In this chapter, the main features of the transformation of VDL becoming a penal colony have been explored. In doing so the administration of all three major schemes of convictism, notwithstanding their common aim to deter and punish crime, has been shown as largely unsuited to VDL as it became a settlers’ society. Accordingly, the next chapter explores the impact of the influx of new and especially free settlers on the island, and Chapter Eight considers the shift in island ‘identity’ that occurred because of them.
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