Recent archaeological research suggests that there had been a fairly continuous Polynesian settlement on Norfolk Island 500–900 years ago, but there was no sign of recent human habitation when Captain James Cook ‘discovered’ the island in October 1774.¹

He was struck by the tall straight pines which grew there, concluding that these would be excellent masts for sailing ships. He also considered that the flax found on the Island would be suitable for sails and other products. It seemed at the time that the Island could become self-supporting, and that it would be able to export surplus produce to support the new penal colony of New South Wales. Clarke points out that, although Norfolk Island was seen as a potentially valuable acquisition in its own right, without New South Wales, ‘Norfolk Island did not possess sufficient intrinsic attraction to have been deemed worthy of colonization by itself’.²

The first settlement, from 1788 to 1814, included both convicts and free settlers. From 1788–1796, Philip Gidley King was the Commandant and Lieutenant Governor, and Norfolk Island was linked to the colony of New South Wales. The focus of this settlement was on the development of land for agriculture and livestock. Contemporary accounts suggested that, while instances of cruel punishments undoubtedly occurred, it may have been a more bearable existence than that of the other penal settlements in Van Dieman’s Land and Botany Bay. However, problems soon arose. It became clear that the pines were not suitable for masts, the flax industry was not competitive, and drought and other climatic conditions limited agricultural production.
The population of convict and free settlers rose quickly during the first few years, with over 1100 residents recorded for 1792. However, these numbers were unsustainable and were gradually reduced, with the final removal of all residents and destruction of buildings and remaining livestock in 1814. The island was now deserted but still remained a British possession, with its very isolation and the lack of a harbour and safe anchorage making the abandonment even more complete. However, these attributes would, only ten years later, make it the preferred site for a maximum security penal colony. This was initiated in 1825 and between 1825 and 1855 a total of 16 administrators were in command of Norfolk Island. Apart from the period of enlightened social reform under Alexander Maconochie in 1840–1844, the Island became known as a place where death was often preferable to the brutalities meted out as ‘punishment short of death’.3

In 1844, an Order in Council brought Norfolk Island under the jurisdiction of Van Dieman’s Land. The population peaked in 1846, with more than 1900 convicts and 400 free settlers, including ticket-of-leave holders, soldiers, civilian officers and their families. However, the continuing condemnation of the cruel and inhumane nature of this penal settlement had influenced British authorities to again consider abandoning Norfolk Island. By mid-1855, only a small group of convicts and caretaking staff remained to await the arrival of the British Government’s final experiment.

These first two British attempts at settlement seemed to have brought only pain and suffering to this once pristinely beautiful island, but at least there was now some hope for the future. As Hazzard (1984:244) reflected:4

Norfolk Island, with its sixty-eight years as a penal settlement, was at last free of its miasma of human sorrow and brutality. The buildings, and the quiet graveyard with its record of mutiny, execution, heroism and accident, were the only evidence of the past. It was soon to return to serenity, with the coming of the Pitcairners, whose home it was destined to be.
The decision to offer the Pitcairn community a home on Norfolk Island can best be understood within the context of these two failed and discredited attempts at settlement. In a very real sense, the third settlement would redeem the Island from its inglorious and sinister recent past. Norfolk Island was no *tabula rasa*, and the proposal that it would be a suitable home for descendants of the *Bounty* mutineers was undoubtedly influenced by its dubious past. At the same time, the impact of the two earlier penal settlements and of the descendants of many of those involved — whether convicts, ticket-of-leave or free settlers, gaolers or administrators — was and remains a recurrent theme in the community’s historical consciousness.

