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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was commissioned by the World Heritage Unit of the Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories, to investigate, through a study of convict places internationally and within Australia, the appropriateness of a nomination of Australian convict transportation places for inscription on the World Heritage List, and to identify gaps in the knowledge base of convict places.

The study was structured within a framework for World Heritage assessment prepared for the Department in 1992. In this report the international historical context for convict transportation is established, and themes of universal significance identified. The history of Australian convict transportation is then presented, and the relevance of the global themes to the Australian experience is identified. Places relating to convict transportation are then identified, and available information assessed, so that the relationship of these places to the global themes can be determined. This resulted in a short-list of places being identified which appeared to be of substantial importance in the context of the global themes.

The short-listed places are then assessed with regards to their authenticity and degree of protective management, and against the criteria for World Heritage Listing. This reduced to eight the number of places thought to merit further investigation and assessment for possible nomination as a series-nomination for World Heritage Listing. Gaps in the information are identified, and an extensive bibliography relating to international and Australian convict transportation is provided.

The report recommends that the Department undertake further research, site investigation and assessment of a series of eight places, in conjunction with the necessary consultation with state authorities, in order to prepare a series nomination of Australian convict transportation places for World Heritage Listing.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE TASK AND CONSULTANTS

Scope of the work

The Brief for this project, prepared by the Department of Environment, Sport and Territories, indicated that:

"this study is intended to identify those places associated with convicts or transportation of convicts to Australia which may be considered for further detailed assessment for World Heritage values. The study also aims to identify any significant gaps in the knowledge base of convict sites".

The Brief required the consultants to:

• collate and present information describing the cultural values of convict sites that might be suitable for consideration for the World Heritage List
• provide an initial assessment of these values against the World Heritage criteria, together with justification of those assessments
• address the themes of transportation of convicts in comparison with other forms of forced movement of people, and other penal processes

The consultants approached the task by applying the Framework for the assessment of Australia's cultural properties against the World Heritage criteria (Domicelj, Halliday and James no date), as described at 1.2 below. This required:

• investigating the international context for convictism, and identifying themes of global significance, as described in Section 2;
• investigating the Australian context for convict transportation, and assessing how the global themes apply to the Australian experience, as described in Section 3;
• applying the criteria of authenticity and management as required for World Heritage assessment;
• assessing selected Australian places against the World Heritage criteria.

The consultants

The Project was undertaken by Dr Michael Pearson and Mr Duncan Marshall, with material overviewed and discussed at critical stages by Ms Joan Domicelj.

1.2 DEFINITIONS

Definition of some commonly used terms

• 'convict' means a person convicted of a crime. For the purposes of this study the term 'convict' does not include persons sentenced within
Australia, unless the sentence is for the secondary punishment of a transported convict.

- **'convict transportation'** means the removal of convicts from their country of residence to another country, usually a colony, in order to serve out their sentence there.

- **'secondary punishment'** means the re-conviction of a transported convict for a crime committed while en-route to, or after arrival in the colony. Secondary punishment was usually harsher than that received by other convicts, but has come to represent the 'normal' convict experience in many popular accounts of convictism. Fear of secondary punishment was used to control convicts within the colony, and to deter people from committing crime in Britain.

- **'convict place'** means a place associated with the direct control, housing, punishment and utilisation of transported convicts by the government, through its convict administration. Privately built and owned buildings are included in the definition of 'convict place' only where it can be shown that the building was built exclusively for, and used for, the housing and control of assigned convicts.

- **'assignment'** refers to the system operating in Australia (and some other British colonies) whereby convicts still serving sentences were formally allocated or 'assigned' to settlers according to a formula relating to land-ownership and investment. Assigned convicts were tied to a designated 'master' to whom they had been assigned as servants, and the master could seek corporal punishment of the assigned servant via a local magistrate for misdemeanours or poor work. Assigned convicts worked commonly as shepherds, stock-keepers, agricultural labourers, 'mechanics' and domestic servants, and were guaranteed only their rations for such labour. In Western Australia a system of more closely controlled fixed-term contract assignment, administered from 'hiring depots', operated for some years prior to 1857.

- a **'ticket-of-leave'** was in effect a form of parole available to well-behaved convicts after a set proportion of their sentence had been served, which enabled the convict to engage in paid work on his or her own behalf (Shaw 1966:229). The system operated in all the Australian colonies receiving convicts. The Ticket-of-leave gave the convict a degree of choice in their employment and employer that was not available to assigned convicts, though they still had to report at set intervals to local magistrates, and to indicate their changes in employment or location of work.

- the **'probation system'** was a system of convict labour introduced in Tasmania between 1839 - 43 in response to dissatisfaction with the assignment system. Convicts were to serve an initial fixed period of labour in gangs working from 'probation stations', followed by a staged progression of less severe punishment at the stations, and finally gaining a conditional release through a ticket-of-leave. Assignment was replaced by a system of probation passes, which enabled a convict, following the probation period, to be hired out to settlers on short term contracts, until they earned a ticket-of-leave.

- **'hulks'** were ships stripped of their rigging and adapted to house convicts. They were used in Britain to house convicts working on harbour works or awaiting transportation, and in a number of colonies
to house convicts working on short-term projects, or when land-based accommodation was insufficient.

- **'Forced migration'** is used here to mean all the forms of involuntary movement of people from their home country.

- **'Slavery'** is the imposition on an individual of the status of human chattel, in which the person is made the legal property of another. The slave loses his or her freedom totally and in perpetuity, usually with no expectation of ever achieving freedom, and the same status is imposed automatically upon the children of a slave.

- **'Indentured labour' or 'contract labour'** is where a contract has been entered into to transport a person to another place for a fixed period, and to have full use of the person's labour for that period. In some cases the contract is entered into voluntarily, in which case it is not forced migration in the sense that slavery and convict transportation is. In other cases the contract may have been entered into by a third party—family, master, abductor or government—in which case it is forced migration. In either case, the indentured labourer has sold their services absolutely, and may often experience a state of semi-slavery for the contract period.

- **'Exile'** means a person banished, deported or transported from their country or location of residence by the government for crimes against the state, usually relating to political beliefs or actions.

- **'Vagabonds'** is used here as the general term to describe a class of people often subject to imprisonment and transportation in several countries of Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. In Britain 'rogues' and other dangerous idle persons were controlled by the Vagrancy Act, which first appeared in 1547 and was subsequently repealed and re-enacted several times through to the late seventeenth century, and similar laws in Ireland allowed the transportation of the homeless poor into the mid-eighteenth century. In Spain, laws in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries allowed the sentencing to hard labour of 'vagrants, gypsies and other undesirables', and in the eighteenth century they could be sent to the overseas Presidios, or military colonies. In France laws for the transportation of habitual petty criminals were enacted as late as the 1850s. (Shaw 1966; Pike 1983; Wilcox 1931).

### 1.3 IDENTIFYING AND ASSESSING PLACES OF WORLD HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE

**A Model for Assessing World Heritage Values**

In 1992 the Commonwealth commissioned a major study to provide a detailed framework for the assessment of Australia's cultural properties against the World Heritage criteria (Domicelj, Halliday and James no date). The study included a model for the assessment of cultural properties and the development of a tentative list. The model is summarised for historic places at Table 1.

**Table 1 Model for Assessing World Heritage Values**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step in Process</th>
<th>Identification Task or Sieve</th>
<th>Comment on Task or Sieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step A</td>
<td>Identification of Historic Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step B</td>
<td>Sieve 1 - Global Context</td>
<td>Identify themes of outstanding universal value compared to important national or important national themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step C</td>
<td>Identification of Historic Places related to the Theme of Outstanding Universal Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step D</td>
<td>Sieve 2 - Authenticity and Management</td>
<td>Identify places which are authentic and well managed compared to places not authentic or not well managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step E</td>
<td>Sieve 3 - Global Context</td>
<td>Identify places which are essential to the theme of outstanding universal value compared to those places which are integral or peripheral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step F</td>
<td>Sieve 4 - Criteria</td>
<td>Identify individual places satisfying one or more of the criteria (that is, are essential at Step E) or those series of places satisfying one or more of the criteria (that is, are integral at Step E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the model is intended to assist in the broader process of developing a tentative list of Australian cultural properties worthy of consideration for World Heritage listing, it has another use in the case of assessing particular themes, regions or places. For the Convict Places study, the process is similar, given that the general historic theme (Step A) is already defined—convict transportation. Step B requires the establishment of the broader world context for convict transportation in order to identify (a) whether the story of convict transportation is of sufficient significance in a world view to be considered of outstanding universal value, and (b) whether the Australian 'story' forms a significant part of the convict theme of outstanding universal value.

World Heritage Criteria are listed and applied to Australian convict places at Section 7.
The model is used as the basis for the analysis and tentative assessment of convict places in Australia. However, given the limited desk-top nature of the project, some of the steps in the model cannot be fully pursued in this report, and it is recommended that further research is required to complete the task. The further work considered necessary is discussed in section 8.

1.4 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The consultants acknowledge the assistance of the following people in carrying out the study: Ian Baxter and staff of the Heritage Council of Western Australia; Professor Tom Stannage and Dr Jenny Gregory of University of Western Australia; David Hutchinson, Fremantle; Patrick Millar, Heritage Victoria; Helen Clemens and staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service of NSW; Tony Prescott and Tracey Ireland, Dept of Urban Affairs and Planning, NSW; Peter Emmett and Sheri Burke, Historic Houses Trust of NSW; Helen Gregory and staff of the Heritage Branch, Department of Environment and Planning, Queensland; Brett Noble, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania; Dr Robert Bruce and Liz Thompson of the Australian Heritage Commission; and Tim Walsh of the Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories, Canberra.
2. CONVICTISM AS AN INTERNATIONAL SIGNSIFICANT THEME

There are two historical themes of global migration that need to be examined to be able to put convict transportation into its international context. These themes are slavery and contract or indentured labour, both of which are examined here in the context of forced migration. Once these themes are examined, the role of convictism as an internationally significant theme of human movement is examined.

2.1 SLAVERY IN THE CONTEXT OF FORCED MIGRATION

The migration of human populations has been a phenomenon of human history reaching back into prehistory. Mass migration over considerable distances can be a matter of free choice, or it can be the result of varying degrees of coercion and force. Slavery is the most extreme example of forced migration. Slavery is the imposition on an individual of the status of human chattel, in which the person is made the legal property of another. The most important distinction between slavery and the status experienced by convicts and indentured labourers is that the slave loses his or her freedom totally and in perpetuity, usually with no expectation of ever achieving freedom, and the same status is imposed automatically upon the children of a slave.

Slavery usually involved the forced removal of native peoples from a country other than that of the slavers, usually an 'undeveloped' or a 'subject' country. By contrast, convict transportation involved the removal of criminal and political prisoners, and sometimes common vagabonds, from their own country, or from a European power's colonies, to a distant location, usually overseas. Contract labour involved the transfer of an individual's labour to another country or colony for a stated period by way of legal contract. The contract labourer could come from the colonising country, from another European country, or from some other place, often a country with a greater population but fewer employment opportunities.

Slavery has existed since at least classical times in Europe. Slavery is difficult to identify in pre-literate societies, as it results in few identifiable archaeological signs. It does not appear to have existed within Celtic society in western Europe, except where the influence of the Roman empire was felt and a market for the export of slaves was created (Piggott 1965: 227).

Slave numbers in ancient Greece are difficult to calculate, but estimates range from 80-100,000 for 5th and 4th century BC Athens, to 20,000 for late 4th century BC Athens or about one slave for every three adult free persons (Finlay 1959: 58-9; Jones 1956: 3). Slaves in ancient Greece were used as domestic servants, in industry and in administration, but few were used in agriculture. In the fifth century BC there were about 10,000 slaves employed at the silver mines at Laurium, either owned by mine operators and smelters, or leased out by other owners to miners (Jones 1956: 1-15). Sources of slaves were warfare, trade and capture on the edges of the settled Greek world among the 'barbarians', and to a lesser extent natural increase, penal servitude, and abandoned children. Most Greek slaves were therefore non-Greeks (Finley 1959:53-72).

Slavery was practiced by the Etruscans in Italy, and the practice increased with the extension of Roman power throughout Italy. In 357 BC a tax was imposed on manumission (the freeing of slaves), and by 209 BC the amount accumulated from this source suggests that in the order of 1,350 slaves were freed each year (Scullard 1961: 352). Freed slaves were given full political rights as citizens.
In Republican Rome slaves were also used extensively in the silver mines near Cartagena in Spain, 40,000 being reported as being employed there at one time. Slaves also provided labour on the growing agricultural estates of the Roman aristocracy, made wealthy by the fortunes of empire. Imperial wars put large numbers of slaves onto the market, through the enslavement of prisoners of war and defeated peoples, and the offspring of these slaves continued the supply into later periods (Jones 1956: 1-15). Transportation, in the case of both Greece and Rome, was from the edges of empire to the centre, the opposite to the later pattern established for convict transportation.

In ancient Rome all servants were slaves, and households had many of them, even relatively humble households often having one or two slaves. Sometimes the situation of the slave was confusing, as in the case of Roman naval fleets where the ship captains were imperial slaves, and the Admirals imperial freedmen, while common sailors were free men. Similarly there were cases where a bailiff or estate manager was a slave while the tenant workers were free. This has been explained as a result of the Roman concepts of freedom, wherein free men were unwilling to act in positions where they had to obey the orders of an employer (Jones 1956: 1-15).

Slavery was common in Europe during the post-classical and medieval periods. In Germany up to 400 AD, slaves were largely used as an agricultural and pastoral workforce. They worked land on which they lived, giving the owner a set amount of produce at set intervals, but appear to have been able to accumulate excess produce for their own benefit. They were, however, still slaves rather than serfs, the master still being able to punish, sell or kill them with impunity, and the slave was inherited by the next of kin on death of the master. Slaves came mainly from outside Germany, either as prisoners resulting from direct warfare, or via traders dealing in the war-captures of others further away (Thompson 1957: 191-203).

The British Celtic tribes supplied slaves to the Roman world, but there is no evidence that slavery existed there before the market demands of the classical world reached the island. However, slavery existed in Anglo-Saxon Britain, and there were other degrees of bondage, which, while not complying with the definition of 'slavery', still meant that individuals were not free in the modern sense. Between 1066 and 1307 "by far the greater number of people living in rural England were personally unfree, people generally described throughout the middle ages as villeins" (Stenton 1965: 138). The social status of the villeins was so low in the early part of that period that they were described as 'slaves' in the Domesday Book (1086). However, with the increasing control of the crown and the law, slaves had become partially-free 'villeins' by the thirteenth century. One reason given for this change from slave to villein status was that, in the climate of increasingly centralised power and the rule of law, the master was totally responsible for the slave's actions (and crimes), whereas the villein, with partial freedoms, was responsible in law for his own actions (Stenton 1965).

While these early examples of slavery are of interest in the broader picture of forced labour, it was the African slave trade that came to be the largest experience of slavery in world history.

The African slave trade was initially controlled largely by the Portuguese and the Dutch. Portugal financed its maritime-based imperial expansion down the west coast of Africa from about 1442 through slavery. Slaves were initially obtained by raiding undefended villages in the Canary Islands, the Sahara littoral and in the Senegal region, then by trade with African chiefs and traders. The trade was initially conducted from ships, but this was soon supplemented by the establishment of 'factories' or trading posts ashore, commencing with that at Argium in 1445, reinforced with a castle 10 years later. This was the start of a chain of fortified factories established along the African and Asian coasts as far as the Moluccas (Boxer 1977: 24-25). Something like 150,000 African slaves were probably secured by the Portuguese between 1450 and 1500 (Boxer 1977:
31). These slaves were sold in Lisbon, or used in the Portuguese colonies. The first shipload of slaves to the Americas was in 1502, when slaves were delivered to Hispaniola, the start of a trade from West Africa which continued for 386 years (Dow 1970: 1).

By the early 18th century the slave trade from West Africa was largely to the tobacco and sugar plantations and mines of Brazil, with some 16,000 to 19,000 slaves annually coming from Whydah and Angola. The main trade item exchanged for slaves was third grade Brazilian tobacco (Boxer 1977: 171).

The Dutch came to dominate the African slave trade, briefly, in the mid-seventeenth century. Initially, the British largely relied on the Dutch trade. Between 1640, when the British commenced sugar cultivation in Barbados, and 1651, the slave population there increased from 1,000 to 20,000, mainly supplied by the Dutch. Slaves were also in demand in the British North American colonial plantations. The Barbados slave population had doubled again by 1673, but by now the slaves were African slaves re-exported from British Jamaica. Jamaica replaced Dutch Curacao as the entrepot for the importation of African slaves, and the prosperity of Liverpool and Bristol during the next century and a half was based on the slave trade (Hill 1969: 140-2).

Britain was involved in the slave trade from an early date, Sir John Hawkins transporting slaves from Guinea to America in 1562 (Dow 1970: 3). The importation of African slaves into Britain commenced soon after. In 1664 Britain seized the Dutch stations on the West African coast and hence broke the Dutch monopoly on the slave trade, and held possession of two of the stations when peace was reached (Hill 1969: 185). Britain seized New York from the Dutch in the same year, and retained it after the peace, excluding the Dutch from the North American trade. One of the British African stations in Ghana, Cape Coast Castle, became the location for an aborted convict settlement in the late eighteenth century.

The war of 1702-13 between Britain and France and Spain ended in the Treaty of Utrecht, by which Britain acquired, among other things, Fort James in Senegambia, and the monopoly over the supply of slaves to Spanish America (Hill 1969: 225). However, all the European powers retained their involvement in the trade, there being no fewer than forty forts and factories on the west African coast in 1790; fourteen British, fifteen Dutch, four Portuguese, four Danish and three French (Dow 1970: 4-5).

Spain relied to some degree on North African slaves to man its Mediterranean galley fleet. Slaves worked beside convicts, and often held positions assisting the officials within the administration system and on the galleys. Some slaves were sold for labour in the mines at Almaden in Spain. Slave numbers peaked at the galleys in Cartagena at 1,260 in 1763, then rapidly decreased as treaties were struck with North African states. A treaty with Morocco in 1766 resulted in 800 Moroccan slaves being freed, and 1,248 Algerians were freed under a treaty in the following year. By the 1780s only a small number of Turks and Algerians remained as slaves at Cartagena. Penal servitude increased to take the place of the reducing number of slaves (Pike 1983: 69).

Pressure for the abolition of slavery on humanitarian grounds mounted in the eighteenth century. Slavery was abolished in England itself in 1772. The slave trade in the British colonies (and in the USA) was abolished in 1807, but slavery as an institution was not abolished throughout the British Empire until 1833. Emancipation of slaves was completed in Portugal itself in 1773, but the slave trade in the Portuguese colonies was not abolished until 1830 (Boxer 1977: 265-6; Dow 1970: 14). Denmark abolished its slave trade in 1812, Holland in 1814, France in 1818, and Spain in 1820, though full emancipation in their colonies occurred after those dates. Slavery was not abolished in Brazil until 1888 (Dow 1970: 14).
Cuban ships operated on what is now the Liberian coast in the early 19th century, and between 1822 and 1839 transported an estimated 5,000 slaves annually to Cuba, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Georgia and Brazil. The slave factories along the Sierra Leone and Liberian coasts were all destroyed by the abolitionist countries by 1847, but the trade was continued from inland bases (Dow 1970: 16-17).

Slavery was not restricted to Europe and Africa. The extent of slavery in south east Asia is described by Steinberg:

'In the eighteenth century, slavery was practiced through most of South-east Asia. There were hereditary, nonhereditary, temporary and permanent slaves. Hereditary, nonredeemable slaves were usually descended from war captives, criminals, or traitors, or were the result of slave raids into the highlands. In the archipelago, both Christian and Muslim law forbade the enslavement of believers. Since, however, it allowed that of infidels, there were some Muslim slaves in the Philippines, Christian slaves from the Biscayas over wide areas of the archipelago, and animist slaves in almost all of the state societies of the islands, including the Dutch in Indonesia. In Burma, Cambodia, and peninsular Siam, there were monastery slaves who lived in villages as ordinary peasants and devoted the produce of their assigned lands to the upkeep of Buddhist monastic establishments. In Vietnam, those who entered slavery as punishment for crimes were often sent to military camps in frontier areas to open up new lands for cultivation. They could become peasant farmers on the land they worked when their sentences as labor slaves expired. Apart from ordinary slaves in Java, there were a number of slaves outcaste communities serving the state in special functions like rope-twisting and maintaining harbour fire beacons. Usually they were outsiders by origin or had fallen by their actions from positions of respect. These people, few in number, were never extensively employed outside personal household service for the elite.' (Steinberg 1985: 15)

Debt bondage was much more common than outright slavery in the late 18th century in Siam, Burma and perhaps Malaya. Where a debt could not be repaid in the due time, the borrower and his dependents were bondsmen until the debt was cleared. This meant working for the creditor at no wage, so repayment of debt was hard, and many were bonded for life (Steinberg 1985: 16).

Raffles, during his governorship of Java, made efforts to try to limit slavery in the Indonesian archipelago, knowing that at the time it was too firmly entrenched to totally abolish. He imposed a tax of the keeping of slaves in 1812, forbid the importation of slaves into Java in 1813, later outlawing it throughout the archipelago. He also abolished the practice of debt bondage. While slavery was not abolished, Raffles' action greatly reduced the number of slaves. While the Dutch administration later retained Raffles' reforms, it appears not to have strenuously implemented them (Hall 1970: 486, 541). British rule in Malaya and Borneo in the late nineteenth century saw the abolition of slavery in those areas, and Britain was attempting to stop slave raiding in Burma in the 1870s (Hall 1970: 556, 629). The Thai King Rama V in 1874 ended the practice of the children of slaves being born as slaves, and outlawed debt bondage in Thailand (Hall 1970: 672).

