• I will be presenting a statistical overview of crimes of transportation and crime families based on information in our Female Convicts in VDL database.
• This will provide a background to the remainder of papers to be presented today.

• We will look first at Crimes of Transportation.
• This represents 93% of convicts in our database.

• To analyse crimes of transportation a classification system for crimes is needed.
Classes of Offences

- Class I: Offences against the person
- Class II: Offences against property
- Class III: Forgery and offences against the currency
- Class IV: Offences against good order
- Class V: Offences not included in preceding classes

- Handout
- This classification of offences was used by magistrates in Van Diemen’s Land.
- DMS and myself found it within the pages of a Lower Court record book of cases heard in petty sessions in the AOT a few years ago.
- We have found this a useful way to classify crimes, including transportation crimes. I used it in *A Drift of ‘Derwent Ducks’* and *Patchwork Prisoners*.

- Transportation crimes were classified into one of these classes.
• Unsurprisingly, the majority of transportation crimes are offences against property.
• 3% of transportation crimes were unable to be classified due to insufficient information.
• Classes I, III, IV and V comprised just 5% of transportation crimes.

• Let’s now look at each Class separately.
• Listed here are the Class I offences used to classify transportation crimes.
• Only 4 offences in this Class were not used to classify transportation crimes.
• Female offences classified as rape involved women aiding and assisting men in rape or being an accessory to rape.
• Aggravated assault offences includes aggravated assault with intent, though these could possibly also be classified as attempted murder.
• This graph shows the distribution of transportation crimes classified as offences against the person.
• About ¼ of the crimes were infanticide, with between 10% and 16% classified as murder, aggravated assault, attempted murder, abduction and manslaughter.
• All cases of abduction were for child stealing.
• The one unnatural offence was for incest – Isobel Cuthbert was transported on the Margaret in 1843 for living with her father and having a child by him which died aged 14 months.
• There were 2 cases of bigamy.
Class II: Offences against property

16. Burglary
17. Housebreaking
18. Robbery and stealing from the person
19. Horse-stealing
20. Cattle-stealing
21. Sheep-stealing
22. Embezzlement and stealing by servants
23. Larceny, other
26. Receiving
27. Fraud and false pretences
28. Arson
29. Malicious damage

• All but 3 of the offences against property classes are represented in the transportation crimes.
• Note that robbery & stealing from the person includes assault & robbery, picking pockets, and highway robbery.
• This graph shows the distribution of transportation crimes classified as offences against property.
• Larceny (other) and robbery & stealing from the person comprise ¾ of the offences against property.
• There were 2 cases of malicious damage: feloniously cutting silk in a loom; and breaking glass.
• What is the difference between burglary and housebreaking? Burglary is housebreaking which occurs at night (under the cover of darkness).
• A further breakdown of larceny crimes can provide more information.
Classification of what is stolen

- alcohol & tobacco
- animals
- books, papers, seals & writing
- clothing (including umbrellas)
- fabric & haberdashery
- food
- footwear
- furniture
- handkerchief
- homeware & pubware

... cont.

• What was stolen by convicts was classified into the above categories.
• In many instances, what was stolen fell into more than one of these categories.
• Theft of linen, bedding & furnishings was often from furnished lodgings.
• The category of plate & metal included theft of silver and copper implements such as cutlery & candlesticks.
• This graph shows the distribution of larceny crimes into the preceding categories.
• It includes all offences against property except for fraud & false pretences, arson, and malicious damage.
• Theft of clothing and money accounts for nearly half of the larceny crimes.
Class III: Forgery & offences against the currency

31. Forgery and uttering forged instruments
32. Offences in relation to the currency (passing bad notes, having forged notes)

• Forgery and uttering forged instruments (31) included coining, uttering, forging and having moulds for counterfeiting.
• Offences in relation to the currency (32) included passing bad notes, and having forged notes.
• This graph shows the distribution of forgery and offences against the currency.
• Most transportation crimes in this category are for forgery & uttering forged instruments.
• Vagrancy was the only transportation crime classified as an offence against good order, out of 8 classifications.
Class V: Offences not included in preceding classes

41. Conspiracy
42. Perjury & surborsnation
49. Desertion of wives & children
52. Other offences

• Only 4 of the 12 classifications of offences not included in preceding classes are identified for transportation crimes.
• This graph shows the distribution of transportation crimes classified as offences not included in preceding classes.
• Note the low number of transportation crimes in this category.
• Conspiracy included such things as: sending a threatening letter to extort money; and conveying instruments into a gaol to aid the escape of a prisoner (her husband).
• All transportation crimes classified as perjury & subornation were for perjury, which included making a false statement or lying in court.
• There was one case of desertion of children.
• The 2 other offences were: deserting the workhouse at County Meath; and returning from transportation before her time had expired.