**The Pitcairners**

In 1856, the third and final British experiment involved the transfer of the entire population of Pitcairn Island to Norfolk Island. This community of 194 men, women and children were descendants of the original group of nine *Bounty* mutineers, twelve Tahitian women and six men who, in order to escape the wrath of British justice, settled in 1790 on remote Pitcairn Island. In 1823, John Buffett and John Evans left the crew of a British whaling ship to join the community, and in 1828, Noah Bunker and George Hunn Nobbs arrived. Bunker died a few days after arrival, but Nobbs was to make a lasting impact on the community. When John Adams died in 1829, he took over as leader, teacher, and pastor of the community. However, there remained an underlying feeling that Nobbs, Buffett and Evans were still newcomers, and did not have the same permanent status in the community.

When Rear-Admiral Fairfax Moresby visited Pitcairn in 1852, he began a life-long association with members of the small community, and in particular with Chief Magistrate Arthur Quintal and Pastor George Hunn Nobbs. Moresby arranged for Nobbs to travel to England, where he was ordained as the Church of England chaplain for the Pitcairn community. While in England, Nobbs continued the
good relationship, which he and Quintal had established with Admiral Moresby. Another valuable contact was with the family of Lady Belcher (Diana Joliffe), who had more than a passing interest in the fate of the community he represented. Her step-father, Peter Heywood, had been a midshipman on the *Bounty* and was one of those tried for mutiny in England. Heywood eventually was pardoned and later became a Captain in the British Navy.⁵ During 1852, a group of leading philanthropists also initiated the Pitcairn Islanders Trust Fund (later renamed the Norfolk Island Fund). The use of this fund by successive governments was, and remained, a bone of contention with Pitcairn descendants.

In May 1853, Chief Magistrate Arthur Quintal wrote to Admiral Moresby, reporting that the community had agreed at a public meeting to the suggestion that they should transfer to Norfolk Island, or some other appropriate place. As a token of their gratitude for the interest shown, and of their loyalty to the Crown, a carved wooden cabinet was presented to Queen Victoria.⁶ Despite many subsequent claims that Norfolk Island had then been ‘given’ to the Pitcairners by Queen Victoria, this was clearly not the intention of the British authorities. In a letter dated 5 July 1854, B. Toup Nicolas, the British Consul for the Society Islands, wrote to inform the community about the proposed arrangements for transfer to Norfolk Island.⁷

I am at the same time to acquaint you that you will be pleased to understand that Norfolk Island cannot be ‘ceded’ to the Pitcairn Islanders, but that grants will be made for allotments of land to the different families; and I am desired further to make known to you that it is not at present intended to allow any other class of settlers to reside or occupy land on the island.

Sir William Denison, whose earlier term as Governor of Van Dieman’s Land had been marked by considerable controversy, was now Governor of New South Wales.⁸ In February 1956, the ship *Morayshire* was employed to transfer the Pitcairners to their new home. Denison
directed G.W. Gregorie, the Royal Navy Agent on board, to make arrangements for the allocation of land and the provision of public reserves. In this despatch, he also asked Gregorie to provide a report for transmission to the Secretary of State concluding:

You will accompany this report with any suggestion which you may think calculated to facilitate the working of this experiment about to be made, or which may tend to the happiness and prosperity of the very interesting people who are the subject of this experiment.

In the official copies which are now held in the Australian National Archives, this sentence referring to the settlement as an ‘experiment’ has been underlined and the margin of the copy marked in red.

On 8 June 1856, the Pitcairners eventually arrived at their new home and were met by a small surveying party whose task it was to mark out the blocks to be granted to each family. On 24 June 1856, an Order in Council formally separated the Island from Van Dieman’s Land, and provided that the separate but dual role of Governor would be undertaken by the incumbent Governor of New South Wales. On 25 June 1856, the Captain of H.M.S. Juno, Stephen G. Fremantle, arrived and read to the islanders a statement setting out the conditions of their occupancy of land on Norfolk Island. The terms set out in this letter have been the subject of continuing interpretation and conflict between successive generations of Islanders and various British, New South Wales and Australian government authorities. The letter itself was mislaid, and its very existence was questioned, until it was discovered in the 1960s in Bishop George Selwyn’s papers, held in the Auckland Institute. A copy is now lodged with the National Archives [See Appendix 2].