2.2 ASSESSMENT—SLAVERY

Between 1492 and 1820 an estimated 8 million African slaves were taken to the plantations of tropical and sub-tropical America. Between 1821 and 1888 a further 2 million African slaves were shipped to American plantations and coastal areas (Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986:3-4).
This provides a context for the comparison of the impact of convict transportation and slavery. Against the 10 million African slaves, the numbers of convicts sent out of Europe would appear to be about 400,000, to which should be added estimates of between 5 and 18 million exiles sent to Siberia, of whom perhaps less than 500,000 were convicts (figures are detailed in Table 2 of the original report, and below for Siberia).

Slavery differed from convict transportation in that it was a commercial trade to supply labour for domestic and colonial industries. It satisfied the first of the themes identified as being of universal significance about convict transportation, and in some situations could be interpreted as satisfying the third theme, in that it furthers the expansion of colonial objectives. It differed from convict transportation in that it was not a system inflicted upon the citizens of the country benefitting from the labour, and was not motivated by any desire to solve internal social problems within those countries. The role of government was much further removed than in the case of convict transportation. Possibly because of those differences slavery effected its victims in numbers that stagger the imagination, and was accompanied by cruelty that was seldom matched in convict transportation.

Slavery is a phenomenon of profound importance to human history, and deserves to be studied globally in terms of its world heritage manifestations. However, it is sufficiently distinct from convict transportation to be studied in its own right, and should not be artificially grouped with convict transportation, or indentured labour, in the world heritage assessment context.

2.3 CONTRACT LABOUR IN THE CONTEXT OF FORCED MIGRATION

Contract, or indentured labour had one characteristic that distinguished it from slavery and convict transportation: it was usually voluntary, and in the overwhelming proportion of cases was for a fixed period of time. In the cases where it was not voluntary but coerced, it could be seen as a form of semi-slavery. To the extent that it was voluntary, which seems to have been the most common condition, contract labour should not be classified as forced migration. It has been argued that it is the social experiences intrinsic in the two states, rather than the legal argument, that distinguishes slave and servant (or in the context of this report, a contract labourer), and for many contract workers, and especially for convicts (transported to the Americas as contract labourers), their actual experience as labourers was, for the contracted period, little removed from that of slaves (Beckles 1989:7-8).

Most contract labour from Europe to the new world was very largely a matter of voluntary choice, and to some extent might be seen as a form of 'assisted passage'. In the Americas the European contract labour often preceded slave labour on the plantations.

In the case of contract labour originating in Europe, the contract was usually arranged in one of four ways:

1. recruitment in the home village by an employer or agent, with that person organising the legal arrangements for transportation to the destination;

2. recruitment by a merchant who would contract the person, arrange their transportation overseas, then auction the indenture to the future employer upon arrival in the colony;
Table 1: Estimates of number involved in contract labour.
(Engerman 1986:272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from India</td>
<td>to the Caribbean region,</td>
<td>1838-1918</td>
<td>543,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Mauritius and Reunion</td>
<td>1826-1910</td>
<td>538,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Natal and Mombassa</td>
<td>1860-1922</td>
<td>191,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Malaya</td>
<td>1844-1910</td>
<td>249,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Fiji</td>
<td>1878-1917</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,584,700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from China</td>
<td>to the Caribbean region</td>
<td>1848-1884</td>
<td>142,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(124,800 to Cuba)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Peru</td>
<td>1849-1874</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1865-1899</td>
<td>33,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Transvaal</td>
<td>1904-1907</td>
<td>63,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>329,900</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Japan</td>
<td>to Hawaii</td>
<td>1868-1899</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Peru</td>
<td>1898-1923</td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Java</td>
<td>to Surinam</td>
<td>1890-1904</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Portuguese Islands (Azores, Canaries)</td>
<td>to Hawaii</td>
<td>1878-1899</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to British Guaina and West Indies</td>
<td>1835-1881</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Pacific Islands</td>
<td>to Australia</td>
<td>1863-1904</td>
<td>61,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to elsewhere in Pacific</td>
<td>1863-1914</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Peru</td>
<td>1862-1863</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>104,700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Africa</td>
<td>to Caribbean region</td>
<td>1834-1867</td>
<td>57,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Reunion</td>
<td>1848-1861</td>
<td>34,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>92,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Angola</td>
<td>to Sao Tome &amp; Principe</td>
<td>1876-1915</td>
<td>96,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,374,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL
(3) sale by the government of political prisoners, convicts or 'undesirables', such as vagabonds, to merchants who arranged their transportation overseas, and the subsequent sale of their indentures to colonists once in the colony; and

(4) individuals paying their own passage to the colony, and indenturing themselves on arrival. (Beckles 1989:2)

In the case of Asian, African and Pacific Islander contract labour, the degree of free will in the initial contract was sometimes minimal or totally lacking, being more akin to slavery or the forced indenturing of convicts. The 'contract' in these cases might be forced by raiding European agents, or by tribal or familial obligation or force.

Since the advent of the modern era (for the purposes of this discussion, since the 16th century) slave and contract labour have been used to make possible labour-intensive projects, in locations where the free labour market was either of insufficient size or would have demanded exorbitantly high wages. Convict transportation seems to have shared that motivation in only a few cases—it was more often linked to issues of law and order, political control and population control in European metropolitan areas, and to the colonial aspirations of European states.

By far the greatest trade in contract labour was from India, South-East Asia, China and the Pacific. Chinese and Indian contract workers to a large extent solved the labour shortage on the plantations in the Caribbean, South America and islands of Reunion and Mauritius in the Indian Ocean resulting from the cessation of the slave trade and subsequently the emancipation of slaves (Van Den Boorgaart & Emmer 1986:8-9).

The other main markets for contract labour from China and India were the plantation economies established by European powers on the rim of both the Pacific and Indian Oceans. The expansion in these areas coincided with the moves in Europe and the Atlantic rim to abolish slavery, and the reliance on contract labour to provide the large number of workers required for the new plantations might be explained as a more morally acceptable and cost effective replacement for slavery (Engerman 1986: 265).

The contract labour trade involved many nationalities and many destinations. From South East Asia and the Pacific alone the trade was complex: Javanese went to Sumatra, Malacca and Surinam; North Vietnamese to Cochinchina and New Caledonia and elsewhere in the Pacific; Filipinos, Chinese and Japanese to Hawaii, Guam, Peru, South Africa and continental USA; Melanesians and other Pacific Islanders to Australia, Fiji and Peru; Chinese, Malays and Javanese to Mauritius and Reunion Islands and South Africa. (Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986: 4-5; Steinberg 1985: 242, Scarr 1984). Paralleling the formal contract labour from India and China, there was also a substantial free emigration from those countries into South-East Asia and the Pacific / Indian Ocean rim countries.

Engerman's estimates the numbers involved in non-European contract labour in the nineteenth and twentieth century are shown in Table 1. Engerman's figures do not include some of the movements listed above, but they are a useful attempt to quantify the scale of the contract labour movement. These estimates show the non-European contract labour trade to have involved over 2.3 million people, of whom over 1.5 million were Indians.

The following descriptions of the trade concentrate on the Australian-Pacific region.

Fiji attracted labour from the Pacific Islands and further afield. Pacific Islanders from Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu, Kiribati, and 4,000 labourers from Melanesia arrived there before 1875. A further 23,000 Melanesians were imported to the plantation between 1877 and the cessation of recruitment in 1911 (Scarr 1984: 78; Scarr 1990: 172). Most of the Melanesian workers were returned to their homes at the end of their contracts.
Indian indentured labour was imported to Fiji from 1879, and 60,969 arrived before the indenture system was abolished by the Indian government in 1916. The recruitment of Indian labourers was arranged by agents licensed by the Indian Government, operating through depots in Calcutta, and after 1900 also in Madras (Scarr 1984: 79-81). Labour was contracted to the employer for five years, in return for the 23 pounds passage money (a third of it paid by the Fijian government) and up to one shilling a day to the labourer for a 50 hour week. Free return passage was available after 10 years, that is five years after the indenture expired. 40,000, or 60% of the contract labourers, chose to stay in Fiji (Scarr 1984: 96-98). The indenture laws were heavily weighted in favour of the employer, and labour conditions were harsh but, apparently, more desirable than returning to India.

In Malaysia, Indian indentured labourers began to arrive in large numbers in 1883 (though some contract labour had gone to Malaya from as early as 1844), and their number increased immensely as the rubber industry developed in the first decade of the twentieth century. The indentures were from three to five years, with the option of staying on when the contract had expired. The older indentured system, in which recruitment agents worked on behalf of specific growers, was replaced by a government-organised recruitment pool established in Madras in 1907, funded by contributions from Malayan growers, and recruiting workers who could work on any plantation. The success of the new recruitment system led to the abolition of the indenture system in 1910 on the insistence of the government of India. The Federated Malay States set up a labour department in 1912 to oversee labour conditions for Indian and Chinese workers, and minimum standards were established for housing and health (Turnbull 1989:176). It is estimated that nearly a quarter of a million Indians reached Malaya as contract labourers over the period (see Table 1).

It has been observed by Dorothy Shineberg that the origins of Australian recruitment of Melanesian labourers was directly linked to the practice of hiring Islanders in the sandalwood trade, both as gatherers and processors of the timber, and as crews of the ships trading among the islands. Ben Boyd's first venture in Melanesian contract labour in 1847 was guided by a sandalwooder, and the ship first recruiting for the Queensland trade in 1863 was manned by Islanders experienced in the sandalwood trade and the recruitment of Islanders for it. Shineberg concludes that contract labour for Europeans was a thing already familiar to many inhabitants of the sandalwood islands long before the labour trade to Queensland and Fiji commenced (Shineberg 1967:193).

Benjamin Boyd was the first to bring indentured Pacific Islander labour to Australia. His ship Velocity, under the command of Captain Kirropp, brought 65 Melanesians from Lifu in the Loyalty Islands and Tana and Anetitum in the New Hebrides to his base at Twofold Bay in 1847. They had marked ('signed') contracts for five year's service to Boyd in either his maritime or pastoral enterprises, in return for rations and 26 shillings per year. A second shipload of 54 men and three women Islanders was brought in by Boyd later in the year. However, local concern at the plight of the Islanders led the government to act to disallow the indentures, and the Islanders gravitated back to Sydney. There was no formal attempt to repatriate the Islanders, some dying in Australia, others taking work in the shipping industry to try to return home, and some being taken back, though not necessarily to their own islands, by the French ship Arche d'Alliance (Diamond 1988: 126-40).

The Islanders recruited for the Queensland cane fields came from the New Hebrides (now Vanuatu) and Solomon Islands. Over 60,000 Islanders were brought to Queensland over a period of forty years, until the trade was ended in 1904. The first year of the Queensland trade coincided with a recruitment raid through the Pacific by ships bringing purportedly 'freely-recruited' Islanders to Peru. Approximately 3,500 Islanders were removed from their islands to Peruvian cotton and rice plantations in a
six-month period in 1862-63. All but a few hundred died before they could be returned to their islands following international diplomatic lobbying (Maude 1981).

In the first period of the Queensland trade from 1863 to 1875, when 10,500 Islanders were recruited, there is considerable evidence that recruitment was mostly by illegal methods, usually kidnap. In the following decade Government regulations tightened the trade, and most of the 24,000 Islanders brought to Queensland were legally recruited for three year periods. Government agents were appointed to ensure that the recruits understood what they were contracting for, but it is clear that this was not always achieved. In the following two decades to 1904, a further 26,000 Islanders came to Queensland, many of them second or third time recruits, and increasingly the Islanders understood the contract and sought the opportunity to travel to Australia (Moore 1979: 12, 18-19).

After the passing of the Pacific Islander Labourers Act of 1901, the majority of Pacific Islanders not already repatriated from Queensland were returned to the islands, a task completed by 1907. About 2,000 were allowed to stay in Australia due to long-term residence or having established families here, and these are represented by about 10,000 descendants today (Moore 1979: 44).

While Queensland and Fiji were the largest employers of Pacific Islander labour, others were also involved. Several thousand New Hebrideans and somewhat less than a thousand Solomon Islanders were taken to New Caledonia, some 2,000 Solomon Islanders went to Samoa, and 550 New Hebrideans were taken to Hawaii (Howe 1984: 329). The pattern of labour recruitment in the Pacific is documented more fully by Scarr (1990: 172-184) and Howe (1984: 328-343). In all some 100,000 Melanesian people were involved in the labour trade. The trade cannot be categorised as simply 'kidnapping', because to do so, as Corris says, would be to believe that two generations of Islanders "were so witless as to stand about on their beaches year after year and allow themselves to be kidnapped by a handful of Europeans and their henchmen. The 'blackbirding' interpretation...denies more than 100,000 Melanesians their humanity" (Corris quoted in Howe 1984: 338).

2.4 ASSESSMENT OF CONTRACT LABOUR

As indicated at the start of this section, contract labour can only be seen as forced migration when it was the result of coercion rather than the voluntary decisions of those contracted. There is little evidence that, for the majority of the labourers, the contract was not voluntary. Even in the case of the Pacific Islanders, while early recruitment was certainly based on kidnapping and lack of knowledge of consequences, in the later period Islanders volunteered their services, many more than once. In the case of Africa, where the slavery infrastructure and mentality was strong, there appears to have been continued coercion, but as shown in Table 1, Africa only accounted for a small proportion of the international contract labour movement.

In the case of the countries contributing the largest numbers of contract labourers, India and China (making up 80% of the international movement), the period of contract labour also saw large-scale free migration from those countries to the same destinations as the contract labourers (among others). Probably for most individuals contracting out their labour was seen as a means to an end—escaping social and economic conditions at home, and looking forward to the prospect of at least an improved economic situation in the new land. The fact that so many declined the opportunity to return to their homes at the end of their contracts would suggest satisfaction with the new country and the lifestyle there, or at least that the new situation was no worse than that left behind.

Even though contracts may have been voluntary, the potential and real abuses of the contract labour system led to pressure in England and the USA, which succeeded in
ending Chinese overseas contract labour in 1874 (mainly following their employment in Cuba, which still employed slave labour). At the same time Indian contract migration was extensively legal regulation, and was in turn abolished in 1916 (Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986:8-9).

Given the probably overwhelming extent to which the choice of contract labour was freely taken, it is concluded that contract labour should not be considered as part of the analysis of forced migration, and is hence not directly relevant to the analysis of convict transportation as a theme of World Heritage significance.

2.5 CONVICT LABOUR IN CONTEXT

Convict transportation has to be seen in the wider context of migrant labour. The statistics for forced migration of labour are not comprehensive, and as a result the date ranges referred to in this section relate to data-availability, rather than to periods specifically relevant to this study. Between 1492 and 1820 an estimated 8 million African slaves were taken to the plantations of tropical and sub-tropical America. Of the 2 million European migrants to the same region over the same period, 25% to 30% were bonded labour of some sort (including convicts), or some 500,000-650,000 people. Between 1821 and 1920 a further 2 million African Slaves, and rather less than 1 million Asian contract workers were shipped to American plantations and coastal areas, while 41 million Europeans, the vast majority of whom were free workers, went to independent republics in the Americas (33 million to the USA). (Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986:3-4). Of the total European migration to the Americas (43 million), perhaps 100,000-150,000 were convicts.

In comparison, in the period before 1820 there was relatively little European migration into Africa and Asia. Of the 995,000 taking passage with the Dutch East India Company between 1602 and 1795, 379,000 returned. The net joint Portuguese, Dutch, English and French outflow to Africa and Asia from 1500 to 1821 is estimated at 2 million people, paralleling that to the Americas in the same period. The flow of Asian and African slaves to the Cape Colony (South Africa) and other trading posts is estimated at 100,000 people. (Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986:3-4)

Estimates for migration flows between 1800 and 1920 suggest:

- approximately 1 million people departing from Europe to Africa
- 255,000 contract workers from the British East Indies and China to South Africa
- 539,000 contract workers from the British East Indies and China to Mauritius and Réunion.
- 2-3 million Europeans migrating to south Asiatic and Pacific colonies
- 500,000 Asiatic and Pacific contract workers from the Pacific to Australia, from the British East Indies to Malacca, from China and Japan to Hawaii and other countries

(Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986:4-5)

Against the 10 million African slaves brought to America before the the trade was outlawed by Britain and the USA, and gradually dried up from the early-nineteenth century, there were roughly 2 million contract workers originating from three continents with three continents as destination. (Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986:4) This does not take into account Russian migration to Siberia, which involved an
estimated 2 million forced migrants between 1820 and 1920, and by some estimates 7-12 million people between the 1920s and 1940s (Dallin 1947:86).

This provides a context for the impact of convict transportation. While the numbers involved in the transportation of convicts by Spain from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries are hard to estimate (though it certainly was in the tens of thousands), the following is an estimate of the numbers of convicts transported by all European countries to particular regions of the world (figures are detailed in Table 2):

Convicts to:

- Australia 162,000
- the Americas, Caribbean and Atlantic colonies 100,000-150,000
- South-East Asia and the Pacific 75,000
- Africa 6,000
- Siberia 2,000,000 (to 1920)
  7-12,000,000 (post 1920)
  (includes exiles and their families)

The interaction between slavery and contract labour is a subject of some historical research. In some colonies slavery was replaced by contract labour, and subsequently replaced again by slavery. In other colonies different patterns emerged, but there is a very common history of the use of both types of labour, in some cases at the same time, in working plantation economies. In the Americas convict labour was often replaced by slave and indentured labour, while in Asia and the Pacific the pattern is one of convicts being replaced by free or indentured labour. In both regions indentured labour was used from the mid-nineteenth century onwards to open up new areas for exploitation which had not earlier experienced slavery or the various forms of convict and contract labour. (see Van Den Boogaart & Emmer 1986; Engerman 1986)

Table 2 summarises the global convict history, and Table 3 indicates a comparative timeframe for that history.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Numbers Sent</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1788-1840</td>
<td>Shaw 1966; Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Dieman's Land</td>
<td>67-69,000</td>
<td>1801-1852</td>
<td>Shaw 1966; Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1846-50</td>
<td>Shaw 1966; Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>1850-1868</td>
<td>Shaw 1966; Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>161,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1824-1863</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1842-1875</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>American Colonies</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1640-1776</td>
<td>Smith 1947, Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Virginia, Maryland,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Carribean Colonies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1640-1700</td>
<td>Smith 1947; Beckles 1989: 56-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Barbados, Jamaica, Nevis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>West Africa (Cape Coast Castle)</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>1755-1776</td>
<td>Shaw 1977; Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Sumatra (Bencoolen)</td>
<td>4,000-6,000</td>
<td>1787-1823</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30, Majumdar 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Straits Settlements</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1788-1860</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30, Majumdar 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Singapore, Penang, Malacca)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td></td>
<td>1815-1837</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India and Burma</td>
<td>Andaman Islands (Port Blair)</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>1789-96,</td>
<td>Majumdar 1975:52, Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(270 in 1789-96), 1858-1920, 1930-1945 at any one time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Nicobar Islands (Nancowry Harbour)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1869-1888</td>
<td>Majumdar 1975:104, Nicholas 1988:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Burma (Arrakan, Tennaserim, Moulmein)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1826-?</td>
<td>Majumdar 1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Global Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Numbers Sent</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Straits Settlements</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1847-1856</td>
<td>Turnbull 1972: 47, Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Malacca</td>
<td>1,000-1,500</td>
<td>1849-1873</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>4-5,000</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>Forster 1991:147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Morocco and Algeria</td>
<td>c.1,500 p.a. (galleys), 3,000+ p.a. (presidios)</td>
<td>16thC-1748</td>
<td>Pike 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>American Colonies</td>
<td>2,000+ p.a. after 1767</td>
<td>16thC-19thC</td>
<td>Pike 1983 esp 1766-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>Siberia</td>
<td>2,000,000+</td>
<td>1820-1920</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988:30, Obolensky-Ossinsky 1931:556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Global timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1650</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Morocco and Algeria (Galleys and Presidios)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish American Colonies (Havana, San Juan (Costa Rica), Pensacola, New Orleans, Piedras Negros (Mexico), Veracruz, Mexico City, Acapulco)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British American Colonies (Virginia, Maryland, South Carolina, Pennsylvania)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Carribean Colonies (Barbados, Jamaica, Nevis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British West Africa (Cape Coast Castle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatra (Indian Colony)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (Britain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straits Settlements (India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andamans (India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Guiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius (India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda (Britain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar (Britain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia (France)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicobar Islands (India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the movement of slaves and processes of banishment had existed in antiquity, punishment of criminals was usually by corporal punishment, fines, recruitment to the armed forces, or sentences to slavery. In European countries prior to the sixteenth century a similar pattern of treatment of criminals prevailed. From the sixteenth century onwards the populations of many European countries commenced to increase at an accelerated rate, with developments in both agricultural and industrial technology progressively increasing the supply of food and goods to support more people, and requiring more people in order to exploit the new technologies. The population of Europe has been estimated to have increased from 95 million in 1600 to 130 million by 1700. This rate of increase was stimulated even further by the Industrial Revolution.