• Were certain crimes specific to a country?
• Analysis of the transportation crimes indicated that certain crimes may be more likely to be committed in one or more of these countries.
• Further analysis indicated this was true.
• The graph shows that the proportion of women tried for animal theft in Ireland was much higher than the proportion of all women tried in Ireland.
• Conversely, the proportion of women tried for animal theft in England and Scotland was much lower than the proportion of all women tried in those countries.
• Therefore, animal theft and killing was a particularly Irish crime.
• Similarly, arson was also a particularly Irish crime.
Conversely, uttering, coining & forgery were more common transportation crimes in England and Scotland, but not common crimes in Ireland.
• Robbery & stealing from the person were particularly English crimes.
• As mentioned earlier, robbery & stealing from the person included highway robbery, assault & robbery, and pick pocketing.
• Likewise, embezzlement & stealing by servants were particularly English crimes.
• Burglary & housebreaking, however, were particularly Scottish crimes.
• Larceny (other) and receiving were equally common crimes across all countries.
• The differences in transportation crimes across countries may have been due to:
  • differing laws across the countries
  • location of the crime – eg, country or city
  • political circumstances

• So, to summarise, most transportation crimes were offences against property, of which the vast majority were larceny crimes, with money and clothing being the most popular items of theft.
Now, to a consideration of crime families.

The database was used to identify female convicts who stated they had a family member transported, then these relations, if transported to VDL, were identified where possible.

The 1,473 female convicts identified comprised 11% of all female convicts in the database.

This is most probably a large underestimation of the proportion of female convicts who had family members transported.

Quite often the female convicts who had family members transported can only be identified from looking at the records of those transported later.

This is why analysing the WA convict records in particular would help identify more female convicts with relations transported.

Not all family members have been identified.
Most of the family members identified were transported to VDL.
Many of the convicts not identified were tried towards the end of transportation and so may have been sent to Western Australia.
Female convicts often noted that their family members were transported to NSW, which included Moreton Bay.
Most of the convicts not transported died in gaol or on the hulks. One of them escaped to America prior to transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Number of Related Convicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convicts to VDL</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts to NSW (incl. Moreton Bay)</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts to Bermuda</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts not transported</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts to Western Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts exiled to Port Phillip</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts to Gibraltar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• This graph shows the distribution of which year the family members identified arrived as convicts.
• Because of the bias of the sample, this graph may not reflect the entire convict population.
• The family members are grouped towards the end of transportation because:
  • Indents exist and have been transcribed for this period.
  • More convicts transported to VDL during this period.
  • More information about families on later convict records.
This table shows how the family members were related to the female convict.

- Female relations (eg, sister, mother, daughter) predominate, possibly because they were transported together and male indents have not been analysed.
- Immediate family members are usually the only ones mentioned by convicts on their Indents, hence the low numbers of less immediate family members.
- Two of the unknowns are possibly sisters – Margaret and Ann Lawless transported on the *Mexborough* in 1841.
- Not surprisingly, many of the women’s husbands or de facto partners were transported, often with them or prior to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>Brother-in-law</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>Half-sister</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Half-brother</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Niece</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De facto partner</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Father-in-law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Granddaughter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister-in-law</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Step-father</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Step-sister</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that female convicts had 1 to 8 other family members transported.

Most female convicts had only one other family member transported.

Ten female convicts have been identified as having 5 or more family members transported.

• Who were these ten convict?
• Ann Mannion per Australasia stated, “committed the offence to be with my family”.
• No relatives of Ann or Honor were left behind in Ireland.
Mary’s husband Matthew and brother Thomas were tried and transported together. 
Her father Matthew and brothers Matthew, Michael and Bernard tried together, and 
the 3 brothers were transported together. 
Brother Patrick was only 13 when he was transported, the last of the family to be 
transported. 
They left behind in County Cavan their mother Bridget and sisters Bridget and Susan.
The four brothers were not identified as arriving in either VDL or NSW. It may be that they were not transported. Further research is necessary.

Her father James was left behind at Belfast.
• A brother to the Lynch sisters, James Lynch, was transported on the Blenheim in 1849.
• No relatives were listed as being left behind in County Clare, Ireland.
• Margaret Williamson is the only female convict with 5 or more relations transported who was not from Ireland. She was from Banff, Scotland and was tried and convicted with her husband, 2 brothers, sister-in-law and brother-in-law. The men were all transported per Elphinstone 1836 and her sister-in-law Mary Lindsay was transported with her on the Arab.
• Catherine Clarke was tried and transported with her mother and two sisters. Her husband and brother were also tried and convicted with her, but they were not transported to VDL. As it was 1850, they may have been transported to Western Australia.

• Were crime families more likely to come from a particular country?
• Theory: Irish female convicts were more likely to have family members transported, to use chain migration.
• The statistics above support this theory, but they are based on a non-random sample. Further research is necessary to draw a firm conclusion.
• The sample also included 5 female convicts tried in Australia, 2 in South Africa (mother & daughter), 1 in Mauritius and 1 in Channel Islands.

• To summarise, an initial attempt to determine crime families has identified that 11% of the female convicts in our database had 1 or more family members transported, with the maximum identified so far being 8.