Given the fact that the very existence and legality of this letter continued to be disputed, the thoughtful explanation provided in a contemporary account by Lady Belcher is persuasive. She noted that the Pitcairners feared that, unless they insisted on an inalienable right to Norfolk Island, they could not guarantee that their children would be secure. They had to insist on their complete ‘ownership’ or
their traumatic abandonment of Pitcairn Island would have been for nothing. She concluded that: 10

The simple Pitcairners were not the only people who had been deluded by a state grant, an insecure kind of title liable to be rescinded or modified at any moment, with very little consideration for the real or sentimental grievances of the sufferers. It was perhaps well for the little community that they were not more inquisitive or suspicious; for had they been so, they would probably never have consented to leave their original home.

But leave they had, and it now remained for their leaders to resist to the best of their ability any and every attempt to diminish their rights of exclusive possession to this new paradise.

Even prior to their arrival, the first of these attempts had already been made. Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand, had proposed that a chaplain would be sent to Norfolk Island with the aim of establishing a regional Bishopric and Mission. Sir William Denison was completely opposed to such a move, partly because he feared that it would diminish the status of George Hunn Nobbs, who was now the official community chaplain. And, as he warned in a despatch to the Secretary of State, also because such a move might diminish British authority.11

In the first place it would, in point of fact, hand over the island to the resident Bishop, whoever he might be, and lead to the establishment of a form of government analogous to that of the Jesuits in Paraguay.

Denison made his first visit to Norfolk Island in September 1857, and after discussions with the elders, held a public meeting to confirm the new laws and regulations under which the Pitcairners would now live. His record of these events reflected a concern for the community and a desire to give them the opportunity to develop a system of government in their own way. Given the prevailing attitudes of cultural superiority, and the absolute authority given to the Governor, Denison’s approach to the community was surprisingly open. He recorded that:12
I left untouched the rule which gave the women, as well as the men, a vote in the annual election of the Chief Magistrate. I hope, however, that this experiment on a small scale, will not be assumed as a precedent in the favour of the claims now made on the part of our ‘better halves’, to have their say in the government of the country, for I doubt very much whether, even among the primitive people of Norfolk Island, it would be found to answer if pushed at all beyond its present limit. I should most certainly not have proposed even this small amount of petticoat government, had I not found it already in existence.

———

I had been asked to act as godfather to a newly-born child of the family of Christian; and soon after the breaking up of the meeting, I limped slowly down to the chapel, being still in pain from my sprain, which was a result of an attempt on my part to show the midshipmen on board the ‘Iris’ how to skip with two people holding the rope. When a man weighs upwards of thirteen stone, he has no business to make experiments on the strength of his tendons.

The child was named Caroline Lucy after Denison’s wife. Correspondence between Nobbs and Denison, and official despatches, record the restlessness of some members of the Pitcairn community and the return to Pitcairn of several families who had been unable to settle in the new environment. Denison also took charge of the special ‘Norfolk Island Seal’ approved by Queen Victoria for use by the Governor on behalf of the Norfolk Island community [See Chapter 7].

During a second visit in June 1959, Denison was concerned that those who left the Island might dispose of their land grants haphazardly to other families, or, despite their stated objections to strangers, sell the land to new arrivals. He outlined a series of regulations for the issuing, registration and transfer of land and finalised these arrangements later in 1859. He was kept busy settling disputes, noting that it was too early to evaluate the overall success
of the settlement. He also commented in circumspect terms on the continuing problems of sexual relationships within a small isolated community, concluding:14

I can say nothing very definite as to the success of the experiment with the Pitcairn islanders. I have had letters from various persons, each complaining of some particular grievance, but I have generally ascertained that these neutralised each other, A. complaining of B. and B. of A. I have also heard that some of the inhabitants have succumbed to the temptations to which they have been subjected under their altered condition, but this was no more than might have been expected.