In this climate of increasing population the control of law and order and the punishment of criminals almost became industries in their own right. The old methods of dealing with criminals in a relatively small and stable population with little excess wealth were not satisfactory in a world with booming numbers of people and economies which led to the development of an urban under-class in which criminal activity was increasingly prevalent. Large-scale wars, which became common in this period, created periods of almost full employment because of the need for soldiers and for workers to provide the supplies the armies required. These frequent periods of war were interspersed with usually short periods of peace, which saw rapid reductions in the size of armies and dramatic reductions in the amount of supplies they needed. This created periods of high unemployment, during which many of the unemployed resorted to crime and brigandry to make ends meet. Prisons, which had previously scarcely existed, became a common feature of government control. Overcrowded prisons, and the potential of using the manpower they contained, lead to increasing use of convicts on public works, often directed towards preparing the country for the next inevitable war. This led in turn to the use of convicts as a recruitment pool when war resumed, and their sentencing to other forms of labour which took them away from the home country, such as providing crews for the galleys which maintained the essential seaways of many Mediterranean countries.

Spain took the next step in this process by sending convicts to its 'Presidios', or military colonies, in North Africa. As the power and wealth of the major European nations increased, colonial expansion became a common way of extending that power and maintaining that wealth. The use of convicts as the labour force for such expansion was a natural progression from their use for domestic public works and military duties. Britain sent many of her convicts to the American colonies as forced indentured labour, then to Australia. Spain sent hers to the Carribean and Mexico. Russia sent hers to Siberia to tap the natural wealth of that under-populated extremity of her empire, and France, the late-starter in the transportation game, sent hers to South America and the Pacific.

In the following descriptions of convict transportation, reference is made to what little information has been located describing buildings and sites associated with convicts. Generally, this information is too restricted to enable meaningful comparison with Australian places.

3.1 BRITISH CONVICT TRANSPORTATION

3.1.1 NORTH AMERICA
The first coherent argument for the transportation of convicts for the purpose of developing the British colonies of the New World was in 1611, when Governor Dale of Virginia wrote to Secretary Salisbury "on account of the difficulty of procuring men in so short a time ... all offenders out of the common gaols should be sent for three years to the colony ... as indentured servants." (Beckles 1989:56)

As a result of the American pressure, James I ruled in 1614 that judges could 'recommend' transportation to petty criminals, in lieu of capital punishment. As a result convicts started to be sent in small numbers to the American colonies, and in 1615 a party of convicts was transported to the East Indies. However, relatively few were transported before 1640, and after that date it was usually limited to political prisoners, mostly sent to Virginia, with some going to Barbados and Jamaica. Until 1718 the operation of the Habeas Corpus Act, which forbade banishment or transportation as a penalty, meant that transportation was a 'voluntary' choice of the convicted, in return for commutation of their sentence. Under this system from 1661 to 1700 about 4,500 convicts were sent to the American (and Carribean) colonies, mostly on seven year terms of indenture. (Smith 1947:91-98; Beckles 1989:56-7)

Convicts were supplied to merchants trading to the plantations as indentured labour, the merchants providing the transportation and upkeep of the convicts until they were sold by them as indentured labour to colonists in the Americas. Most convicts were used as labour on the plantations in Virginia, with a small number going to Maryland before that colony excluded them in 1676.

With the end of the wars with France in 1713 the problem of overcrowding of British gaols increased, as forced recruitment of criminals into the army and navy, a common remedy in times of war, could no longer be used. By this time Virginia had followed Maryland in refusing further convicts (Smith 1961). A new Act was passed in 1717 which had precedence over the Habeas Corpus Act and which became the cornerstone of transportation throughout the century. It allowed direct sentencing to transportation for 7 to 14 years, and it overrode Virginia and Maryland's objections to receiving convicts. The new system was still based on private sector implementation, with merchants being paid per head to transport and dispose of convicts as bonded labour in the Americas. In periods of high demand for labour, such as between 1772 and 1775, government payment to merchants was dropped. (Smith 1947:110-115)

Between 1719 and 1772 approximately 30,000 convicts were transported from Britain, 17,740 of them being from the Home Counties and Newgate Prison. An additional 10,000 felons and vagabonds were transported from Ireland during the century. It is estimated that 70% of all those tried and sentenced at the Old Bailey went to America. Nearly all transported convicts went to Virginia and Maryland, with a few to South Carolina, Nevis (Leeward Islands), Barbados, Pennsylvania and Jamaica. (Smith 1947:116-118,134)

While the American War of Independence stopped the large-scale transportation of convicts from Britain, there were a few isolated cases of convicts being sent there as indentured labour after 1775. In 1783 a shipload of 150 convicts bound for Nova Scotia mutinied in the Channel, and 40 escaped. The remaining convicts were disposed of in Baltimore. In 1784 a further 185 convicts left Britain on the Mercury, bound for Baltimore. They mutinied in the Channel again, and 100 escaped at Torbay. The remainder were taken on to Baltimore, where entry was refused, and the ship travelled on to Honduras, where again the convicts were refused. (Frost 1994: 18-19).

Because transportation to the Americas was based on an indentured labour system, the convicts were subject to the normal colonial civil law system. Hence there appears to have been no separate convict establishment infrastructure, and no buildings erected specifically for convict administration, unlike the situation in Australia.
3.1.2 BERMUDA

Convict transportation followed earlier slave labour in 1824, the convicts to work on the fortified naval depot. This work was triggered by the War of 1812. Convicts worked under free skilled tradesmen and overseers, and were guarded by 400 Royal Marines.

Hulks were used as accommodation until a barrack was built ashore. Hulks and barracks housed between them up to 1,400 convicts at any one time. A total of about 9,000 convicts were sent to Bermuda before transportation was abolished in 1863. Convicts sent to Bermuda were repatriated to Britain when their sentences had expired, except for 462 sent from Bermuda and Gibraltar to Australia in 1848, for assignment after part of their sentence had been served. About 200 convicts remaining under sentence were transferred from Bermuda to Western Australia when the Bermuda penal establishment was closed in 1863. (Shaw 1966; Nicholas 1988:31)

3.1.3 BARBADOS

From 1661 to 1700 about 4,500 convicts were sent to the mainland American colonies and Barbados, most on seven year terms of indenture. The exact proportion entering Barbados has not been identified, but it must have been considerable in comparison with the free population, given the apparent impact it had on the colony. In total, Barbados is said to have received about 4,000 convicts by the early 19th century. (Smith 1947:91-98; Beckles 1989:56-8).

3.1.4 GIBRALTAR

Convicts were transported to carry out fortification works at Gibraltar from 1842-1875. They worked on the construction of breakwaters and forts. 9,000 convicts were sent during the period, with about 1,000 being based there at any one time. Convicts were returned to Britain after the completion of their sentences, except for a number sent to Australia for assignment in 1848.

(Shaw 1966; Nicholas 1988:31-2)

3.1.5 HONDURAS

In 1784 a shipment of 185 convicts was sent to Baltimore (USA), where another shipment had been sent in 1783. However, the convicts mutinied and set ashore in Torbay, where 100 escaped. The remainder (84) were taken to Baltimore as planned, but the ship was refused entry, and sailed on to Honduras. The Honduran authorities also seem to have rejected the shipment, the ultimate fate of which is not known. (Frost 1994:19; Martin 1975).

3.1.6 NEWFOUNDLAND

A shipment of convicts was sent to Newfoundland under the indentured system in 1789, where they were received with much controversy. (Martin 1975).

3.1.7 GHANA
Between 1755 and 1776 some 746 convicts were sent to Cape Coast Castle in what is now Ghana. Despite high mortality rates, other West African locations were suggested as convict settlements before the final decision was made to establish the convict colony in New South Wales. Though its history as a convict colony was of short duration, Cape Coast Castle remained the headquarters of British colonial administration in West Africa until 1876. (Norton 1995; Nicholas 1988:30; Shaw 1966:43).

3.2 INDIAN CONVICT TRANSPORTATION

Indian convict transportation was an extension of the British penal system into the administration of the Raj. Most convicts were Indians found guilty of crimes within India, though the Indian penal settlements were also used to a small degree as destinations for convicts transported from other British colonies in the Asian region.

3.2.1 ANDAMAN ISLANDS - INDIA

Convict transportation to the Andaman Islands can be roughly divided into four periods: those from 1789-96, those from the 1857 mutiny until 1910, those from 1910-21 and those from 1932-37 (based on Sengupta 1994:32).

An Indian colonial penal settlement was established on the Andamans at Port Cornwallis (now Port Blair) in 1789, but this first attempt was abandoned in 1796. 270 convicts and 550 guards and free settlers were involved.

The second settlement of the Andamans commenced in March 1858, following the transfer of administrative control over India from the East India Company to the Crown. The settlement was partly stimulated by a desire to establish government rule over the islands to provide shelter and protection for shipwrecked crews and passengers from the depredations of the native Andamanese. The Indian Mutiny of 1857-58 was another motivation (Kaul 1994:31). The government needed somewhere to imprison mutineers and the communities of the Straits Settlements, which were the existing penal colonies, were reluctant to accept mutineers because of the danger they posed.

Port Cornwallis was renamed Port Blair, and the settlement commenced with 200 Indian convicts and a guard of 50. Convict numbers soon increased to 773, though in the first three months 64 had died of illness and 140 had escaped, of whom 88 were recaptured and executed. Among the early convicts were those who took part in the Indian Mutiny (Majumdar 1975:52-62). Operation of the convict establishment appears to have continued throughout the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century.

The increasing activities of the Indian freedom movement around the turn of the century led the British to develop a policy to separately confine political prisoners away from ordinary convicts. The Andaman Islands provided a solution for the separation of political prisoners and the island penal settlement was only used for them (Kaul 1994:31).

The penal settlement was originally located on Viper Island near Port Blair. Construction of the Cellular Jail, the major convict building in Port Blair itself, began in 1896 and was completed in 1910. It was originally used to house convict Thaggi (or Thuggee) and Dacoits (Kaul 1994:28). After the completion of the Cellular Jail, Viper Island continued as the location of the execution gallows of which red brick ruins remain (Mahadevan 1994:17).

Convicts were employed in local public works, agriculture, boat building and timber felling and milling. In addition they helped run the gaol and other establishments, and
were engaged in construction and sanitation activities (Mahadevan 1994:18 and Sengupta 1994:32).

A workforce of up to 11-15,000 convicts could be housed at any one time during the second settlement period. Figures given by Majumdar (1975:119) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>7,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>11,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>11,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>14,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-6</td>
<td>11,947 (plus 1,168 government employees and a free population of 2,991, Mahadevan 1994:18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Convicts came from all parts of India and Burma, and were mainly under life sentence for murder or other major crime.

From 1910 the Andamans were used increasingly to house political prisoners, and it has developed as a national shrine because of that association with Indian nationalism.

The Cellular Jail is located at Aberdeen in Port Blair. The original building had seven radial wings with a central watch tower (Kaul 1994:28, Mahadevan 1994:18 describes the building as having six wings). It is a brick building, generally three storeyed with a four storey tower. There are arcaded verandahs on one side of each wing with solitary cells leading off the verandahs. In total the gaol had 698 cells, each cell being 4.5 x 2.7 metres and having a high level vent at the back away from the verandah (Kaul 1994:28).

Convicts were divided into two broad categories, labourers and self-supporting convicts. The former undertook skilled and unskilled labour in the settlements while the latter worked in agriculture. The two categories were further sub-divided according to length of sentence. Newly arrived convicts were the fourth class and they were kept in the gaol for the first six months sleeping in solitary cells and working during the day. Good behaviour was rewarded by their promotion to third class. These were enlisted for gangs, allowed to work outside the gaols and slept in barracks (Kaul 1994:31 refers to convicts being transferred to associate gaols for 18 months). They remained in this class for about four and a half years, then promoted to second class (Sengupta 1994:33).

Second class convicts served as minor officials or became domestic servants. They were not paid and lived on rations. After five years of good behaviour, convicts became first class (Sengupta 1994:33). This enabled convicts to obtain a ticket-of-leave. They could seek their own livelihood, own property on the islands, could send for their wife and children or choose a wife from the female convicts (Sengupta 1994:34). Women convicts were treated the same although they were much fewer in number (Kaul 1994:31).

The conditions were apparently harsh with reports of malnutrition, unhygienic conditions, poor medical facilities, hard labour and no outside communication for convicts. There were hunger strikes by convicts in 1912-14 for better conditions. About 1920 the British decided to abandon the penal settlement, send prisoners back to the Indian mainland by 1921 and encourage a self-supporting community of ticket-of-leave convicts (Kaul 1994:31 and Sengupta 1994:34).

Transportation resumed to the islands in 1932 and the number of convicts was about 300 (Sengupta 1994:34, Majumdar 1975:314 indicates that 400 political prisoners were transported to the Andamans in the 1930s). After the 1937 national elections there were further hunger strikes and the political prisoners were withdrawn in 1937-8 following much political agitation in India and Britain (Sengupta 1994:34 and Majumdar
During the Second World War, in 1942, the Japanese took control of the islands and released all prisoners from the gaol. The penal settlement was abolished by the British when they re-occupied the islands in 1945, granting pardons to the remaining convicts and repatriating 2,400 convicts and ex-convicts to India (Majumdar 1975:314, Kaul 1994:31 indicates the penal settlement closed in 1947 with the independence of India).

After 1947, the government demolished four of the wings of the Cellular Jail to make way for a hospital (Kaul 1994:28, Mahadevan 1994:18 attributes the destruction of three wings to an earthquake). Following this it appears two of the remaining wings were used for offices and the third continued in use as a gaol for male and female prisoners. Part of the latter wing was destroyed by an earthquake in 1941. A new tower was constructed in wood. The execution room and an oil press shed survive as part of the gaol (Kaul 1994:28).

In 1979 the gaol was declared a National Monument and now houses a small museum (Mahadevan 1994:18, Kaul 1994:31 indicates only the central tower was declared a protected monument).

3.2.2 Bengkulu - Indonesia

(The following section replaces 3.2.1 Bencoolen, Sumatra, in the original report.)

Bengkulu is located on the west coast of Sumatra and was the first overseas penal settlement for Indian convicts. Bengkulu was originally called York Fort, then Fort or Port Marlborough and later Bencoolen. The British East India Company established the settlement as part of its spice trading activities, in particular for the pepper trade (Bastin 1965:viii). Sir Stamford Raffles, later founder of Singapore, was its Governor in the early nineteenth century.

About 100 Bengal convicts were first sent to Bengkulu in 1797 and more were sent in the early nineteenth century (Bastin 1965:108). It is estimated that between 500 and 900 Indian convicts were maintained at Bengkulu between 1787 and 1824, to provide labour for the development of the colony.

The convicts prepared clove plantations in about 1804 (Bastin 1965:126) and in 1807, coffee and nutmeg plantations were being worked by them (Bastin 1965:129). In 1818-24, about 800 convicts were employed on public works and in the cultivation of spices in the surrounding districts (Bastin 1965:108).

Many, if not most, time-expired convicts remained in Sumatra. When the colony was transferred to Dutch rule under the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 1824, in exchange for Melaka, the remaining convicts were transferred to Pinang and Singapore (Majumdar 1975:47-49; Nicholas 1988:32; Moore & Moore 1969:57-8).

Public works such as a military fort and soldiers barracks appear to survive, but nothing has been located describing the extent to which these were convict built, or describing other convict-related places in Bengkulu.

3.2.3 Nicobar Islands

When the Nicobar Islands passed from Danish to British control in 1869, a new penal settlement was placed there using convicts from the Andamans. This penal settlement, at Nancowry Harbour, continued in operation until 1888. (Majumdar 1975:104; Nicholas 1988:37)
3.2.4 THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS

The government of India decided in 1788 that certain criminals should be transported to the new settlement of Pinang (Penang) (This overview of the Straits Settlements is based largely on Turnbull 1970 with additional information from Sandhu:1968). The first such convicts arrived in 1789 (Turnbull 1970:87, 1790 according to Sandhu 1968:198). In 1793 the Indian Government changed the destination for transported convicts to the Andaman Islands but this changed again in 1796 with the closure of that settlement and the resumption of transportation to Pinang.

A few convicts were sent to Melaka (Malacca) during the British occupation of the Dutch settlement during the Napoleonic Wars. The first group of 100 convicts were sent in 1805 (Turnbull 1972:47 indicates convicts were first sent to Melaka in 1795). Melaka became a regular penal colony for India from 1825 with the permanent transfer to the East India Company. As part of this transfer agreement, the East India Company gave the Dutch the settlement at Bengkulu and the 600 Indian convicts from that settlement were sent to Singapore in 1825.

Pinang, Melaka and Singapore were united in 1826 to form the Straits Settlements and they continued as penal colonies throughout the period of Indian rule. While the Straits Settlements began as commercial ventures for the Company, they later assumed greater significance for India as penal settlements.

While the overwhelming number of convicts sent to the Straits Settlements were Indian, there were groups of Chinese, Ceylonese, Burmese and at least one European convict. Over three quarters of the convicts were serving life terms and the majority were murderers or robbers such as Dacoits and Thuggees. In addition, there were a few political prisoners. Bengalis were the largest group of Indian convicts however, convicts came from many different Indian regions and all castes. In contrast, the majority of free and indentured Indian settlers in the Straits Settlements came from southern India.

Singapore quickly became the major convict centre in the Straits. Singapore needed the convict labour more and it was less easy for Indian convicts to escape into the community compared to Pinang where the free Indian population was larger. In contrast, the importation of Chinese convicts from Hong Kong was opposed in Singapore because of the large free Chinese population and the possible ease of escape. Despite objections, Chinese convicts were imported from 1847 to 1856.

The cheap convict labour was essential to the economy of Singapore in its early years. In 1841 there were about 1,150 Indian convicts in Singapore and by 1845 there were 1,500. The convicts worked on roads and buildings, they were employed as domestic servants and in government offices, and they could earn wages. They enjoyed a large measure of freedom and often worked without guards, in part because the settlements could not afford guards. The convicts were under the control of the military engineers in each settlement. Long-term and well behaved convicts were put in charge of other convicts.

The convicts were divided into six classes. The sixth class comprised invalids, old men and most women convicts. The fifth class comprised violent prisoners and those denoted from other classes, it was a punishment class for those requiring close supervision. Most convicts began in the fourth class and worked in light irons. With good behaviour they were promoted to third class, were allowed to work outside prison without irons and received a small wage. Again with good behaviour, convicts were promoted to the second class and allowed to work as minor officers in government departments. Upon reaching the first class, convicts could earn a ticket-of-leave and
live and work in the community. The only conditions were they needed someone to stand surety for their good behaviour and to report to authorities every month.

The convicts were housed in special prisons, known as convict lines, which were initially temporary long wooden and thatch sheds. Later these were replaced with masonry buildings surrounded by high brick walls. The prisons included dormitories, hospitals, cooking places for the different castes and a separate ward for women convicts. The largest prison was in Singapore.

The convict system came to be regarded with some pride as it was said to be more advanced and enlightened than in Britain or the rest of the Empire. Convicts were trained both as a means of increasing the usefulness of their labour but also to provide them with a means of earning their living after release. Women convicts seem not to have been imprisoned for long given the encouragement of authorities to have them marry and move out into society under the care of a husband.

Up until the early 1830s most convicts who finished their sentences were repatriated to India at government expense. When the government stopped paying for repatriation the number of ex-convicts returning to India decreased significantly. Accordingly most settled in the Straits Settlements. However, after 1859 the Indian Government agreed to pay for the repatriation of undesirable ex-convicts.

The convicts seem largely to have been very well behaved and this no doubt encouraged authorities to trust them to undertake a broad range of work under minimal supervision.

From about the 1850s, the presence of convicts in the Straits Settlements became a source of grievance by the free settlers against the East India Company and the government in India. This was one of many grievances although it proved to be a vital concern which arose because of fear about the large body of virtually unguarded convicts in a community without adequate defences.

**Table 5.1 Number of Indian Convicts in the Straits Settlements, 1810-73 (Sandhu 1968:203)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pinang</th>
<th>Melaka</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>3,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>4,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>3,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the Indian Mutiny of 1857, the Indian Government began to send convicted mutineers to the Straits Settlements along with other dangerous criminals to provide space in Indian gaols. This provoked great concern amongst the Settlements and there were calls for a total end to transportation. The Government of India decided to reopen the Andaman Islands as a penal settlement for mutineers and dangerous criminals, and by 1858 this was the destination for all mutineers. Despite the concerns about convicts, labour continued to be short in the Straits and the convict labour was a valuable asset.
One of the underlying features of the use of convicts in the Straits Settlements was that the Indian Government required payment from the colonies for their labour in return for meeting the cost of their maintenance. This was calculated at two thirds the value of free labour. In contrast, the Australian colonies did not pay for convict labour. Notwithstanding, the authorities in the Straits still regarded convict labour as more valuable than the cost imposed by the Government of India.

In 1860 the Indian Government decided to retain penal settlements in the Andamans, Arrakan, Tenasserim and Bombay Province, and to end transportation to the Straits Settlements. By 1862 there were still 2,000 male Indian convicts and 120 women. More than 300 of the men were ticket-of-leave convicts, many working as domestic servants. By 1864 the work of the convicts was considered less valuable with the increasing availability of Chinese labourers. The administration was also finding it difficult to provide sufficient work for the convicts.

The Straits Settlements were transferred from the Indian Government to the British Colonial Office in 1867 which agreed to leave the remaining convicts in the Straits for the time being. The last Indian convicts were removed in 1873 and transferred to the Andamans.

During the period 1790-1860 it has been estimated that 15,600 Indian convicts were sent to the Straits Settlements.

**Pinang (Penang) - Malaysia**

British settlement of Pinang was commenced in 1786 under Captain Francis Light who was the Superintendent of the then named Prince of Wales Island. He established George Town and the settlement was part of the investment by the British East India Company. The Company was seeking to enhance its spice trade and George Town was to be a strategic trading port to challenge the Dutch in the Straits of Malacca and to expand trade with China (Su Nin 1994:5).

Light imported convict labour in 1789 from Bengal, India for making bricks and building roads (Su Nin 1994:iii), and also to construct all government buildings of the time (Su Nin 1994:18). There is also reference to Malabari convicts from Kerala in southern India and Tamils (Su Nin 1994:97 and Salma Nasution 1996).

There were 130 convicts at Pinang in about 1801 and 772 in 1805 (Penang, Past and Present 1786-1963:4-5).

Surviving associated places are or may include:

- aspects of Brick Kiln Road (now Burmah Lane?);
- the former, early 1800s brick kiln site, now the city incinerator site (Su Nin 1994:50-52);
- Government House from about 1790 (Su Nin 1994:114-115);
- Fort Cornwallis. Light had an earlier fort (1786?) rebuilt in brick by convict labour at a cost of 67,000 Spanish dollars (in 1793?). In 1804-5 Governor Farquhar repaired the fort and built a new half-moon battery costing 71,000 Spanish dollars however, the battery fell into the sea soon after (Su Nin 1994:108). The fort was rebuilt again in 1810 and used for administration rather than defence. Early surviving structures include the gunpowder magazine and Chapel from about 1799. The fort was surrounded by a moat.
which has now been filled in. It is now a cultural venue and gazetted national monument though poorly maintained (Su Nin 1994:109 and Salma Nasution 1996);

- a four mile long aqueduct, an open brick drain structure, which ran from the Waterfall to a small reservoir at the present site of the E & O Hotel, dating from about 1804-5 (Su Nin 1994:86);

- the former gaol, now Gudang Acheh (a warehouse), from 1803, 'renovated' but apparently still intact (Su Nin 1994:47 and Salma Nasution 1996, Su Nin 1995:xix refers to the building being purchased by the colonial government for a gaol);

- Gaol, Gaol Road, may have been established in the 1840s, other evidence suggests 1874 and enlarged later, still a prison (Salma Nasution 1996);

- Saint George's Church from 1819, convict labour used in construction;

- Kapitan Keling Mosque from about 1800, convict labour used in construction;

- Dato' Koya Shrine from the mid nineteenth century and dedicated to the patron saint of Malabari convict labourers, convict labour used in construction; and

- canal, from 1805 and constructed with convict labour (Su Nin 1995:xiii).

Singapore

Singapore was founded in 1819 by the British East India Company as a strategic trading port between Europe and India to the west and China to the east. It also consolidated Britain's sphere of influence in South-East Asia.

The first suggestion to send convicts to Singapore came from the Indian Government in 1821 when it indicated a preference to send convicts to Singapore rather than Pinang. This suggestion was welcomed by authorities in Singapore (Buckley 1965:69).

However, it was not until 1825 that the first Indian convicts arrived and these were transferred from Bengkulu to Singapore (Turnbull 1989:46). There were 80 Madras and 120 Bengali convicts. The first convicts occupied the Temenggong's (local headman's) village which had been vacated, but later the convicts were moved to permanent buildings between Bras Basah Road and Stamford Road (Samuel 1991:63). Lines were built for 600-700 convicts with scope to expand to 2,000 convicts (Buckley 1965:180).

Singapore quickly became a major penal colony in the Straits. Convicts carried out entire projects, particularly public works, because of the shortage of other labour. Convicts undertook stone quarrying, felling timber, land reclamation, the draining of marshes, making bricks as well as construction activities which seem to have included (based on Turnbull 1989:46, 71 and 110, the survival or integrity of the following places is not known except as detailed further below),

- roads, canals, sea walls, bridges, jetties, piers
- private houses
- Horsburgh Lighthouse
- Roman Catholic Church (1833)
- Armenian Church (1835)
- the private house at the core of the present Parliament Building
- the first Saint Andrews Church (1836, now demolished)
- Convict Places and World Heritage Report -

- Chinese Temple, Thian Hok Keong (1842)
- Cathedral of the Good Shepherd (1846)
- Mosque in Kampong Glam (1846)
- Fort Canning (1860)
- Saint Andrews Cathedral (1862)
- Sri Mariamman Temple (the 1862 brick building replacing an earlier building)
- Town Hall, now part of the Empress Place government offices
- Court House, now part of the Empress Place government offices
- General Hospital
- Lunatic Asylum
- New Pauper Hospital
- reclaimed swamp for Commercial Square, now Raffles Place
- Government House, now the Istana Negara, and
- Cavenagh Bridge (1869).

A map of 1857 shows a convict gaol, convict hospital and convict market shed on the site bounded by Victoria Street, Bras Basah Road, Bencoolen Street and Stamford Road (Moore and Moore 1969: following 256). It appears no convict buildings survive on this site.

Large gangs of convicts were dispersed in the countryside of Singapore engaged in various works and housed in 'open' lines (Buckley 1965:631). Because of a lack of funds to provide many guards, convicts were allowed a great deal of freedom. Senior convicts were made petty officers to supervise other convicts.

The Singapore penal system was regarded as a model for other countries.

'In convict administration mid-nineteenth century Singapore came nearer to advanced Benthamite thinking than anywhere else in the world' (Turnbull 1989:56)

There was an emphasis on training, reformation and useful employment rather than punishment.

Most convicts were Indian although small numbers of Chinese convicts were brought from Hong Kong. The transportation of Chinese convicts to Singapore stopped in 1856.

While cheap convict labour was welcomed for most of the period when convicts were located in Singapore, by the mid-nineteenth century there was concern about the influence of convicts on the broader community. Partly in response to this concern, the government in India stopped transportation in 1860. However, it was not until 1873 that the convicts already in Singapore were finally removed.

The following detailed information has been obtained about surviving places which were built using convict labour (based on Urban Redevelopment Authority 1996 unless otherwise noted).

- **Fort Canning (1859-61)**, Singapore's first fortifications, but poorly located. It consisted of a barracks for the artillery force, a signal station and gun salute station. All that remains now is the gateway (Lee 1990:4-6).

- **Saint Andrew's Cathedral**, Coleman Street. The Cathedral is on the site of Saint Andrew's Church which was built in 1835-36 to a design by the architect G D Coleman. Construction was carried out by Indian convicts. This was replaced with another Church building designed by J T Thompson and built in 1842.
The second Church was demolished in 1855 and the Cathedral built between 1856-64, although it was largely completed by 1861. Government engineers directed the work and again Indian convict labour was used. The designer of the Cathedral was Colonel Ronald MacPherson of the Madras Army, and the building work was supervised by Major J F A McNair, the Colonial Engineer and Superintendent of Convicts, and John Bennett, a civil and mechanical engineer.

A War Memorial wing was added in 1952 and this was extended in 1982.

- Sri Mariamman Temple, 242 South Bridge Road. A local businessman built a Hindu Temple on the site in 1827 and this was replaced by a brick and plaster Temple building in 1843. It was built using convict labour including plaster craftsmen from Madras. The Temple has been repaired and refaced many times.

- Istana Negara, formerly Government House, Edinburgh Road. Following the creation of the Straits Settlement as a Crown Colony in 1867, the first Governor commissioned the building of Government House to a design by Major J F A McNair. Using convict labour, bricks and plaster also made by the convicts, and imported marble, the building was completed in 1869. The house is now the palace of the President of the Republic of Singapore (Urban Redevelopment Authority 1996, Lee Kip Lin 1988:162-3, Lee 1990:83-4).

3.2.5 MAURITIUS

Mauritius received Indian convicts from 1815. By the mid-1830s there was a convict population of about 800, employed constructing roads and buildings. (Nicholas 1988:32)

No information has been located about buildings or sites relating to convicts on Mauritius.

3.3 SPANISH CONVICT TRANSPORTATION

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Spanish convicted criminals were sentenced to hard labour in the galleys of the Mediterranean ports, or to the mercury mines at Almadén, or to the military forts (presidios) of North Africa. Penal servitude co-existed with slavery in the Spanish system for centuries, sample years in the seventeenth century showing that of between 2,000 and 5,000 galley oarsmen used by Spain, the ratio of convict: slave ranged from 3:1 to 1.5:1 (Pike 1983:12-13). The galleys were abolished in 1748, but the presidios remained in Algeria and Morocco. Convicts were used both as soldiers and labourers in the presidios, helping to maintain Spain's naval posts in the Mediterranean. After the abolition of the galleys, especially, the presidios became virtual penal settlements, with convicts working for private settlers as well as for the state, and many remaining in the colonies after their sentences expired. At the start of the eighteenth century, Spain had five presidios in North Africa, with Oran and Centra being the largest (Pike 1983:111-12). Oran had between 2,500 and 3,000 convicts at any given time between 1772 and 1788, before being captured by the Algerians in 1792 (Pike 1983:118).

Presidios in the Americas included Havana (Cuba), San Juan (Puerto Rico), Pensacola (Florida), New Orleans (Louisiana), Piedros Negros, Veracruz, Mexico City and
Acapulco (Mexico). Convicts had always been sent to these presidios, from the middle of the sixteenth century many being turned over to private employers as a labour force as the local Indian populations declined in number (Pike 1983:135). With the abolition of the galleys in 1748, the use of the American colonies as major penal settlements became more attractive as a means of disposing of convicts. This trend was accelerated by the need to reconstruct and strengthen the fortifications of Havana (Cuba) and San Juan (Puerto Rico) in 1766, following the Seven Year War. Initially slaves were used for this work, 4,198 of them between 1763 and 1765. Convicts became more important after 1767, making up over half the workforce by 1768, replacing slaves fully from 1769 (Pike 1983:135-7). At Havana about 2,000 convicts were used at any one time, and at San Juan an average of 476 worked between 1771 and 1776, declining to 77 between 1784-86.

In 1771 classes of convicts were distinguished, with minor and first offenders being sent to the presidios of North Africa, and recidivists and major offenders going to labour in the Naval arsenals in Spain. At this time the North African presidios were being strengthened due to renewed hostilities with Moslem groups (Pike 1983:116-18). Civilian convicts were also sent to Mexico, while nearly all the convicts sent to Cuba and Puerto Rico were military prisoners. Some Mexican prisoners were also sent to the Caribbean and the Philippines (Pike 1983:144-5). From 1774 it was decided to re-settle time-expired convicts from other parts of the Americas in Puerto Rico, rather than return them to Spain, creating an ex-convict-based colony rather than just a penal-based military presidio (Pike 1983:141-2).

3.3.1 HAVANA, CUBA

Convicts from Spain and the Presidios of North Africa and the Americas were sent to Havana (Cuba) and San Juan (Puerto Rico) to repair and strengthen the defences following the Seven Year War (1756-63). Initially slaves were used for this work, 4,198 of them between 1763 and 1765. Convicts became more important after 1767, making up over half the workforce by 1768, replacing slaves fully from 1769 (Pike 1983:135-7). At Havana about 2,000 convicts were used at any one time.

The old city of Havana and its fortifications are inscribed on the World Heritage List.

3.3.2 SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICA

The general history of convict transportation to Puerto Rico is outlined in 3.3.1 above. At San Juan an average of 476 convicts worked between 1771 and 1776, declining to 77 between 1784-86.

From 1774 it was decided to re-settle time-expired convicts from other parts of the Americas in Puerto Rico, rather than return them to Spain, creating an ex-convict-based colony rather than just a penal military presidio (Pike 1983:141-2).

The fortresses in San Juan are inscribed on the World Heritage List.

3.4 FRENCH CONVICT TRANSPORTATION

The French attitude to convict transportation was heavily influenced by the British experience in Australia, which was seen as a success, and a short-lived penal settlement was established at Cayenne in French Guiana in the 1790s (see Forster 1991:136 for a discussion of the influence of Botany bay on french transportation planning). From the time of the Bourbon Restoration in 1814 there were renewed pressures to create a penal
colony for France, to deal with the criminal component of an increasing population (Forster 1991:136). The trigger for the introduction of transportation was the revolution of 1848, during which 15,000 insurgents were arrested. For want of another option, political prisoners were sent first to Algeria from 1850, then later in that year a small party was sent to the Marquesas in the Pacific. Added pressure for transportation occurred with Louis Napoleon's coup d'etat in 1851, following which 27,000 opponents of the regime were sentenced, and 12,000 sent out of France, including 4-5,000 sent to the penal establishment in Algeria, and 239 of the most dangerous sent to start a penal colony in Guiana in 1854 (Forster 1991:146-7).

In the 1850s France closed its *bagnes* (labour prisons at the main French ports) and turned to 'transportation' for convicted criminals and 'deportation' for political prisoners, and from 1884 added 'relegation', by which habitual petty criminals were transported (Willcox 1931:206). A new penal colony was established in New Caledonia in 1864, and from 1867 this was the only penal settlement for the punishment of white prisoners. During this period Guiana was a penal colony only for Algerian convicts, becoming the destination for white convicts only after 1886 (Lyons 1986:71).

### 3.4.1 FRENCH GUIANA

5,000 Political prisoners had been transported to Cayenne in French Guiana in the 1790s, but transportation was not continued with at that time. In 1854 Cayenne became a French penal colony, the use of which extended into the twentieth century, supplying Guiana with its labour force for public works, agriculture and forestry industries, and for private assignment. Until 1886 transportation to Guiana appears to have been limited to non-white convicts from Algeria, but after that date it became the principle penal colony for white hard-labour convicts (Lyons 1986:71). By 1911 the 6,465 convicts formed 13.2% of the population, and numbered 8,568 by 1915. (Nicholas 1988: 34-35) It has been estimated that approximately 53,000 convicts were sent to Guiana between 1852 and 1920 (Willcox 1931:206).

### 3.4.2 NEW CALEDONIA

New Caledonia was claimed by the French in 1853, because of its desirability as a site for a penal settlement (Forster 1991:135). It was designated a place of exile in 1863 (*Sites et Monuments Historiques de la Province Sud* 1995:10). The first French convicts landed at New Caledonia in 1864 and transportation ended in 1897. However, it was not until 1922 that the penal colony was closed (Nicholas 1988:35 and Ohlen 1996).

Convicts were classified into three general categories - 'transportation' for convicted criminals, 'deportation' for political prisoners, and from 1884 'relegation', by which habitual petty criminals were transported (Willcox 1931:206). Overall New Caledonia received 20,000 transported convicts, about 4,250 deportees and a significant number of people relegated to the island. This included about 1,000 women (*Sites et Monuments Historiques de la Province Sud* 1995:10).

The colony was heavily dependent on convict labour. For example, in 1877 immediately before a Kanak uprising, the European population of about 16,000 was made up of 4,000 deported Communards and their families, 6,000 transported criminals, 2,700 military and guards, and 3,000 free settlers (Nicholas 1988:35).

The transportees were further categorised according to their conduct into four classes. The fourth class included the incorrigible convicts who were kept in the central depot at
the Ile Nou Penitentiary and undertook the hardest labour. The other three classes were able to receive a salary.

Convicts undertook public works such as the construction of buildings related to the convict establishment as well as other community buildings. Convicts could be sent to prison farms such as that at Bourail, or sent to work in the nickel mines (Lyons 1986:71).

The first class convicts were the best behaved and could work as agricultural labourers or as domestic servants for free colonists. In addition, there were freemen (ticket of leave convicts?) who benefited from a provisional concession and undertook forestry work at Bourail, La Foa, le Diâhot, Pouembout and Prony (Sites et Monuments Historiques de la Province Sud 1995:10).

Convicts transported for civil crimes had to remain in the colony after completion of their sentence for a period equal to the duration of the sentence, and if their sentence was for eight years or more, they were never to leave New Caledonia (Lyons 1986:71).

The Ile Nou Penitentiary was the most important penal establishment on the island and it was also a transit centre for convicts to be sent elsewhere in the colony (Ohlen 1996). In addition, there were several other important penal establishments on New Caledonia such as Camp Est and Camp Brun. There were other places of detention, such as at Téremba, Bourail and Prony. However, these were apparently not part of the penal establishment but, rather, places of forced labour.

The Communards, deported after the revolutionary Paris Commune in 1871, were settled on the Isle of Pines, separate from transported convicts to prevent the spread of revolutionary tendencies. Some were kept in prisons while others had freedom of the island. After the granting of an amnesty in 1880, most returned to France.

In 1931, New Caledonia was classified as a place of exile.

Details of places related to the penal colony are as follows (based on Sites et Monuments Historiques de la Province Sud 1995).

- **Penitentiary at Ile Nou, Noumea.** A site on Ile Nou was developed as the location of the penitentiary. Ile Nou was chosen because it was well separated from the port of Noumea. The first group of 248 convicts arrived in 1864 and were employed in the construction of the first penitentiary buildings. This core of buildings, known as the central depot, was completed by 1867. The Penitentiary grew to become an extensive complex.

  It is believed there are substantial historic remains of the Penitentiary although details are not known.

  Various remains of the early penitentiary are classified as Historic Monuments.

- **Camp Est (East Camp), Ile Nou, Noumea.** Was the base for prisoners working a quarry on Ile Nou for the nearby lime kiln. Camp Est is still a general prison.

- **Cellular Building at the Old Hospital of Marais, Noumea.** The hospital comprised a complex of many buildings. The old Cellular Hospital building was constructed for the insane, it was both prison and hospital. It has a central corridor with cells either side, and a central watch position. The building has been altered over time.
In 1927 the building was transferred to the civilian colonial authorities. In 1978 it was a central specialised hospital. The building was declared an Historic Monument in 1974.

It is not known if other early buildings survive.

• Saint Josephs Cathedral, Noumea. Construction of the Cathedral was under the direction of the Chief of Works of the Penitentiary. Work started in 1876 but was delayed. It was not until 1887 that work re-commenced and the Cathedral was completed in 1890.

The Cathedral was classified as an Historic Monument in 1992.

• Camp Brun (Brown Camp), near La Foa. Was established in 1876 between two villages, La Foa and Boulouparis. It was a disciplinary camp for fourth class convicts, the incorrigibles or strong heads.

The remains of the camp are now on private land and overgrown.

• Fort Teremba, Moindou. In 1871 it was decided to construct a fortified building to allow the extension of the penal settlement to this area which was, at the time, only accessible by sea. However, it was not until 1879 that the fort was built. Teremba was the centre for convict administration in the area which included La Foa, Farino and Fonwhary. In 1885 it was transferred from military to penal administration.

The fort is enclosed by a wall and there are several buildings in the complex. A village is nearby.

The fort was abandoned and fell into a decayed state. In 1984 a decision was taken to restore the fort and the tower was reconstructed in 1989-92.

• Old Cheese-making building, Bourail. The building dates from 1870 when it was a military store which supplied agricultural concessionaires (ticket of leave convicts?). In 1938 the building was the property of a cooperative cheese society. In 1966 the building was acquired by the Territory and in 1978 it accommodated a veterinary service. In 1984 restoration was undertaken with government funding. The building is occupied and used by an historical society.

• Chapel of Nemeara, Bourail. The penal administration created a school in 1878 but this was closed in the same year. It was then run by the Marist Brothers as a school. These uses resulted in the development of a complex of buildings which had the atmosphere of a village.

Only the main building and Chapel survive from this complex and the latter was classified as an Historic Monument in 1989.

• Cemetery for those deported from the Paris Commune, Isle of Pines. In 1871 the Paris Commune was crushed and the insurgents deported to New Caledonia. Some 323 who were regarded as common criminals were sent to Ile Nou, another 900 were deported to fortified areas and the remaining 3,000 simple deportees were sent to the Isle of Pines to live out their exile. Transportation took place between 1872 and 1880.

The isle was divided into territory for the exiles and that for the native peoples.

In 1880 the exiles were granted an amnesty and most returned to France.
A cemetery remains on the isle for the 188 deportees who died there. There are no religious references on the graves reflecting the anti-religious views of the Communards. The graves are simple stone-bordered mounds with no other identification and the cemetery has a feeling of austerity. There is also a general monument erected by the Communards before their repatriation.

The cemetery is an Historic Monument.

- Civil and Military Officers' Cemetery, Isle of Pines. Transportees and those in the relegated class were sent to the Isle of Pines after 1880. An administrative centre was established to manage these convicts. The surviving cemetery has 62 graves of civil and military officers or their family members from the period 1872-97.

3.5 RUSSIAN CONVICT TRANSPORTATION

3.5.1 THE EXILE SYSTEM

The use of exile in Russia dates from the medieval period, and its form evolved over time. While initially aimed at removing political dissidents, exile gradually became a tool with broader application. Ivan the Terrible, for example, forcibly resettled the entire populations of rebellious cities such as Novgarod and Pskav. An edict of 1582 listed towns on the periphery of Muscovy as places of banishment for certain offences, but it was the discovery and conquest of Siberia that led to the introduction of exile as a standard penal procedure in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the combined aims of punishment and colonisation (Wood 1980: 20; Wood 1989:12-13).

In 1649 Tsar Alexei issued a Code which specified the Yakutia and Lena River as places of exile for a number of offences, ranging from murder to trafficking in tobacco. Exiles were first flogged and often mutilated before transportation, a feature of the system until the late nineteenth century. Families were sent with the exile. By 1662 exiles accounted for 8,000 out of the population of 70,000 then in Siberia (Wood 1980: 20).