Denison’s term expired at the end of 1859 and Bishop Selwyn’s proposal for a Mission was again brought forward. The Governor and the Secretary of State were persuaded, and the islanders, thinking that it would only be a grant of 200 acres, agreed. Much to their horror, the eventual outcome was a further sale of 1000 acres at three pounds an acre, although it was argued that the money obtained would be of great benefit to the islanders. Official despatches over the next 15 years recorded only minor arguments over the use of the Norfolk Island Fund to pay for the salaries of different local officers. Others reported on difficulties related to an outbreak of typhoid fever in 1869, a severe hurricane in 1874, and various charges against different community members for sexual misconduct.15

As Denison had hoped, it was clear that the Islanders had generally been left to look after themselves, with minimal interference from external authorities.

The end of Norfolk Island self-government

This state of affairs ended when, after receiving reports of lax management and administration, Governor Lord August Loftus visited the Island in April 1884. A contemporary New South Wales
official reported that the Governor met with the Chief Magistrate and the Councillors and then spoke at a general meeting of the Island Parliament.\textsuperscript{16}

After some complimentary remarks by the Governor, he proceeded to explain his views as to the condition and prospects of the islanders, and dwelt on their duty to themselves, to their families and children, and to the nation at large. …He endeavoured to disabuse their minds of the idea that they have any absolute claim to the proprietorship of the island, and read for them the order by which the Governor for the time being is empowered to grant or sell land to whomsoever he pleases. He deprecated the way in which the land is allowed to go to ruin, and intimated that he would issue no more grants till he had communicated with the Imperial Government on the subject.

Following his visit, Loftus appointed Henry Wilkinson, then visiting magistrate for Lord Howe Island, to undertake a detailed inquiry.\textsuperscript{17}

After spending five months on the Island, Wilkinson’s final assessment was that a complete overhaul of the Island’s administration, and a revamped system of law enforcement, were urgently needed. A major problem appeared to be the weakness of community leadership, and the ease with which unauthorised outsiders could gain control. Wilkinson laid the blame for the present situation on the ‘liberal manner in which the people of England and the Government have from time to time supplied their wants’. He suggested a series of 55 laws and regulations, which would bring them generally in line with New South Wales. The aim should be to introduce a more efficient system of government without unnecessary or wasteful expenditure.

While the Governor’s 1884 visit had caused a local uproar, reactions to Wilkinson’s recommendations were more far-reaching. The report suggested that the situation on Norfolk Island reflected badly on the Imperial authorities and the ‘experiment’ was apparently not succeeding. It would, however, be impossible to close down this
third settlement in the same way as the first two had been abandoned. Apart from any other considerations, the Melanesian Mission was now well-established on the Island. In November 1885, a despatch was sent to the Governor of New South Wales, asking him to ‘ascertain whether the Government of New South Wales might be prepared to undertake the control and administration of the Island’.18

Although it was clear that there was no great enthusiasm for this request on the New South Wales Government side, the Islanders immediately petitioned the Governor, strongly protesting against the proposed transfer. Irritated by Wilkinson’s unflattering descriptions of their inadequacies, they enlisted the support of Alfred McFarland, a New South Wales judge, who had studied the history of the Pitcairn community. In December 1885, he published a passionate statement of support. He criticised Sir William Denison for not fulfilling the promises he had made to the Islanders and for leading them to believe that they would own everything on Norfolk Island. He also supported islander complaints that the Pitcairn (later Norfolk Island) Trust Fund had not been used for their benefit. However, his strongest argument related to the problem of infrequent and unreliable shipping. He pointed out that criticisms of a lack of industry failed to take into account the reality that there was also a lack of markets:19

At present, the islanders fairly say, “What is the good of our raising anything except what is required for our immediate consumption? Months often elapse without a vessel visiting us; there is no certainty when one may be looked for; and the produce that we do raise becomes a drug amongst us, or rots in the fields.”