Peter the Great altered the system, largely replacing simple exile with katorga, or forced labour, which was to remain the harshest category of exile until it was abolished in 1917. Other forms of exile remained in place, however, and by the mid-1700s exile was commonly used to remove politicians and administrators who had fallen from favour. In several cases exiled administrators later became governors of Siberia and administrators of the exile system, following further changes in power relationships in St Petersburg (Wood 1980: 20-21).

In 1760 Empress Elizabeth promulgated a decree giving noble landowners and others the right to send idle or recalcitrant serfs to Siberia through the exile system. Serfs were supposed to be under 45 years old and able bodies, were flogged and mutilated before transportation, and were to be accompanied by their wives, and may also be accompanied by their children. The age and family requirements stressed the colonisation objectives of the decree, while the pre-exile punishment and arduous land journey stressed the punitive aims (Wood 1980: 21).

Capital punishment was abolished in 1753, and perpetual banishment to Siberia with hard labour was substituted, further boosting the category of convict or katorga transportation.

Estimates of the number of people involved in exile and katorga very considerably. Before 1822, when the system was reformed and systematised, all figures are suspect.
Between 1760 and 1782 it has been estimated that 60,000 exiles were sent to Siberia, with a mortality rate of 20% during the journey (Wood 1980: 21). In 1796-7 the population of Siberia was estimated at 939,000, of whom 576,000 had migrated from west of the Urals, though it is not clear what proportion of these were forced migrants. In the period 1801-1850 an estimated 250,000 prisoners and exiles were settled in Asiatic Russia (Obolensky-Ossinsky 1931:556).

In 1819 Mikhail Speransky, himself a former exile, became Governor of Siberia, and set about reforming the grossly inefficient exile system. He issued Exile Regulations in 1822, and established an Exile Bureau in Tomsk in 1823, later relocated to Tyumen. The new system introduced categorisation of exiles by their form of exile and sentence, and remained in position until 1900 (Wood 1980: 22). Under the new system the categories of exiles were as follows:

- **Convicts or Katorga**—These were criminals convicted by courts to hard labour for limited terms or for life, with the type and location of punishment being specified. Labour was on the railways, in agriculture, forestry or in mining. The convict was deprived of all civil rights, and were transported in chains to Siberia. Wives could choose to accompany their husbands, but if they did not they were legally considered to be widows. The property of katorga was treated as if the person were dead, and distributed to the heirs. After a set period, under some sentences, a convict could be sent to a 'free command' with lessened supervision. On the expiry of sentence, the convict was forcibly resettled in one of the exile communities in Siberia.

- **Exile for settlement in Siberia**—The formal exile of people for criminal, political or religious reasons by the government and its authorities, or by the courts for lesser offences than katorga. This was for life, with the exiles being sent in chains to special exile towns, or to ordinary Siberian towns, under gradually decreasing degrees of surveillance, until they were regarded as part of the general population.

A sub-set of this group were **Exiles for resettlement**, to whom similar conditions applied, but who were made up of fugitives from the exile system, and vagrants. In the late nineteenth century it is estimated that up to a third of the exile population at any given time was on the run, having escaped from exile stations or en route to the east. A large number were recaptured, some escaping again and being recaptured many times over many years (see Wood 1991b).

Another sub-set of this group, after 1845, were offenders from the privileged classes, who were exempt from corporal punishment, could supply their own transportation, and were able to enter into industry and trade as soon as they arrived in Siberia.

- **Administrative exiles**—These made up by far the greatest number of exiles to Siberia (77,000 out of the 148,000 exile population (excluding dependents) in the 1880s and 90s). The power to exile could be used by government and police authorities, and by local peasant and merchant communities, without recourse to court proceedings. Peasant and merchant communities administrative exile accounted for the greater number of exiles (94% by the end of the 19th century). No trial was held or formal sentence issued, the person was simply given over the exile bureau for exile for up to 10 years. These exiles were not fettered during transportation, and were generally free to make their own living in Siberia. While administrative exiles were able to return to Russia when their sentences expired, many chose to remain in Siberia (Wood 1980: 22; Kennan 1970: 79).
Between 1822 and 1900 an estimated 187,000 criminals, 513,000 political exiles, and 216,000 'followers' were sent east (Nicholas 1988:36-7). As many as 17-19,000 were sent eastward each year in the mid-nineteenth century (Wood 1991a: 11). In the whole period between 1800 and World War I one estimate is that 6,021,000 migrants from eastern Russia settled in Asiatic Russia, of whom 1,312,000 were convicts or exiles (Obolensky-Ossinsky 1931:556). The make-up of the exiles in any given year is illustrated by Kennan, who worked directly from the records of the Bureau of Exile Administration. In 1885, of the 15,766 exiles and dependents transported eastward, 11,687 were male and 4,079 female. 35% were dependent wives and children, leaving 10,230 true exiles, and of those 4,210 (41%) were katorga or convicts under lesser sentence. The largest single category of exile were exiled by administrative process rather than by court sentence (57%). The largest proportion of these (3,758, or 37%), were persons banished by their own village communes. Kennan thought that less than 1% of exiles in the period 1879-1884 had been political exiles, thought they were distributed among the other classes and hence difficult to count (Kennan 1970: 79-80).

As suggested by Obolensky-Ossinisky's figures, free migration and natural increase were much more important factors in the settlement of Siberia up until the First World War than was the exile system. In the 1890s, for example, while 1,078,000 peasants freely crossed the Urals, only 130,000 exiles did so. In 1900 there was a major review of the exile system. This resulted in the retention, and indeed expansion of the convict or katorga category, but exiles for resettlement were to be limited to Sakhalin, an island where escape was far more difficult, and the powers of local communities to use the administrative exile system were greatly reduced, cutting the major source of pre-1900 exiles significantly (Wood 1980:24; Wood 1991a:2-3). Political prisoners were still represented, however, an estimated 100,000 being exiled after the 1905 revolution (Forsyth 1992: 195).

After the bolshevic revolution the number of political exiles increased. Figures are not very reliable, as the gathering of statistics is subject to both poor sources and ideological bias. For an analysis and presentation of the widely varying estimates of Soviet forced labour, see Wheatcroft (1981). Estimates of forced labour population for the year 1937, for example, range from 2 million (Timasheff 1948) to 5-6 million (Dallin 1948), and for the 1940s range from 2-4 million (Timasheff 1948) to as high as 15 million (Dallin 1948).

While the exile system seems to have evolved continually during the Soviet period, there appears to have been three main categories of exiles, especially between the period 1929-1958:

- inmates of corrective labour camps, including common criminals and political offenders, some camps being designated as punitive in nature;
- inmates of corrective labour colonies, who worked in local industries and were treated less punitively than in the labour camps;
- those subject to exile (required to live in a specified place) or banishment (required not to live in specified areas) and to special settlement in new or established settlements in the east.

The first two categories could be called 'convicts'. The Soviet forced labour system has been interpreted as a way of implementing the five-year plans, and was hidden from open scrutiny for that very reason: that the reliance on such forced labour ran counter to the objective and expected outcome of fully-operational socialism (Armstrong 1965: 147-8). Corrective labour camps were abolished as a separate category in 1958, but still survived in reduced numbers in 1965.
Armstrong (1965) makes some interesting comments about the parallels between the Siberian convict experience and that of Australia. In this context, it is the *katorka*, or forced labour convicts, that are seen as being the nearest equivalent to British convicts. In Australia the convict experience was limited to the first 60 years of European settlement, and is seen in historical terms as an essential element in the foundation of the nation. In Siberia the convict experience not only continued over 300 years, but intensified over that period, and the exile system is not viewed in Russia or by most historians as being a positive contribution to the national identity. As Armstrong says:

"Seen in perspective, there does seem to be an essential difference between a society which had a strong convict element in its early development, and one which was continually reinforced by convict settlers over centuries." (Armstrong 1965: 87-88)
Table of estimates of exile population of Siberia
Single dates indicate census figure, date ranges indicate total population movements over that period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Numbers of exiles</th>
<th>Convicts (Katorga)</th>
<th>Other exiles</th>
<th>Siberian Population</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Wood 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>393,000 (incl. 288,000 natives)</td>
<td>Treadgold 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760-82</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>939,000</td>
<td>Oblensky-Ossinsky 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-50</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,534,500 (1815)</td>
<td>Treadgold 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827-46</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>79,846</td>
<td>2,936,036 (1858)</td>
<td>Wood 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treadgold 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823-87</td>
<td>772,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennan 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-98</td>
<td>535,000 (incl. families)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>911,000 settlers to Siberia</td>
<td>Goryushkin 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-90s</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-98</td>
<td>309,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,760,000</td>
<td>Wood 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1900</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>513,000 +216,000 followers</td>
<td>Nicholas 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 mill settlers to Siberia over period</td>
<td>Goryushkin 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-1914</td>
<td>992,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,366,335 (1911) 5.7 mill total settlers to Siberia over period</td>
<td>Treadgold 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1917</td>
<td>1,312,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,021,000 total settlers to Siberia over period?</td>
<td>Oblensky-Ossinsky 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,070,000</td>
<td>Treadgold 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timasheff 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>5-6 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dallin 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>2-4 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timasheff 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>7-12 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dallin 1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2 The Transportation System for Siberian Exiles

In the eighteenth century the exile administration was not well established, with parties of exiles being driven from town to town eastward, with an inadequate formal support system to ensure food supplies or transport services, and no distinction being made between the nature of the exile's crimes and punishment. By 1811 a system of identity cards was formalised to provide some semblance of order, and by 1817 the system of accommodation stations, or etapes, was starting to be developed (Kennan 1970: 77).

After the reforms of Speransky in 1822 the exiles travelling from Russia to western and eastern Siberia followed an established overland route. Exiles were sent by river or road from Moscow via Kazan and Tyumen to Tomsk on the River Ob in Western Siberia. From Tomsk the exiles were walked along a thousand mile long route, called the etap or etape route, leading to Irkutsk in Eastern Siberia. The trip from Russia to the final Siberian destination took from three months to reach Irkutsk, up to two years to reach Kolyma or Kamchatka (Kennan 1970; Armstrong 1965: 83). After the completion of the trans-Siberian railway, the areas east of Irkutsk into the Transbaikal became more prominent as destinations. Those sent to the far east, to Sakhalin, travelled by ship from Odessa via the Suez Canal, Hong Kong and Nagasaki, and these typically numbered 2,200 each year.

The etap system is best described by George Kennan, a journalist who travelled the route in the late 1880s (Kennan 1970). At that time Tyumen (Tiumen to Kennan) was the chief forwarding station through which all exiles passed en route to Siberia. Exiles spent two weeks there before being sent in specially designed barges to Tomsk. The Tyumen Prison was a rectangular 3-storey brick barracks 75 ft long by 40-50 ft wide (22.9 x 12-15 m), white stuccoed and with a roof made of "tin". The prison was surrounded by a whitewashed brick wall 12-15 ft high, with a sentry box at each corner. The walls were patrolled by armed guards. A prison office was located outside the gates, with a bell on a post in front of it (Kennan 1970: 84). In its plan the prison was similar to Hyde Park Barracks.

The Tyumen Prison was designed to hold 550 exiles, but the capacity had been extended to 850 by building six timber-log communal cell buildings, 25 ft x 35 ft, against the perimeter wall. When Kennan visited, the prison in fact housed 1,741 exiles, in conditions of extreme overcrowding. Most exiles wore leg-fetters, and slept on long communal sleeping platforms with no blankets or mattresses. They wore a grey prison uniform, with yellow diamonds sewn to the back, and half of the head was shaved. In the brick barracks, cells of from 8 x 10 ft to 10 x 15 ft opened off a central corridor, housing from 6-30 prisoners each in extremely ill-ventilated conditions. The kitchens were in the basement of the main cell block, small workshops on the second floor, and a hospital on the third floor (Kennan 1970: 84-89).

The women's prison was across the road within a stockade of vertical logs, and of similar plan to the men's prison, but conditions there were far less crowded and unhealthy. A third stockade housed the log barracks for the families of exiles, and this too was overcrowded, housing nearly 300 men, women and children (Kennan 1970: 92-94).

The Tomsk forwarding prison was of different design, being a large log stockade with 15-20 log buildings within it, of which eight were one-storey prison barracks, 75 ft x 40 ft, divided into two large cells by a transverse corridor, each building designed to house 190 exiles, but again they were dramatically overcrowded. The families of the exiles were housed in three pine-board buildings with cotton-cloth sides, and terribly overcrowded. A two-storey log building housed the hospital, in which 193 people were located.
From Tomsk Kennan traced the \textit{etape} route eastward. Exiles travelled the route in groups of 300-400, taking about three months to reach Irkustk, 1040 miles to the east. \textit{Etapy} were wooden staging prisons located 25-40 miles apart, representing two-day intervals along the route. Half-way between each was a \textit{polu-etap}, which served to house the exiles overnight. At each \textit{etap} the exiles spent one day resting before the next two day trip to the next \textit{etap}, over-nighting again at the next \textit{polu-etap}.

The \textit{etap} was a stockaded area with buildings containing four or five large communal cells (\textit{kamera}), furnished only with a communal sleeping platform and an open tub for excrement. Separate buildings house the officers of the guard, and the troop of about 40 soldiers who guard the exiles as they moved between \textit{etapes}.

The \textit{polu-etap} is a stockaded enclosure similar to the \textit{etape} in design, only smaller. The enclosure is about 100 ft x 50-75 ft, containing three one-storey log buildings, one for the escort officer, another for the soldier guard, and the largest for the exiles, divided into three or four large cells, each with a brick oven and a double row of sleeping platforms. Most were 30 to 50 years old (in the 1880s), and designed for half or one-third of the number of people they had to house when Kennan visited (Kennan 1970: 369-89).

In the Trans-Baikal, beyond Irkutsk, Kennan visited a new forwarding prison, about to replace an old and decayed two-storey log prison. The new prison was a four storey brick barracks, stuccoed and painted white, and the best Kennan had seen. It was placed inside a large courtyard, with separate buildings for the political prisoners and the prison guard. The prison was designed to house 440 exiles, but the administrator feared it, too, would be overcrowded within a short space of time. Kennan also visited a large two-storey brick prison near Irkutsk which housed 992 convicts, with a similar number of ticket-of-leave prisoners living outside the surrounding walls. The hard labour inside the prison was the operation of a crank mill to grind grain. The cells in this prison, unlike most described by Kennan, were well ventilated and clean, and said by him to be the best of the fifteen prisons he had inspected in eastern Siberia (Kennan 1970: vol 2 345-350).

Kennan travelled onwards to the gold mines of the Kara River. Here the exiles were hard-labour convicts, and lived in buildings within a village with a population of about 1800 convicts, and 600-800 women and children dependents. Half of the convicts were under close confinement, while the remainder lived in barracks or cabins of their own outside the prison walls. The latter were 'ticket-of-leave' convicts, those who had worked with good conduct for a given period and could work with limited supervision, could live with their families, could do additional work on their own account, but were still not able to leave the prison area. Seven such prisons were scattered along the length of the Kara River. The prison itself, and the female prison opposite, were stockaded log prisons, similar to others described by Kennan. A separate prison for political prisoners was of similar design (Kennan 1970: vol 2 138-53).

\section*{3.5.3 Assessment of Russian Convict Transportation}

Exile to Siberia has been seen as having two objectives: the punishment and removal of criminal, religious and political disruptive elements from European Russia, and the accelerated settlement and development of the vast Siberian territories. Each of the three global themes identified in the study can be identified in these motives.

'Exile' was a term with a very broad meaning, ranging from the transportation of hard labour convicts, parallelling the Australian convict experience, to the forced movement of communities to further government land settlement policies, parallelling Australia's treatment of some Aboriginal communities until relatively recent times. It is the penal use of exile that can be seen as part of the global convict transportation theme.
No sources have as yet been identified that provide any modern description of the nature and survival of any of the penal establishments associated with the exile system, from either the Tsarist or Soviet periods. Inquiries have been forwarded to ICOMOS contacts in Russia, but as yet no replies have been received. Kennan's descriptions of the forwarding prisons and the etapes in the late nineteenth century would suggest that they bore considerable similarities to the pre-Pentonville convict establishments in Australia. Comparison of surviving examples would be extremely useful in historical research, and in the context of world heritage assessment.

3.6 THEMES OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

This global overview of convictism and forced labour generally has been presented partly to provide an historical context for the Australian convict experience, and partly to determine if any themes of outstanding universal value can be identified in the history of convictism.

The themes arising from the study of forced labour and convictism are, almost overwhelmingly, sombre ones. They have more to do with punishment, pain and the subjugation of one part of humankind by another, than they do with the enlightening and uplifting aspects of the human experience. The themes are, nonetheless, of outstanding universal significance, despite these associations with the darker side of human history.

The themes which run through the global story are:

1. The transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places for the immediate or long-term economic benefit of the home state.
2. The transportation of civil and military criminals, political exiles and 'vagabonds' to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a mechanism for the control of law and order in the home state.
3. The transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a strategic tool of colonialism and the expansion or maintenance of regional spheres of influence.

Slavery and indentured labour demonstrated most clearly the first and last themes—most slavery and indentured labour was to provide a cheap labour force to operate in labour-intensive agricultural or resource industries, which created wealth for the home state; and such centres of wealth-creation, consciously or coincidentally, were also components of the home state's colonial aspirations and spheres of influence. The economic motivation was by far the strongest, while the extension of the power of the home state was usually just a by-product of overseas economic development. The second theme may have also had an influence on indentured labour, in that the movement of labour away from the home state eased the pressure of increasing population, and hence assisted in the maintenance of control of law and order, but the encouragement of indentured labour does not appear to have been used as a policy tool by European governments.

Convictism sometimes demonstrated the immediate economic benefit component of the first theme—the convicts first sent by Britain and Spain to the Americas, for instance, were to provide labour for economic benefit, and that labour worked with, replaced, or was replaced by, slavery and indentured labour depending on which provided the most available and cost-effective labour force at the time (Beckles 1989). The long-term economic argument has been used in the Australian case, for example, to suggest that the NSW penal colony was set up to tap the trade potential of the Pacific, and the use of
convict labour by the colonial governments to establish the physical infrastructure of the colonies, and the assignment of convicts for private agricultural and industrial labour could also be seen as part of a long-term strategy to increase the economic wealth of the colonies and hence the empire.

However, most convictism can be seen as demonstrating more strongly the second and third themes, the control of law and order in the home country, and the extension of its colonial power. The labour markets in Europe from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries were greatly influenced by the rapid increase in population and the quick succession of periods of war and peace. In times of war labour was at a premium, for the armed forces and for the supply industries which fed them. In times of peace there were large numbers of men and women shed from the armed forces and industry, with no support mechanisms provided by the state. At such times the prisons of Europe bulged with criminals and the streets and countryside were roamed by, or home for, unemployed vagrants, 'rogues' and 'vagabonds'. Britain, Spain and France all used transportation both as a way of supplementing their colonial military forces during times of war, and of putting out of harm's way unemployed ex-military and redundant workers who turned to petty crime in times of peace. Dealing with bulging prisons was one of the central reasons for establishing the penal colony in New South Wales.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were also times of political turmoil and revolt within the states of Europe, and transportation was a convenient way of removing potentially rebellious political prisoners and maintaining law and order in the home state.

As the European states developed, their economic and political spheres widened, and overseas colonies were established, either to add to the defence of the home state and its supply lines (as in the case of the Spanish and French colonies in North Africa), or to actively extend metropolitan economic and political influence more widely. Convictism was used by a number of states to supply the workforce needed to establish the colonial presence (as in the case of the Straits Settlements) or to create the infrastructure to defend the wider empire (as in the building of the defences of Havana, San Jose and Bermuda).

The strategic use of colonialism has been proposed as one of the motives for the establishment of the Australian penal colony, both to tap the supposed wealth of trees and flax to support British naval and commercial shipping in the Indian and Pacific oceans, and to establish and protect a new access route to the commercial wealth of the Pacific and China.

In many cases it is difficult to distinguish the real balance between the three factors of economic benefit, the control of law and order and the servicing of empire, and this is certainly the case with the Australian convict experience (see Martin 1978). However, the detailed actions of the convict administrations can give clues to parts of this complex issue, and it is by looking at the detail of the places associated with convictism that the themes can be teased out.

It is argued here that these three themes of forced migration, in varying combinations, affected the development of so many nations of the world, and the lives of so many millions of people and their descendants, that they are themes of outstanding universal significance which can be considered as a framework for the identification of places of World Heritage significance. Some aspects of slavery have already been reflected in World Heritage listing, with the listing of the Island of Goree in Senegal, and the Forts and Castles of Ghana. Some of the works produced by convict labour have been listed in Old Havana and its fortifications in Cuba and La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site in Puerto Rico (USA). However, the documentation for the places listed only touches on elements of the themes of forced labour migration that are of universal significance.
4. CONVICTS IN AUSTRALIA

4.1 THE ORIGINS OF THE AUSTRALIAN PENAL COLONIES

There has been an active debate among Australian historians over the last three decades about the motives underpinning the British settlement of Australia in 1788. A useful collection of the principle articles in this debate have been gathered by Martin (1978). The traditional view has been that Britain needed to find a new location to which to transport its convicts following the loss of the American colonies. This view, which has been called the 'dumping ground' model, was based on a belief that the British prisons were full to bursting point, and that there was no suitable location for a penal colony other than New South Wales. The dumping ground model has been supported by historians such as Clarke (1960), Shaw (1966; 1967-9) and Bolton (1968).