The Government of New South Wales was in no hurry to accept the transfer. Apart from sending two surveyors to the Island in 1886, and authorising Wilkinson to continue as a visiting magistrate, no further action was taken. However, in October 1886, Wilkinson again visited the Island. After discussions with Island leaders, he held a public meeting to reassure the community of the benefits
of being linked to New South Wales. He appeared to have had some success, as the strong opposition recorded on October 4 in *The Norfolk Island Pioneer* was followed by a complete reversal of opinion in the November issue. The public meeting was reported to have ‘passed off amicably’ and most of those assembled had been convinced that New South Wales would take a greater interest in their welfare, as had been indicated by the current surveying assistance being provided.

Ironically, the community appeared to have been once again persuaded by exaggerated reassurances, this time from the very Commissioner who had criticised them for their duplicity. However, the New South Wales Government was not yet convinced. On 16 March 1887, in response to a question in Parliament from the member for Queanbeyan, Edward William O’Sullivan, Sir Henry Parkes explained that such a transfer was fraught with many difficulties.20

The task would be a serious one, and one involving a great deal of confusion, as constituting a dependency to a dependency; and the government of necessity being conducted on a small scale, at a remote distance, without the possibility of supervision or criticism, would be liable to run into great abuse, and I fear corruption. With all these things staring us in the face, however interesting the experiment might be, it must present itself as a question requiring the greatest consideration before any further step is taken.

On 8 July 1888 Mr. O’Sullivan again asked what was happening as the situation appeared to be very confused. Sir Henry responded that:21

The British Government has offered to hand over Norfolk Island to New South Wales but in the view of the present advisers of the Crown, we should hardly know what to do with Norfolk Island, and we have not decided to accept the offer, as it would appear to be something like a white elephant.
The transfer gathers momentum

For the next few years, New South Wales continued to resist attempts by the Colonial Office to implement the transfer of authority for the Island. Finally, in 1895, Viscount Hampden, the newly appointed governor designate of New South Wales, began more decisive moves to combine his dual administrative roles. Premier George Reid was persuaded to ‘agree in principle’ to the transfer. At the same time, members of the British House of Commons had become aware of opposition to the proposed transfer. On 2 March 1896, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain, was asked about the grounds on which ‘it was sought to deprive the inhabitants of that island of the large measure of local self-government they have hitherto enjoyed’. His response left no doubt that this was the best course of action.22

I have to state that, up to the present moment, the administration of justice, which is in the hands of a magistrate elected by the community, has been partial and unsatisfactory, crime is rarely punished, and debts are not recoverable; and that these circumstances, coupled with the fact that the public buildings have been allowed to fall into a ruinous condition, and that no effort has been made to develop the resources of the island, the condition of which is thus rapidly deteriorating, have, in the opinion of her Majesty’s Government, afforded sufficient grounds for effecting a change in the administration of its affairs.

The residents of Norfolk Island were not the only voices raised in opposition to the change of administrative control. The New Zealand Government also opposed the transfer to New South Wales. This was on the grounds that Norfolk Island was much closer geographically to New Zealand, that it would become a strategic part of their Pacific cable link, and that the Melanesian Mission was part of the province of New Zealand. On 26 May 1896, after an initial protest, the Governor of New Zealand sent a despatch to the Colonial Secretary, setting out in detail New Zealand’s greater claims to take over the administration of Norfolk Island [See Appendix 3].
However, as Merval Hoare noted, political support for the claim that Norfolk Island would be better under New Zealand control was far from unanimous:\footnote{23}

During debates in the New Zealand Legislative Council in June 1896, the Honorable Sir George Whitmore, speaking on the subject of New Zealand’s claim, said that he could hardly believe that there was any serious intention to have Norfolk annexed to New Zealand, that it was a singularly valueless possession for any colony to desire, and that before such a step, involving some expenditure and no earthly advantage, the people of the country ought to be consulted.