An alternative view was proposed by K. M. Dallas in 1952, which suggested that Botany Bay was settled because of the advantages its location gave it in the emerging trading opportunities of the Pacific. Dallas argued that the location of Australia was attractive for a British colony because: it was situated on an alternative route to the lucrative markets of China; it provided access to the fur trade of the north-west Pacific; it was a good location for the Pacific whaling industry; and it was well situated for trade with, and disruption of, the Spanish South American trade area (Dallas 1952). The argument in favour of the China trade motive has been strengthened by the work of Fry (1971).

A third interpretation, proposed by Blainey (1966), is that the principle motivation was to gain access to the raw materials, timber and flax, which were needed to supply the Royal Navy. These raw materials were thought to be available on Norfolk Island, and would replace, or at least supplement, the traditional sources which were threatened by the loss of the American colonies, and the political situation in the Baltic. This explanation was modified by Frost (1975a; 1975b; 1994) to concentrate on the resupply of the navy and East India Company ships in India and the east.

Each of the alternative interpretations has been supported by the use of specific documents, and attacked for its ignoring of other documentary evidence, and so the debate continues. The latest contribution has been by Frost (1994), which challenges many of the traditional views of the penal settlement of Australia, and reiterates the perceived access to naval stores as one of the motivations for settlement of NSW, and particularly of Norfolk Island.

In balancing up these differing views, it might be safe to say that NSW offered perhaps the only alternative penal settlement site to the Americas which could become self-sufficient, and where the security offered by distance against easy return of escaping convicts was assured. At the same time, there seems to have been current perceptions within the government administration (which had varying bases in reality) that a colony at Botany Bay might prove to be well sited to reinforce the British presence in the Pacific/south-east Asian region, for both military and commercial strategic purposes, either immediately or in the future. The naval supply argument, as restated by Frost (1994) is a persuasive one, especially as it relates to Norfolk Island.

This paper takes a pluralist view on the motives for the founding of the British penal colonies in Australia. The evidence suggests that there is a strong probability that all three motives (dumping of convicts, commercial opportunism and military strategy) may have influenced the decision makers, either individually or jointly, and there is no evidence which discounts any one of the motives.
4.2 THE EARLY CONVICT ESTABLISHMENT

New South Wales was settled by Britain as a convict colony in 1788, and the settlement extended immediately to Norfolk Island, and, in 1803 to Tasmania. Up until the 1820s the attention of the convict establishment was very largely upon the consolidation of these first settlements, and, in the later stages, the provision of secondary punishment for re-offending convicts. Until the arrival of Governor Macquarie in 1810, most of the convict establishment buildings were of modest scale and design. Relatively little remains intact from this early period, though a number of archaeological sites do exist, such as:

- the First Government House site, Sydney (1788),
- Risdon Cove settlement site in Tasmania (1803),
- Sullivan’s Bay settlement site in Victoria (1803),
- Castle Hill agricultural settlement, Sydney (1801-11),
- convict housing, Parramatta (1790-1820),
- Phillipshorough/Cascade, Queensborough and Kingston sites, Norfolk Island. (1788-90 to 1814)

Other sites known to have been in operation in this early period have not been investigated, so the extent of archaeological remains is unknown.

In this early period there was little segregation or classification of convicts according to crime or behaviour. Convicts were put to work during the day and locked in wards or cells at night, if they were available. Work consisted of agricultural labour, road building, harbour works, boatbuilding, timber cutting, grass cutting, fishing, building construction, industrial labour of various kinds, and clerical and domestic service.

Barracks buildings, designed according to standard British Army form, and similar to the gaol layout of the time, were built from at least 1809 onwards in a number of locations, such as the Military Barracks and Carters Barracks at Sydney, and Convict Barracks at Parramatta and Windsor (all 1819-20). Similar plans were used for hospital buildings in Sydney and Parramatta. (Kerr 1984a:47-56).

Macquarie’s period as Governor (1810-1821) saw considerable development in the convict establishment, and the first real application of a sense of design style to convict buildings. This work was not accompanied by any real knowledge of developments in penal design Britain, nor any consistent drawing on local penal experience, and aesthetic criteria predominated in the major works (Kerr 1984a:40-1). The Rum Hospital (1811-16), Hyde Park Barracks (1818), and Liverpool Convict Hospital (1830) (the latter two by ex-convict architect Francis Greenway) were among the major works initiated during the Macquarie era, of which these three survive in varying degrees of intactness.

The provision of adequate housing for female convicts was pressed upon Macquarie by Bathurst (Secretary of State for the Colonies) in 1817, and resulted in Francis Greenway’s design of another significant building, the Female Factory at Parramatta, commenced in 1818 and completed 1821, only fragments of which survive.

4.3 NORFOLK ISLAND—FIRST SETTLEMENT

The strongest argument about a motive for the settlement of Norfolk Island, within weeks of the First Fleet arriving in Sydney in 1788, is that the British administration believed the tall pine trees and flax observed by Cook on the island could provide a possible regional supply of naval materials to support the Royal Navy in the Indian /
South-East Asian region, and that the French had their eyes on the same resource. Without such an explanation it is very difficult to suggest a motive for settling such a remote location with such urgency. (see Frost 1994).

Lieut. Phillip Gidley King in the Supply established a settlement at what was first called Sydney (renamed Kingston during the Second Settlement) and commenced cutting Norfolk Island pine, experimenting with the cultivation of flax, and establishing agricultural areas to support the settlement. The early buildings were timber framed and weatherboard clad. The First Settlement was simply an extension of the main NSW convict settlement, and not, as it was during its second settlement, a place of secondary punishment.

The settlement grew slowly, but by 1791 numbered 1,172 convicts, and two new agricultural settlements had been established, at Charlotte's Field (soon renamed Queensboro' then Queensborough) and Phillipsburgh in 1790. No major buildings were constructed during the First Settlement, the convicts and guards being housed in many small buildings. The settlement was abandoned in 1814, and the buildings fired, so that no extant buildings survive from this period, though several archaeological remains exist, including the original Government House foundations.

4.4 THE BIGGE COMMISSION AND CHANGES TO THE SYSTEM

Commissioner John Thomas Bigge headed an inquiry into the penal colony and its administration from 1819 to 1822, and his report had a considerable impact on the convict system for over a decade and a half. Bigge was set the job, among other tasks, of determining ways of making transportation more of a deterrent to potential British offenders, and ways of better separating the convicts from the free settlers of the colony. The wording of Bigge's commission pre-determined the establishment of distant penal settlements and an increase in the severity of punishment and the tightening of surveillance of convicts (Shaw 1966:102-3; Kerr 1984a:57).

Bigge was reminded by Bathurst that the objective of transportation was to provide a severe punishment such as would render it an '...object of real terror to all classes of the community...'. This was at odds with Macquarie's emphasis on rehabilitation. Bigge also took aboard the commercial interests of the local gentlemen of property. The outcome was that the report recommended that the majority of the convicts, who had been in government employment in the settled districts, be dispersed, those of the best character to be assigned to settlers as agricultural labourers, others to form labour gangs to carry out land clearing, and the boys to be kept at Carters' Barracks and taught trades sufficient to make them useful when assigned. The remainder, and those of bad character, were to be sent to new and distant settlements at Moreton Bay, Port Curtis and Port Bowen. The last two settlements did not come to pass. Bigge further specified the buildings which would constitute the new settlements (Kerr 1984a:58-9).

4.5 NORFOLK ISLAND—SECOND SETTLEMENT

Norfolk Island was re-settled in 1825 as an establishment for the secondary punishment of convicts who had committed crimes while in the colony after transportation. At this time the penal settlements at Maria Island and Moreton Bay were also established, and those at Sarah Island and Port Macquarie had been in operation for only a few years. Port Arthur was to follow in 1830. This development of penal settlements marked a period of more severe, and more closely administered convict punishment, especially for secondary offenders, which followed the Bigge Reports findings.

The Kingston establishment on Norfolk Island was arranged with the military and civil accommodation on the inland side of the coastal flat, and the convict barracks and gaol
on the foreshore. An area of swampy land lay in between. This arrangement is
reflected in the many surviving buildings at the site. Governor Darling summed up the
attitude to the purposes of the settlement by stating that "My object was to hold out that
settlement as a place of the extremest punishment short of death...".

As transportation to New South Wales ceased in 1840, Norfolk Island began receiving
convicts direct from England, as well as secondary offenders from the mainland. This
period coincided with a change in penal philosophy, with experiments in more humane
treatment with a view to reformation through punishment and exposure to moralising
influences. On Norfolk Island this was represented by the reign of Alexander
Maconochie as commandant from 1840-44, but the experiment was ultimately
ineffectual.

Norfolk Island was finally abandoned as a penal settlement in 1855, the remaining
convicts being relocated to Port Arthur.(Kerr 1984a; Clive Lucas Stapleton and
Partners 1988; Wesley 1994).

The remaining standing buildings and substantial ruins at Kingston include:

- Old Military Barracks (1829+)
- Commissariat Store (now All Saints Church) (1835)
- New Military barracks (1836)
- Government House (1829+)
- 9 cottages providing quarters for military and civil officers (1832-47)
- perimeter walls and archaeological remains of Prisoner's Barracks
  (1828-48)—includes the Protestant Chapel, which has been
  reconstructed.
- perimeter walls and archaeological remains of the New Prison
  ('Pentagonal Prison') (1836-40, 1845-7)
- ruins of the Hospital, built on First Settlement remains (1829)
- Surgeon's Quarters and kitchen, on site of First Settlement Government
  House (1827)
- Landing pier (1839-47)
- beach store (1825)
- Settlement guard house, on foundations of First Settlement building
  (1826)
- Crank Mill (1827-38)
- Royal Engineer Office and stables (1850)
- double boat shed (1841)
- Police Office (now boatshed) (1828-9)
- flaghouse (1840s)
- Constable's quarters, partly standing (1850-53)
- Blacksmiths shop (1846)
- salt house (1847)
- windmill base (1842-3)
- cemetery (1825-present)
- many stone walls, wells, drains, building platforms and archaeological
  sites of former buildings.

4.6 NEWCASTLE AND PORT MACQUARIE—NEW SOUTH WALES

Newcastle was first occupied in 1801, to dig coal from the prominent coal seams at the
Hunter River headland, but it was abandoned again in the following year. A penal
settlement was established in 1804, again to mine coal and to manufacture salt and
produce lime, and as a place of secondary punishment. The first gaol was built in
1816, which was converted to a hospital by 1818 and a new gaol built (Kerr 1984a:24-5).
Other buildings included the Commandant's House, Surgeon's House, military
barracks, officers barracks, warehouses, and a number of other buildings and work areas. In 1823 the penal settlement was transferred to Port Macquarie, which promised greater security, being further removed from Sydney. The former Lumber Yard on the Newcastle foreshore has recently been rediscovered and excavations have revealed some of the early lumberyard activities and remains (Bairstow 1987). No other substantial remains of the convict period are known to survive.

Port Macquarie was discovered in 1818, and in 1821 a penal settlement was established there. Buildings included a military barracks, gaol, courthouse, civil officers and military officers quarters, granary, commissariat store, prisoners barracks, hospital and St Thomas's Church. The penal settlement was abandoned by 1831, and the buildings used instead as a depot for 'specials' (educated prisoners) and invalids, relieving Wellington Valley (established in 1823 as an agricultural station for 'specials') of that task and allowing its closure. A new barracks for the invalids was opened in 1840. (Kerr 1984a:74, 113-4). The only substantial remains of the convict era is St Thomas's Church.

4.7 TASMANIA—THE EARLY PERIOD, 1804-1820

Hobart was settled in 1804 (following the short-lived settlement further up the Derwent at Risden Cove), not as a penal settlement but as a free settlement supported by convict labour. A wish to forestall suspected French interest in the island appears to have been the motivation for the settlement (Shaw 1974). A gaol was erected between 1815 and 1818, for both civil and convict use (Kerr 1984a:23-4). A Prisoners' Barracks was built in 1824, added to in 1827, and a Female Factory was created by the conversion of the Cascade distillery in 1827. In other areas the administration of convicts was aided by the construction of facilities such as the Richmond Gaol (1826-7), and Launceston Female House of Correction (1833-7). Initially, convicts on arrival were placed in government service or assigned as servants and labourers to free settlers.

The administration of convicts does not appear to have been a great problem in Tasmania prior to 1819, when there was an increase in the numbers of convicts arriving. In that year convict numbers jumped to 47% of the population, following the commencement of direct transhipment of convicts initially landed in Sydney, and the arrival of convicts directly from Britain. In 1820 over 1,400 convicts arrived from Britain, boosting convict numbers to 73% of the population, and number continued to increase by about 1,000 annually over the next five years (Shaw 1966:366; Clarke 1950:408). In this context, the decisions to establish penal settlements at Sarah Island and Maria Island in the early 1820s can be understood.

4.8 SARAH ISLAND

Sarah Island was the earliest penal settlement in Tasmania, established in 1821-22 as a site for secondary offenders, and as an industrial settlement to gather Macquarie Harbour's timber and coal, discovered by James Kelly in 1815. Prior to the settlement at Sarah Island, convicts had to be sent to Sydney for trial and punishment for secondary offences. The settlement held between 100 and over 350 convicts at different times, both male and female convicts being sent there in the early years. Work consisted of timber-getting, lime-burning, ship building, farming and gardening, charcoal burning, and construction of the settlement and reclamation of swampy areas to increase the size of the island. Work camps were established on the adjacent shores and into the forest areas as timber-getting proceeded later in the settlement's history. After 1830 prisoners were gradually transferred to the new Port Arthur penal settlement, Sarah Island finally closing in 1833.

The settlement was re-opened in 1846 for a short period in an un-economic attempt to use unemployed probation-pass holders to fell Huon pine for the government.
Most of the buildings on the island were of timber, with some, such as the gaol, penitentiary, and commissariat store being of stone. The ruined lower walls of some of the stone buildings survive.

(Sources: Brand 1984; McGowan 1989; Bannear 1991; Julen 1976)

4.9 Maria Island

A penal settlement was established on Maria Island, at Darlington Bay, in 1825, as a place for minor secondary offenders and colonial offenders, thus both relieving the pressure on Sarah Island and Hobart Gaol, and introducing a two-part classification system for prisoners. During this period convict numbers probably never exceeded 145 at any one time. The settlement contained a prisoners barracks (part of which was to be integrated into the second settlement convict barracks), buildings for the various tasks associated with the manufacture of woollen cloth, at which work the convicts were employed, a commissariat store, hospital, boat house, military barracks, Commandants house and office, and other buildings. The settlement was abandoned in 1832.

Buildings surviving from the first settlement are:

- commissariat store (1828)
- Prisoners Barracks (1830)

Maria Island was again occupied in 1842, when the Darlington Probation Station was established. Darlington was said in 1847 to be the best situated and arranged station in Tasmania. Darlington was managed from 1845 by James Boyd, a former Pentonville instructor and future manager of Port Arthur (Kerr 1988:55) The new probation station was built around the earlier convict barrack. The three classes of accommodation, and solitary or punitive cells, were arranged in three courtyarded enclosures on three sides of a larger quadrangle. The First and Second Class departments occupied the old convict barrack and yard, and prisoners were housed in separate apartments (except in the old barracks until full height cage partitions were erected in 1847). At times over 600 convicts were housed at the settlement. A second Probation Station was established on the island at Long Point (now Point Lesueur). The Darlington Probation Station was again abandoned in 1850. (Kerr 1984a: 149-50).

Buildings remaining from the second settlement period include:

- miller's cottage (1846)
- part of the penitentiary (1830, reused 1846)
- barn (c 1844)
- Religious Instructors House ruins (1843)
- mess room (1845)
- 5 cottages and quarters (1840s)
- cookhouse (1842)
- bakehouse (1843)
- Administration offices (1842)
- day room and chapel (1847)

4.10 Moreton Bay Penal Settlement

The convicts sent to Moreton Bay were minor offenders, sent from Sydney and Port Macquarie, rather than arriving directly from England. The settlement was intended partly to replace Port Macquarie, which was now too close to expanding settled areas to offer security as a prison. The Moreton Bay Penal Settlement was established at
Redcliffe in September 1824. However, the site was unsuitable, due to poor anchorage, Aboriginal resistance, and 'unhealthy' surrounds, and the settlement was moved up the Brisbane River to the present site of Brisbane in May 1825. Due to the poor access to the Brisbane River, because of the bar at its mouth, Governor Darling in 1827 authorised Captain Patrick Logan, the Commandant of the settlement, to establish a small outpost at Dunwich, on Stradbroke Island, for the transhipment of stores to smaller vessels for the trip up-river.

Logan had a reputation, born out by the records, of imposing a strict and harsh regime on the settlement. In one 9-month period in 1828 he ordered as punishment 11,100 lashes, though the convict population only stood at 168 for most of that period, jumping to 693 by its end (Fitzgerald 1982:80-1). In 1829 Logan established an agricultural settlement at Eagle Farm, employing 150 convicts, making the colony self-sufficient in maize. Other outposts were at Ipswich (for limestone), and Amity Point (a pilot station). By 1830 when Logan was killed while on an exploration trip, almost certainly by Aborigines rather than by escaped convicts, as has sometimes been asserted, the population of convicts was 975. The peak number of 1,200 convicts was reached in 1832, under James Clunie's command.

The last convicts were sent to Moreton Bay in 1839, when the population of convicts stood at 94, falling to only 29 at the end of that year. The penal settlement was formally closed in 1842, when Moreton Bay was opened for free settlement.

The larger buildings associated with the convict establishment were the convict barracks and the female factory, both of which have been demolished. The only standing buildings from the penal period are the Commissariat store (1829) and the Windmill (1828).


4.11 PORT ARTHUR

Port Arthur was established as a timber getting establishment in 1830, and as a penal settlement for secondary and special punishment in 1832. Between 1831 and 1836 about 7% of all convicts in Tasmania were sentenced to secondary punishment, and Port Arthur became the centre to which they were sent. The Tasman Peninsula was a natural prison, having only one land access point, the narrow Eagle Hawk Neck, which was strictly guarded. Prisoners from Sarah Island and Maria Island were transferred to Port Arthur, allowing the other penal settlements to be closed down. From 1833 Port Arthur and the Tasman Peninsula was the only exclusively penal settlement in Van Diemen's Land, housing convicts who had re-offended in the colony, those offending while on the voyage out, those sentenced for particularly atrocious crimes, and gentlemen convicts, who were kept separate from ordinary convicts in fear that with their greater education they might incite revolt. In 1833 a separate barracks was constructed on Point Puer for boy convicts, the numbers of which increased after 1837, reaching 455 by the end of 1838.

The violent nature of Port Arthur is shown by the figures for punishment. In 1837, for example, of the 919 convicts at Port Arthur, 29% were flogged, compared with only 6% for convicts in the rest of Tasmania, and 18% in NSW. By comparison, however, the average number of lashes at Port Arthur was lower in that year, averaging 26 in comparison with the rest of Tasmania's 30 and NSW 45 lashes. This suggests that the regime was one of frequent medium level corporal punishment. Of the 259 boys at Point Puer that year, 70% were beaten, with an average of 15 strokes. (Shaw 1966:202).
By 1838 Port Arthur had become a significant industrial centre in the colony, producing shoes and other items, and coal from the Coal Mines on Tasman Peninsula. Ship building also became an important activity. The settlement was extensively rebuilt in the 1840s and 50s, but retained the same basic layout. Some of the existing buildings relate to this later re-development, such as the Penitentiary (converted from a granary and mill 1854-57). This building development was in response to increasing numbers of convicts arriving in the colony, peaking at 5,329 arrivals in 1842.

Port Arthur remained a penal settlement, even though transportation to Tasmania ceased in 1853, receiving convicts returned from Norfolk Island, and housing the remaining convicts under sentence, infirm or insane. It finally closed in 1877, by which time at least 12,500 convicts had served sentences there.

Buildings which remain standing or as substantial ruins include:

- Commandant's House (1830s)
- Guard Tower (1835)
- Church (1836)
- Hospital (1842)
- Penitentiary (1844, converted 1854-7)
- Asylum (1864-8)
- Separate Prison (1848-52)
- 'Lithend' dockyard cottage (1841)
- Medical Officer's House (c.1847)
- Commissariat Officers House (c.1845)
- Roman Catholic Chaplain's House (c.1843)
- Assistant Surgeons House (1848)
- Pauper's Mess (1865)
- Overseer's Cottage (1858)
- Smith O'Brien's Cottage (1847)
- 'Sunnybanks' shipwright's house (1830s)
- Court house and library (1848)
- Tower Cottages (1854)
- C of E Chaplains House (1842)
- Government Cottage (1853-4)

4.12 PORT PHILLIP DISTRICT

The two unsuccessful attempts to establish formal settlements in the Port Phillip District (in what is now Victoria) in 1803 and 1827 were supported by convict labourers. However, these did not lead to the long-term presence of convicts in the district. When the NSW Governor Bourke acted in 1837 to establish a formal presence to control the free settlement springing up around Batman's settlement at Melbourne, he sent convict gangs to assist police magistrate William Lonsdale with the physical labour of the new settlement. Numbers were kept small due to local opposition to the convict presence in what they wanted to see as a free settlement. In 1838 about 70 convicts worked in work gangs in Melbourne, and another 8 worked in Geelong. They made roads, built houses, burnt lime, cut timber and drew water. (Atkinson and Aveling 1987:289-92).

In 1838 there were 267 convicts in Port Phillip District, 121 of whom were employed on government works. Between 1844 and 1849, 1,727 convicts were shipped directly from Britain to Port Phillip. These convicts had already served a proportion of their sentences in Pentonville prison, and were thus dubbed 'Pentonvillains'. The intention was that upon arrival they would be dispersed immediately among the free settlers as assigned labour. However, increasing local opposition to convict arrivals, due both to the general opposition to convictism and to the now-buoyant local labour market, turned to near riot in 1849, and two shiploads (the Hashemy and Randolph) had to be
diverted to Sydney without unloading (Shaw 1966: 326; Evans and Nicholls 1976:202-9). This marked the end of transportation to Port Phillip.

There appears to have been few substantial buildings erected to house or punish convicts, as were built in other settlements. A timber watch house, stocks and hospital were built in 1838 (Kerr 1988:21). A gaol was designed along the lines of the county prison in Philadelphia, versions of which were to be erected at Port Phillip, Bathurst, Goulburn and Maitland. One wing of two planned parallel three-storey wings was built in 1841-3, and was demolished in 1908. It was built of stone with barrel-vaulted cells, and had about 80 cells. (Kerr 1984a:106-7). A second wing was built in 1859, by which time the gaol was a civil establishment.

4.13 CONVICTISM IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

The Western Australian Colony had survived from its settlement in 1829 to 1850 as a free settlement without convicts. There have been a number of explanations suggested as to why the colony sought the commencement of convict transportation at that date. Pastoralists lobbied for convicts to solve a labour shortage in their sector of the economy, and argued that the colony would benefit from the injection of capital the establishment of a convict centre would entail. It has been argued that the pastoralists had created the labour shortage by their own poor labour management practices (Stannage 1979), and that they saw transported labour as a way of breaking the bargaining power of free labour, and of re-establishing a social hierarchy which they perceived was being eroded (Cameron 1981:202). While there appears never to have been general community support for the proposition, transportation to W.A. was legislated in Britain in 1849, for an unlimited number of male convicts (Statham 1981b:209; De Garis 1981:321). Ultimately, nearly 10,000 convicts were sent to Western Australia between 1850 and 1868. Over the same period the total population of the colony grew from 5,886 in 1850 to 24,292 in 1868.

The Comptroller General of Convict in Western Australia, Capt. E. Y. W. Henderson, was faced with the housing of the first 75 convicts, when they landed on 1 June 1850. They were accompanied by 54 Pensioner Guards and their families (Campbell 1979:91). He set about finding a site for a depot for convicts, from which they would carry out public works, and selected a site in Fremantle for the prison. Fremantle Prison was designed by Henderson, based on the Pentonville model and its expression at Portland Prison. The Fremantle prison is described at 3.15 above.

Until the prison was available for occupation in 1855, the convicts had to be housed wherever accommodation could be found, such as a Fremantle warehouse, and it was initially not very secure. By June 1851, Henderson had built two stone sheds next to the warehouse, capable of housing 500 men, and had walled the site (Campbell 1979:92). Twelve cottages for warders had also been completed and the Commissariat store and offices commenced (now the Maritime Museum). The convicts had been guarded during their sea voyage by military pensioners, and these were kept on as a guard until their successors arrived on the next transport (Shaw 1966:354). The convicts sent to Western Australia had already served their penitentiary term and penal labour in England, and were supposedly selected for transportation on the basis of their good behaviour. When they arrived, they were placed in close confinement in Fremantle or Perth, and employed on public works, or before the gaols were built they were sent out in parties to work on roads and construct country depots. Early in the period convicts could be eligible for tickets-of-leave very soon after landing, so by the end of 1852 845 out of the 1,469 landed so far were working for private employers. Ticket-of-leave men were confined to stated districts, and were closely supervised, but were paid wages and could accumulate property. (Shaw 1966:354-5).
The Convict Establishment operated independently of the colonial administration, but was called upon to assist with various public works, as had been intended. Jointly the colonial and Convict Establishment administration set up a system of hiring stations in rural areas, through which the convicts could be administered for local public works, and the activities of ticket-of-leave men monitored. The stations were staffed by Royal Engineers and Pensioner Guards, and included their housing, lock-ups, offices, commissariat stores and officer's residences. The hiring station at Lynton, built in 1853 to provide labour for the local copper and lead mines, was typical, and survives in a largely ruined condition. The growing expense of this system led to most hiring stations being closed down by 1857. (Campbell 1979:97).

The Pensioner Guards, when their tour of duty was completed, were given as part of their contract 10 acres of land. The settlement at Greenough attracted pensioners, and their selections there were consolidated into a pensioner village in 1854, which became the centre for the developing farming district. (Campbell 1979:98).

In England legislation was passed in 1853 that substituted penal servitude for transportation for those sentenced to less than 14 years, and many were released on license in England. This effectively reduced the numbers receiving transportation sentences from the annual average of 2,649 between 1850 and 1852, to only 298 between 1854 and 1856. After 1861 the regulations changed again, and men who previously served half their sentences in Britain before transportation could now be transported immediately, doubling the number eligible for transportation. As fewer were eligible for tickets-of-leave the colony had greater numbers available for public works. By the 1860s it was felt that penal servitude within Britain was more cost effective than transportation. The prison at Chatham had replaced the Thames hulks, and in 1862 the Bermuda hulks were broken up, and the convicts transferred to existing prisons, which do not appear to have suffered overcrowding as a result. The penal philosophies now favoured more repressive prison conditions, and ideas of prison reform were swept away for the next 30 years. As penal arrangements in the colonies were not in line with the new philosophies, and as British prisons could cope with prisoner numbers, it was announced in 1867 that transportation would cease, and the last convict transport ship sailed to Western Australia in October of that year. (Shaw 1966:355-8).

4.14 ASSIGNMENT AND PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT

One of the defining characteristics of the convict system was the use of convict labour by private settlers. This took the form of assignment, especially in NSW and Tasmania before the Probation System was introduced there, whereby convicts still serving sentences were formally assigned to settlers according to a formula relating to land-ownership and investment. Assigned convicts were tied to a designated 'master' to whom they had been assigned as servants, and he (or she) could seek corporal punishment of the assigned servant via a local magistrate for misdemeanours or poor work. Assigned convicts worked commonly as shepherds, stock-keepers, agricultural labourers, 'mechanics' and domestic servants, and were guaranteed only their rations for such labour. In Western Australia a system of more closely controlled fixed-term contract assignment, administered from 'hiring depots', operated for some years prior to 1857. Several hiring depots survive in varying degrees of completeness and intactness.

In NSW, and it would appear also in the other colonies, there was no prescription of the way in which assigned convicts should be housed. By far the majority seem to have been housed within the master's own house, or in slab huts sleeping 3-6 people located to the rear of the master's house, or near the location of their habitual work. In a few instances there were more substantial timber or stone barracks built to house assigned convicts (especially in Tasmania), but many buildings identified in this way in
local tradition have been subsequently shown to have been store buildings or barns (as at 'Strathallan' and 'Mt Elrington' near Braidwood, and 'Lanyon' near Canberra) (Altenburg 1988; Blair and Claouie-Long 1993). Similarly, many local traditions refer to convicts being housed in cellars, but few of these claims are able to be verified, and many have been shown to be myth. Few places claimed to be assigned convict barracks have been thoroughly researched, and such accommodation was certainly the exception rather than the rule (Altenburg 1988). Further research needs to be conducted on places relating the assignment before any such place could with confidence be identified as representing this aspect of convict administration.

"Tickets-of-Ieave" were in effect a form of probation available to well-behaved convicts after a set proportion of their sentence had been served, which enabled convicts to work on their own behalf (Shaw 1966:229). The system operated in all the colonies receiving convicts. The Ticket-of-leave gave the convict a degree of choice in their employment and employer that was not available to assigned convicts, though they still had to report at set intervals to local magistrates, and to indicate their changes in employment or location of work. Ticket-of-leave convicts operated to all intents and purposes as free labour, and there are no buildings identified in this study that are specifically associated with their control and administration.

4.15 WORK GANGS AND STOCKADES

Convict work gangs were used for public works throughout the convict era. Several distinct phases in the development of the work gang system as it applied in NSW have been identified (Thorpe 1988; Thorp 1987). From 1788 to 1822 the use of work parties had two objectives—firstly to employ convicts effectively to enable the colony to be established and to survive, and secondly to allow a form of secondary punishment by having recalcitrant convicts work in iron gangs (as the chain gangs were known). Work gangs undertaking agricultural work on public farms were an established feature of the colony during the later years of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth centuries. The use of iron gangs as a secondary punishment had commenced by 1797. The agricultural gangs were superseded by work gangs operating in lumber yards, dock yards, stone quarries, supply gathering and transport gangs (boat gangs), and on public works. (Thorpe 1988).

From the 1790s convicts were also being 'lent' to landowners as a work force, in return for their keep and a percentage of yields, and this was the origin of the assignment system. Up to 1815 conditions meant that security and discipline were relatively light, and many convicts working in gangs (not chain gangs) had to find their own accommodation, paid for by after-hours labour. The increase in convict numbers after 1815, following the cessation of the Napoleonic Wars, led Governor Macquarie to a re-assessment of their use. The assignment system was consolidated and expanded, and convict labour was used to extend the colony and develop public buildings of a greater refinement suitable for a growing free colony. Macquarie used the convict's labour as a means towards clearly defined ends. These views did not sit comfortably with those in Britain, where the colony was still seen as a place of punishment, in other words a penal colony, and this view was reflected in the setting up of the Bigge Commission (see elsewhere). (Thorpe 1988:110-113).

Following the Bigge report, the work of convicts, while to be fully utilised, was to be seen as being harsh enough to be a deterrent to would-be criminals in Britain. Convicts also were to be separated more effectively from the growing free community. This resulted in the second phase of work gang development, from 1822-26. Government gangs were now sent out to clear and grub stumps from areas into which settlement could expand. However, though reduced, some work on the roads continued, to allow communication with the new areas being cleared. While the new system had its advantages, its day-to-day operation and security was less than adequate, relying as it
did on convict and ex-convict supervision, and the third phase of work gang development followed quickly. (Thorp 1988:114). The clearing gangs were finally abolished by Bourke in 1832 (Kerr 1984a:62).

The next phase, from 1826 to 1837, saw the full development of the work gang system. The growing size of the convict population, together with the growing free community, increased the problems of maintaining security within the convict system and protecting the free population from the deprivations of escaped convicts. Increased severity of the system was a response to these pressures. The use of the fully developed system of chain gangs on the roads of NSW was introduced by Governor Darling in 1826, with a view to both putting the convicts to effective and secure public work, and reducing the need to create new penal settlements to deal with the increased number of secondary offenders. The gangs were controlled by surveyors, and operated with convict overseers. Governor Bourke gave the surveyors the power to give up to 50 lashes for inefficiency, and replaced the convict overseers with paid superintendents and free constables, and from 1834 placed military guards at each of the stockades at which the road gangs were based. After 1835, when an extra regiment arrived in the colony, supervision of the gangs was transferred from the surveyors to the military officers, who were also made magistrates. (Shaw 1966:214; Thorp 1988:114-5). By 1836 Bourke reported that he had 1,000 convicts in irons working in 16 gangs. He also indicated an intention of removing the road parties which had previously worked with no irons, though these Road Parties were still being reported in correspondence as late as 1840 (Rosen 1994:35; Pearson 1995:35).

In 1832 Bourke issued instructions for the erection of stockades for road gangs, consisting of convict accommodation huts surrounded by a timber stockade fence, with guard accommodation facing the stockade gateway. One such stockade at Cox’s River is well documented (Rosen 1994; Pearson 1995; illustration Kerr 1988:29). However, Bourke changed his mind about stockades within two years, issuing new instructions in 1834 which did away with the stockade fence and replaced it with guard huts and lamps overlooking the encampment (Rosen 1994:43).

To date the archaeological remains of only three road gang stockade sites have been described, at Wiseman’s Ferry and Devines Hill on the Great North Road (Karskens 1984; Karskens 1985a; Karskens 1985b; Karskens 1986), and at Cox’s River near Lithgow (Rosen 1994; Pearson 1995). Another work gang site, a lumber yard, has been investigated at Newcastle (Bairstow 1987).

The last phase of the work gang system, from 1838 to 1851, saw the cessation of transportation, and the stagnation of the gang system. The population of NSW increased by two and a half times between 1837 and 1847, from 85,000 to over 205,000, and the proportion of convicts dropped from 37.7% of the population in 1837 to only 3.2% in 1847. In absolute numbers, convicts fell from their peak of 38,305 in 1840, to 6,664 in 1847. (Shaw 1966:405-6). In this context, the role of work gangs both as punishment and a tool of separation, and as an effective public works force, disappeared, and the last stockade was closed in 1851 (Thorp 1988:116).

The buildings associated with the work gangs were usually temporary, and some such as the portable wooden houses used from 1835 at some road stations and stockades, were movable (see Kerr 1984a:63-4). As a consequence, there are no known standing buildings surviving from stockades, and few intact archaeological sites.

In Van Diemen’s Land, Governor Arthur saw the use of chain gangs as a way of utilising convicts who would otherwise be sent to penal settlements. In 1832 the chain gangs held 568 men, compared with only 182 convicts at Macquarie Harbour, and 260 at Port Arthur. While the numbers at Port Arthur subsequently grew, Governor Arthur still had 805 men, or more than 5% of all male convicts, at work on the chain gangs in 1835. (Shaw 1966:212).
4.16 THE PROBATION SYSTEM—TASMANIA

The Probation System was the last major phase of the convict system in Tasmania, and was restricted to that island. At least 85 probation stations were established between 1841 and 1853, when transportation to Van Diemen's Land ceased.

The probation system was a response to the dissatisfaction with the assignment system, whereby convicts were released for service with free settlers. The assignment system had been under attack from as early as 1837, due to its inability to distinguish in treatment between convicts under differing sentences, for differing crimes, or on the basis of their character or conduct subsequent to conviction. The increasing crime rate also suggested that transportation with assignment was not a sufficiently feared punishment to deter crime. The Molesworth Committee set up by the House of Commons in 1837 found the system to be inefficient and inhumane, in that the convict was basically at the mercy of the assigned master, sometimes in conditions little short of slavery. This objection to assignment had been current among the social reformers in Britain since the early 1830s, their perceptions influenced by their understanding of the slavery trade, which was abolished in the British Empire in 1833 following their successful campaign against it (Atkinson & Aveling 1987:274). The Molesworth Committee, reporting in 1839, recommended that there be a fixed punitive period of imprisonment, followed by a period of sentence which could be foreshortened by good behaviour. The assignment system was phased out in Van Diemen's Land between 1838 and 1843, being replaced by a new system founded on principles of uniformity of treatment. (Brand 1990; Kerr 1988:50)

In Van Diemen's Land the convicts were removed from assigned service, and placed in one of the many probation stations established around the colony. The basis for the new system was the introduction of the initial fixed period of labour in gangs, followed by a staged progression of less severe punishment, finalising in conditional release. Assignment was replaced by a system of probation passes, which enabled a convict, following the probation period, to be hired out to settlers on short term contracts, until they earned a ticket-of-leave (Brand 1990:1). The Probation Stations were the centres for administering and housing the work gangs. From 1841 Governor Franklin set out new regulations for the probation system, drafted by Matthew Forster, the Director of the Probation System. The prisoners at probation stations, consisting of 250 to 300 men at each, were to be divided into 3 classes:

- the 3rd Class to be subjected to separate confinement (ie housed individually when not at work)
- the 2nd Class to be hotted in rooms of 10 men
- the 1st Class, composed of those men approaching the end of their probation period, to be housed in huts containing 20 men.

The different classes were never to be mixed up either at labour or in housing. (Kerr 1988:52-3). However, the combination of poor local administration, inadequate funding, and poor communication between the colonies and the Colonial and Home Offices, meant that the probation system was never fully implemented, and was not effective (Shaw 1966:ch 12-13; Kerr 1984:130). The increased rate of transportation to Tasmania did not help, with, for example, 7,500 male convicts arriving in 1841-42.

Rocky Hills Probation Station has been identified by Kerr (1988:53-4) as being the most orthodox expression of this system, which survived for the duration of the probation era. The station, designed by the Royal Engineers Office, had three wings or ranges of accommodation built around yard areas, one for each of the three classes
of convict, and administration buildings and quarters closing the top of the resulting clover leaf or crucifix form. This basic plan was repeated at a number of other probation stations, and can be seen in the combination of extant buildings and archaeological crop marks at the Fingal Probation Station. Near the Rocky Hills Station is an example of the work carried out by the probation system, the drystone Spiky or Lafarelle Bridge. Other work commonly included road-building, timber-getting and agriculture.

Other stations were laid out in a variety of rectilinear arrangements, forming open squares or parallel rows of buildings (see Parham and Noble 1994; Kerr 1984:133-5). Examples were at Victoria Valley, Seven Mile Creek, Paradise, Oyster Cove, Hobart Brickfields, Buckland, Westbury, Jericho and Southport.

Darlington Probation Station, on Maria Island, was said in 1847 to be the best situated and arranged station in Tasmania. Darlington was managed by James Boyd, a former Pentonville instructor and future manager of Port Arthur (Kerr 1988:55). Darlington was first made a penal settlement in 1825, as a place of less severe secondary punishment than Macquarie Harbour, and was abandoned in 1832. The new probation station of 1842 was built around the earlier convict barrack. The three classes of accommodation, and solitary or punitive cells, were arranged in three courtyard enclosures on three sides of a larger quadrangle. The First and Second Class departments occupied the old barrack and yard built during the earlier penal settlement. (see 3.9)

Construction of separate apartments for the Third Class was delayed at most stations due to the resources these took up. After 1846, due to reports about homosexual practices at the convict establishments, a programme of converting open dormitories to individual batten cages commenced for all classes. This system was used on the top floor of the Port Arthur Penitentiary from 1854 (Kerr 1988:58-9), and the system was introduced to Norfolk Island from 1848, as numbers there dropped before the final closure of the settlement.

The Cascade Probation Station on Tasman Peninsula (1841-56) has been identified by Kerr as perhaps the best example representing the intended 1841 philosophy (Kerr 1984: 133). The plan for Cascade shows a First and Second class yard with huts of the approved size, and a Third class yard with huts but no indication of separate accommodation being implemented. (see plan Kerr 1984:134).

The Saltwater Creek Probation Station on the Tasman Peninsular is one of the earliest designs embodying all of Director of Probation System Forster's requirements to implement the new system. This 1843 addition to an earlier station was a predecessor of the Rocky Hills clover-leaf model. (Kerr 1984:136-7)

In 1842 Governor Franklin was instructed to 'assimilate the system of management at the juvenile establishment at Point Puer with that at Parkhurst Prison'. Parkhurst was a reformatory for criminal boys set up in Britain in the mid-1830s. B.J. Horne was sent out with a number of Parkhurst convicts to oversee this process. While this did not result directly in any new building developments, in 1844 the now Comptroller of Convicts, Forster, sought the views of the Commandant of Port Arthur (Champ) on the Horne report looking into juvenile punishment, and Champ recommended abandoning Point Puer and establishing a new station at Safety Cove, two mile to the south. After further delays the penitentiary at Safety Cove was commenced in 1846, but was only partially built before the idea was abandoned and the buildings converted for farm use in 1856. (Kerr 1984:143-4) A similar fate befell plans for a Female House of Correction at Oyster Cove, which was never proceeded with.

### 4.17 Changing Gaol Designs and the Pentonville Model
From the 1820s onwards there was a blooming of prison design, influenced largely by the reform movement in Britain (especially the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline), and the development of the Separate System of imprisonment in America (Kerr 1984a:90ff). Various gaols, female factories and prisons were constructed on cruciform and radial designs, integrating to varying degrees the concepts of separation of different classes of prisoner and the use of individual or separate cells. These replaced the older prisons, in which prisoners were housed in dormitories with little distinction made between age, crime and character of the fellow prisoners. A typology for these various forms is provided in Kerr (1984a).

The radial and cruciform gaols offered ease of access to each of the wings of the prison, and separation of prisoners in individual cells or small dormitories allowing classification of prisoners, but the full utility of this design was not reached until the system devised by the Inspectors of Prisons in the late 1830s, known as the Inspector's System. This introduced the concept of visual inspection from the central point, or along a single range of cells, and introduced open galleries which ran the full height of the cell block to allow easy inspection of all floors from a single point. Details in what follows are taken from Kerr 1984a and Kerr 1988.

Australian examples of cruciform designs included:

- Launceston Female House of Correction (1837), now demolished

Examples of radial gaols include:

- Berrima Gaol, NSW (1834-9)— three wings, built incorporating some of the ideas of the inspector system, but not incorporating some of its key aspects in terms of cell size and arrangement. It incorporated visual inspection of cell-fronts able to be carried out from a central position. Not completed in time to really be used as a convict establishment.

- Darlinghurst Gaol, Sydney NSW (1835-41)— radial design with seven two-storey (altered to three storey) wings ranged around a separate central observation point. Original design altered by Gipps, adding a floor and creating an open floor to roof gallery down the centre of each wing, with cells arranged on either side, bringing it more in line with the Inspector's system. Only two wings were built during the transportation era.

- Kingston Pentagonal Gaol, Norfolk Island (1836-48)— five radial wings within a pentagonal encircling wall. Did not really comply with the Inspector's system requirements, in having cells back-to-back, facing exercise yards, and not easily viewed from the central point. This gaol is now a ground-level ruin and archaeological site.

- Port Macquarie Gaol, NSW (1836-40)— three radial wings and a range of wards along the front which did not radiate from the centre. The plan does not comply with the Inspector's system, and is a modification of an 1826 design, similar to that used for Berrima. This gaol was demolished in 1917.