In any event, the British Government was not supportive of New Zealand’s claims, and remained impervious to the various petitions of protest sent to the Queen and to her representatives, both in London and Sydney.

In preparation for the transfer to New South Wales, J. H. Carruthers, Secretary for Lands, and Magistrate C. J. Oliver were appointed as Commissioners to carry out a further report into Norfolk Island Affairs. The Department of Lands surveyor, Michael Vincent Murphy, who was later to become the first Commonwealth administrator of Norfolk Island, was attached to the Commission. He accompanied Oliver on a two-month visit, and carried out an extensive survey of the Island. In March, the commissioners presented their report, recommending that although present occupants of government buildings might only be subject to a ‘nominal’ rental, a more orderly system should be introduced.

The commissioners also suggested that a local council should be elected annually, ‘by the male members of the Community of the age of 21 years and upwards’.\footnote{24} There appeared to have been no concern that one of the consequences of these changes to the electoral procedures would be the removal of the limited female suffrage, which Denison had accepted as an important part of the culture of the community.
In October 1896, with Federation now a definite possibility, Premier George Reid agreed that, while Norfolk Island would not be formally annexed to New South Wales, a provisional arrangement would be made, bringing the Island under the authority of the Governor of the Colony of New South Wales. Administrative services would be provided by the appropriate New South Wales government departments. To facilitate these arrangements, the British Government offered to pay one thousand pounds towards the initial expenses, and an annual charge of one hundred pounds towards the salary of the resident magistrate. Nevertheless, the Premier’s memorandum to the Governor of New South Wales of 13 October 1896 reflected the reluctance and sense of unease which he and his Ministers felt in succumbing to the British Government’s pressure for this transfer to go ahead [See Appendix 4].

The unenthusiastic and only partial acceptance of Norfolk Island by New South Wales was mirrored by the Islanders themselves, who continued their protests and petitions. Nonetheless, in November their worst fears were realised: losing no time now that he had gained Ministerial agreement, Viscount Hampden visited Norfolk Island to announce a revised system of Government. Although a complete adoption of New South Wales laws and regulations was deemed to be inappropriate, the laws which had been in force since 1857 were repealed and a new set of 23 laws and regulations proclaimed. The limited voting rights which women had maintained under Denison’s more sympathetic revision of the Pitcairners’ own laws and regulations were removed. Only adult males could now take part in the election of Elders to the Council. The office of Chief Magistrate became a Government appointment rather than an elective office, and other administrative changes further weakened the Islanders’ right to control their own internal affairs.

The British Government seemed to have completely lost interest in the problems of this small dependency and clearly did not want to know about any problems. In response to a query in Parliament as to whether the new arrangements were working satisfactorily, the
Secretary of State for the Colonies replied.\textsuperscript{25}

I have no reason to believe that the new arrangements for the administration of Norfolk Island are not working satisfactorily. It has not hitherto been the practice to present an annual report on the affairs of Norfolk Island, and I do not propose to make any change in this respect.

In October 1900, in preparation for the passage of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, an Order in Council confirmed that the Governor of the State of New South Wales would continue to administer the affairs of Norfolk Island until such time as other arrangements were made. The process of a complete divestment of authority from the United Kingdom had begun, although the Governor of New South Wales would retain ultimate authority until the Commonwealth of Australia Norfolk Island Act 1913 was finally proclaimed on 17 June 1914 [See Appendix 6].

It is, as the report of a later Royal Commission pointed out, ‘particularly worth noting that this first move for control of Norfolk Island to be shifted came from the British Government and not from the Island itself or from the Colony of New South Wales’.\textsuperscript{26} The community on Norfolk Island continued to feel aggrieved that they had not been consulted and were merely pawns in the Imperial game. These feelings of betrayal and injustice were to surface even more strongly when the Governor and New South Wales administrative services began to implement the new laws and regulations and exert more definite control over the management of land and property on the Island.
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