Inspector's Gaols included:

- Parramatta Female Factory Cell Block, NSW (1838-39)— A cell block added to the Female Factory by Gipps, to house "penal class" prisoners. It was a single range of cells, three storeys high, with an open gallery running the full length and height of the block, with cells ranged on either side. The ground floor cells were without windows, though home government disapproval of such
barbarous dark cells (still somewhat better than some being used in Tasmania) led to new windows being punched through the lower walls.

A similar design was used for country gaols in Port Phillip, Bathurst, Goulburn and Maitland, but were generally too late to be considered part of the convict transportation period.

**Pentonville system:**
Between 1840 and 1842 the English Home Office constructed a model prison at Pentonville, north of the City of London. The Pentonville model was similar in plan to the radial prisons, some of which had been built in Australia already, but differed in having the wings of separate cells connected to the central hall by passages almost the full height of the wing. This enabled all of the interior corridors, galleries and most of the cell doors to be viewed from a central point (Kerr 1988:62-3). The Pentonville design was viewed as a success by 1844, and became the model for prison design for the period.

The basis of the model was the separation of prisoners at all times, with separate exercise yards and cubicles in the chapel, and provision of wash and toilet facilities in each cell to avoid the necessity for communal ablutions. The only and essential interaction was to be with the prison officers. Port Arthur Separate Prison and Fremantle Prison originated from the Pentonville model. (Kerr 1988:62-3).

**The Port Arthur Separate Prison** was proposed by Hampton, Comptroller General of Convicts, to Governor Denison in 1847, and was constructed in 1848-52. The prison, for re-sentencing of refractory convicts, was to have '50 separate cells on the Pentonville Plan', and to be cruciform in plan with cells occupying three wings and the chapel the fourth. One of the wings was extended between 1853 and 55. Light- and sound-proof 'dumb cells' were used for punishment. Silence was maintained by the use of carpet runners in the corridors, and the warders wore carpet slippers. Food was served through a trap door in each cell door, and attention could only be summoned by the use of a signal system. An hours exercise was allowed each day in one of nine separate exercise yards. Verbal communication with the warders was kept to the absolute minimum, and prisoners were prevented from interaction, or from even recognising one another in the corridors by being made to wear masks when out of the cells. The chapel was divided up into individual cubicles so that no connection could be made between prisoners.

The Port Arthur Separate Prison was more severe in its approach than the Pentonville model. The cells had been reduced from Pentonville's 13ft x 7 ft to 9ft x 6ft, and the provision of piped water, wash basins, WC and heating facilities found at Pentonville were dispensed with (Kerr 1988:64-5; Kerr 1984:159-64). The separate prison survives, with two wings and the chapel restored, and a third wing in ruins.

**Fremantle Prison** was built to the design of Comptroller General of Convict in Western Australia, Capt. E. Y. W. Henderson, based on the Pentonville model, as constructed at Portland Prison in Britain. Originally designed to have four wings, the final two-wing plan was approved in 1852, and completed in 1857. The final design was for four tiers of cells of the exceptionally small size of 7ft x 4ft. This small cell-size was because the cells were intended to be used for night time accommodation only, the convicts working outdoors during the day. In correspondence with Jebb, the British Controller of Prisons, designer of Pentonville and approver of the plans, Jebb indicated that the use of corrugated iron cell partitions (as at Portland Prison) would reduce cost and be easier to ventilate than stone cells. However, Henderson proceeded to build with stone, and retained the reduced cell size, which made the Fremantle cells cramped and poorly ventilated. (Kerr 1988:65-66; Kerr 1984:164-66).
The prison in Henderson's original proposal was to hold 570 men, 240 in 'association' (dormitory) rooms and 330 in separate cells. Jebb did not approve of 'association' rooms, but Henderson persisted. The chapel, detached in Henderson's plan, was now to be attached to the main wings, as at Pentonville. (Kerr 1984a:166). The prison passed from Imperial (British) to colonial (WA) management in 1886.

Fremantle Prison remained in operation until 1987, and is the most intact convict prison in Australia.

Table 4 indicates the timeframe for convict places in Australia, and Table 5 lists major convict sites identified.

4.18 AUSTRALIAN CONVICTISM AND THE THEMES OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL SIGNIFICANCE

The themes which run through the global story (as identified in Chapter 2) are:

1. The transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places for the immediate or long-term economic benefit of the home state.

2. The transportation of civil and military criminals, political exiles and 'vagabonds' to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a mechanism for the control of law and order in the home state.

3. The transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a strategic tool of colonialism and the building or maintenance of regional spheres of influence.

The motives ascribed to the British government in setting up the NSW penal settlement, outlined in 4.1 above, include to some extent all three themes, though the last two are predominant.

The first theme is able to be read into the establishment of the Australian penal colony only in terms of perceived long-term economic benefit, as there was no established plantations or natural resources known to exist in the colonies, other than the presumed-useful trees and flax of Norfolk Island, which might be of immediate economic benefit. In any case, the trees and flax argument should perhaps be seen more as one of perceived strategic value than as one about the economic value of these materials (see below). If, as seems likely, the British government was influenced in its decision to settle New South Wales as a penal colony by the prospect of planting a British presence in the Pacific at a time when trade with China, and the exploitation of the natural resources of the Pacific were promising to boom, transportation to NSW could be seen as strategic colonialism for long-term commercial reasons.

It is difficult to argue that any direct economic benefit lay in transportation as a particularly cheap mode of disposal of convicts, as Frost (1994) would seem to have countered any suggestion that transportation to NSW was more cost effective than the option of transporting convicts elsewhere or retaining them in Britain. There was, however, clearly a belief in the minds of some of the proponents of transportation that the penal colony of NSW would not only grow into a self-sufficient colony, but would also make a long-term return to Britain for its investment. The use of convict labour to stimulate the growth of the colonies by its use in the development of an extensive road network, and in the assignment or early release of convicts to private settlers for agricultural and industrial production demonstrates that the administration shared the view that one of the benefits of convictism was the stimulation of colonial growth and prosperity. To this extent, theme 1. applies clearly to the Australian convict experience.
The second theme was certainly one of the motivations for the establishment of NSW. Britain used transportation of convicts to Australia not only as a means of relieving pressure on crowded British prisons, but also as a sentence designed to fill existing and would-be criminals with such dread as to deter them from crime. This use of transportation as a sentence with strong deterrent value extended to the re-transportation of recidivist convicts once in the colony, whereby convicts found guilty of new offences were sent to places of secondary punishment. Some of Australia's best preserved convict remains, such as Kingston, Norfolk Island, and Port Arthur, were places of secondary punishment for at least some part of their operating life. The systems of assignment, probation stations, and various of the changes in penal policy during the period of transportation to Australia, resulted from changes in thinking within Britain about the nature of punishment and its relationship to reform and deterrence. Such developments were reflected also in changes in the treatment of prisoners within Britain itself, and were part of the effort to achieve the rule of law and order by the reform or deterrence of what were seen as the 'criminal classes'.

The third theme provides the framework within which to place the theories of settlement based on commercial and military strategic positioning proposed by Dallas, Blainey, Frost and others. As pointed out above, the long-term commercial prospects afforded by placing a colony on the edge of the Pacific, with access to the China trade and the fur trade of the Pacific north-west, was a strategic consideration. If the British government really perceived that Norfolk Island could provide flax and timber with which to supply the Royal Navy and the East India Company with much needed ships' supplies, and that NSW might be able to grow the flax on a plantation basis, this also could be seen as a motive based in the maintenance of the sphere of influence Britain held in the region, and, as importantly, in denying access to those supplies by rival powers.

The conclusion is drawn from this study that the Australian experience is of such importance in the story of convict transportation on a global scale that it is an aspect of that story that is of outstanding universal value. Australia is the clearest example of the nature and global implications of British convict transportation, the British representing a major component of the convict story globally. British convict transportation apart from directly involved the movement of convicts to the Americas, Africa and Australia, was the model for the convict transportation system to South-East Asia established under the Raj in India, and greatly influenced French transportation to Guiana and New Caledonia. Australia experienced the full evolution of the system as a British penal process, and reflects all of the themes underlying the story of convict transportation globally.
Table 4. Timeline for major penal settlements and building types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sydney Settlement</th>
<th>Norfolk Island</th>
<th>Newcastle</th>
<th>Hobart / Tasmania</th>
<th>Port Macquarie</th>
<th>Sarah Island</th>
<th>Maria Island</th>
<th>Moreton Bay</th>
<th>Tasman Peninsula</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stockades, radial gaols, inspectors gaols, Pentonville Gaols, Probation, Separation
5. AUSTRALIAN PLACES OF SIGNIFICANCE TO CONVICT TRANSPORTATION THEMES

5.1 THE BIG PICTURE—AUSTRALIAN CONVICT PLACES

Australia experienced the transportation of convicts over an 80 year period, from 1788 to 1868. The formal administration of transported convicts who, for one reason or another, could not be returned to the mainstream of society, lasted until 1877 when the Port Arthur establishment was closed down.

Over this period in the order of 162,000 male and female convicts were transported to Australia from England and Ireland, which had its own legal system, and in much smaller numbers from several British Crown colonies. Convicts represented a sizeable proportion of the populations of several Australian colonies. In NSW for the first 10 years of the colony's existence the convict proportion of the population did not drop below about 60%, and reached over 80% in 1791. While later numbers fluctuated from year to year, nearly half the population of NSW were convicts under sentence as late as 1828, and convicts were still nearly one-third of the population in 1840, at the time transportation to the colony ceased. In Tasmania convict numbers reached a peak of 72% of the population in 1820, and remained at between half and one-third of the population until at least 1848. The population of the colonies also contained a considerable proportion of former, pardoned and ticket-of-leave convicts, the vast majority of Australian convicts staying in the colonies after their release.

Several aspects of the Australian convict experience stand out in the world context. The first is the numbers of convicts involved. While the figures for early convict transportation to the Americas are hard to estimate, it would appear from the analysis provided in Section 2.2 that more convicts were transported to the Australian colonies than to any other region with the exception of Siberia. This is reflected in the large number of places that were built in Australia relating to convicts.

Secondly, while convicts were used as a tool in the colonisation of other places such as Puerto Rico, Singapore and New Caledonia, in Australia they were the underpinning workforce and seeding population in a much more ambitious colonising venture. In Australia, convicts were used extensively on public works which established the transport infrastructure of the colonies, as well as being used as cheap labour for private and public agricultural and industrial expansion. Again, the Australian experience is overshadowed only by that of Siberia, where the numbers transported outstrip any other country's history of convict transportation, and approach slavery in terms of the number of individuals involved. They were used for establishing transport infrastructure, developing mining, forestry and other industries, and for establishing a Russian presence in the east. However, the nature and impacts of transportation to Siberia requires a separate study before it can be adequately compared with the better documented convict experience in Australia and elsewhere.

A third aspect of the Australian convict experience which seems to set it aside is the close control exercised by the government over the convict labour, and the extent of the physical infrastructure established to administer and control convicts. This statement needs to be tested by a more in-depth assessment of the physical remains of convictism in, for example, New Caledonia, the Andamans, Penang and Malacca, and Puerto Rico, but on current evidence, there appears to be few if any extensive convict establishments to compare with Port Arthur or Norfolk Island.
5.2 AUSTRALIAN CONVICT PLACES AND THE THEMES OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL SIGNIFICANCE

This section will look at matching known convict places to the convict themes of global significance. While over 200 Australian convict places are identified in Table 5, the majority of these are insufficiently documented to be able to consider them further in this study. Inadequacy of documentation is generally due to insufficient or the total absence of historical research on an individual place, and lack of information on its current physical condition and management. These places can be related to the global themes in a general sense, but lack of information means the relationship of the places to the themes and subsequently to the World Heritage criteria cannot be assessed, and in many cases it is not even known if they survive at all. Emphasis is therefore given to identifying, among the better documented places, the most intact and most representative places to illustrate each theme. The authenticity and management of each will be looked at further in Section 6. In considering convict places for possible World Heritage nomination, the degree to which the places are individually essential, integral or peripheral to the global themes has to be determined, as outlined in the assessment model in Section 1.

If the three themes of universal value discussed in 3.6 and 4.18 above are accepted as applying to the Australian convict experience, how does the range of places identified in Chapter 4 fit into that framework and illuminate those themes?

It is difficult to assess whether these places are essential or integral to the global themes in the absence of knowledge of the existence and integrity of overseas examples of places that also demonstrate the themes. As a result, the following assessments have to be seen as being based on current knowledge as outlined in this report, and may need to be revised as further international comparative information becomes available.

The theme "transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places for the immediate or long-term economic benefit of the home state" could be demonstrated through convict places related to the development of the colonial infrastructure and assistance to settlers to create export commodities. Places related to this theme include:

- Wiseman's Ferry and Devine's Hill Stockades, NSW, and the section of the Great North Road between them, representing the use of convict gang-labour in establishing a transport and communications system in the colony;
- a Probation station in Tasmania (possibly Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or the Ross Probation Station), representing later development in the use of convict labour for public works;
- a site or a landscape (such as near Braidwood) reflecting the assignment system and the use of convict labour as a stimulus to the development of the free colonial economy.

The first two places are assessed as being integral with the theme, as they demonstrate an important aspect of the global theme, well represented in the Australian experience. They would add substantially to a serial nomination demonstrating the global themes, but would not stand up in their own right to nomination. The assignment site or landscape is assessed at this stage as being peripheral to the theme, as the known places lack integrity and stature in demonstrating the theme, and would not add substantial meaning to a serial nomination. Additional research would be necessary to pursue this aspect of convictism further.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1790-1814?</td>
<td>Queensborough Station</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>a few stone chimneys. Private land.</td>
<td>Key surviving buildings include the old and new Military Barracks, the Commissariat Store, Government House, a number of cottage quarters, the crank mill, pier store, boat houses, and convict gaol and barracks walls, as well as a number of other sites.</td>
<td>Varman 1985c, Kerr 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790-1850</td>
<td>Cascade Station</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>work station</td>
<td>ruins, some partly intact walls, private land</td>
<td>incorporates the Phillipsburgh First Settlement site</td>
<td>Varman 1985c, Kerr 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820-1850</td>
<td>Longridge Station</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>some buildings altered and in use, some ruined buildings. On private land. Part of area buried beneath airport runway.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varman 1985c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788-1814/1825-1855</td>
<td>Kingston and Arthurs Vale, Norfolk Island</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>Penal Establishment</td>
<td>Many buildings survive from Second Settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerr 1984a; Wesley 1994;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW SOUTH WALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1788-</td>
<td>Pinchut Island (Fort Denison)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>prison</td>
<td>destroyed by construction of Fort Denison</td>
<td>extensively excavated, museum on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788-1845</td>
<td>First Government House, Sydney</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>administration</td>
<td>archaeological site, actively managed site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790-1820</td>
<td>Parramatta convict housing</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict housing</td>
<td>archaeological site, excavated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791-1803</td>
<td>Toongabbie Government Farm</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>originally convict huts and farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-11</td>
<td>Castle Hill Agricultural Establishment</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>substantially altered, archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804-</td>
<td>Newcastle Penal Settlement</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Unknown (see Lumber Yard, Newcastle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809-18</td>
<td>Lane Cove Saving Establishment</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (sawing)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Convicts places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1811-</td>
<td>Rum Hospital</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict hospital</td>
<td>two sections survive as the NSW Parliament House and the Mint</td>
<td>Completed 1816.</td>
<td>Kerr 1984:36-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814-30</td>
<td>Emu Plains Farm</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Agricultural Establishment</td>
<td>Building substantially altered, condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-</td>
<td>Brownlow Government Stock Station</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-</td>
<td>Mount York Road Camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-26</td>
<td>Cawdor Stock Station</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-28</td>
<td>Bathurst Government Stock Establishment</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>substantially altered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-32</td>
<td>Glenroy Stockade, Harley</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816-31</td>
<td>Pennant Hills Saving Establishment</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>works camp (sawing)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-</td>
<td>Canterbury Farm</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>substantially altered, archaeological site unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-</td>
<td>Liverpool Road Timber Camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (timber)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-1832</td>
<td>Thornleigh Sawing Establishment</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (sawing)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-20</td>
<td>Carters Barracks, Sydney</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict barracks</td>
<td>demolished</td>
<td>held barracks, lumber yard and stables complex, plus a mill and two treadmills. The design of convict barracks at Windsor, Parramatta and Carters barracks were similar. Converted to Female Refuge Society 1840s.</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:52-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-20</td>
<td>Convict Barracks, Parramatta</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict barracks</td>
<td>demolished 1935</td>
<td>The design of convict barracks at Windsor, Parramatta and Carters barracks were similar</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:52-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819-20</td>
<td>Convict Barracks, Windsor</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict barracks</td>
<td>demolished</td>
<td>The design of convict barracks at Windsor, Parramatta and Carters barracks were similar</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:52-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grose Farm</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epping Sawing establishment</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (sawing)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Bottom Stockade, Concord</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>Maria River Lime Camp, Kempsey (a.k.a. Pipers Creek Kilns)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (limeburning)</td>
<td>structures partly intact, archaeological site</td>
<td>Lime kilns intact</td>
<td>Thorp 1987, Pearson 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parramatta Park convict cottages</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict cottages</td>
<td>archaeological sites within public park area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molong Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Factory, Parramatta</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>female factory and barrack</td>
<td>Fragments survive only</td>
<td>Greenway design</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rooty Hill Government Farm</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convict barracks, Port Macquarie</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict barracks—two periods.</td>
<td>demolished (both)</td>
<td>Details of first (1825) barracks unknown. New Barracks built 1837, to house 'specials' and invalids remaining.</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devines Hill Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site, managed passively</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987, Karskens 1984, Karskens 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisemans Ferry Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site, structures partly survive, managed passively</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987, Karskens 1984, Karskens 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bong Bong Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1840?</td>
<td>Liverpool Convict Hospital</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>survives in altered form, as Liverpool Technical College</td>
<td>Greenway design</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:38-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Ballalaba Station Convict Barracks</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>assigned convict barracks</td>
<td>partially intact structure</td>
<td>Also called Nithdale. Possibly a convict barracks, but not beyond doubt</td>
<td>Jeans 1984, Connah 1988, Altenburg 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Bowenfels Work Camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Bulls Camp, Woodford</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>substantially altered, archaeological site</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Great North Road</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>convict built road</td>
<td>intact</td>
<td>Karskens 1984, Karskens 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Illawarra Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Strathallan Station convict barracks</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>claimed assigned convict barracks</td>
<td>partially intact structure</td>
<td>Traditionally held to be a private convict barracks, but much more likely to have been a store building only</td>
<td>Jeans 1984, Connah 1988, but see Altenburg 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Wollongong Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (harbour works)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-35</td>
<td>Mount Victoria Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-35</td>
<td>Bowlers Bridge Stockade, Liverpool</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-35</td>
<td>Lumber Yard, Newcastle</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (timber and road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site, owned by Newcastle Council</td>
<td>Thorp 1987, Bairstow 1987; RNE Database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-35</td>
<td>Lansdowne Bridge camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (bridges)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-37</td>
<td>Georges River Road Gang Camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-37</td>
<td>Green Hill Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>stockade (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-39</td>
<td>No. 2 Cox's River Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site; public land; passively managed</td>
<td>part-excavated 1995</td>
<td>Rosen 1994, Pearson 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-40</td>
<td>Pennant Hills Quarry</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>works camp (quarry)</td>
<td>unknown condition, substantially altered</td>
<td>Used as a magazine and barrack site, stone quarried by convicts, and convicts housed after 1834 in portable houses within stockade.</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833-40</td>
<td>Hassans Walls Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>three wings, built on the inspector system, with visual inspection of cell-fronts able to be carried out from a central position.</td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834-42</td>
<td>Parramatta Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>works camp</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834-43</td>
<td>Marulan Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>archaeological site, substantially altered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Myrtle Creek Road Camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-37</td>
<td>Seventeen Mile Hollow Camp, Springwood</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-7</td>
<td>Berrima Road Station</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>demolished/destroyed</td>
<td>radial design with seven two-storey (altered to three storey) wings ranged around a separate central observation point. Original design altered by adding a floor and creating an open floor to roof gallery down the centre of each wing, with cells arrange</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a; 1988:41-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-41</td>
<td>Darlinghurst Gaol</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Gaol</td>
<td>substantially altered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Torm 1984a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-</td>
<td>Hartley Courthouse</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>administration and detention centre</td>
<td>structure intact, actively managed. External cell block demolished</td>
<td>Courthouse and cells centre for district convict administration.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-41</td>
<td>Port Macquarie Gaol</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>gaol</td>
<td>demolished 1917</td>
<td>three radial wings and a range of wards along the front which did not radiate from the centre. The plan does not comply with the Inspector's system, and is a modification of an 1826 design, similar to that used for Berrima.</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:100-101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-</td>
<td>Woolloomooloo Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838-42</td>
<td>Towrang Stockade, Goulburn</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>structure partly survives, archaeological site, passively managed</td>
<td>archaeological site, magazine, cemetery, Bridge and culverts on road nearby built by convicts from the stockade.</td>
<td>Thorp 1987; RNE database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-</td>
<td>Cooks River Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-57</td>
<td>Cockatoo Island Convict Station</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp, prison,</td>
<td>substantially altered, survives in part</td>
<td>Extant structures: 1839 Guard Room and kitchen; 1839 grain silos; 1839 prisoners barracks; 1840-2 Biloela superintendents quarters; operated as secondary offences prison for NSW from 1841, prison transferred from convict to civil admin after 1840s.</td>
<td>Thorp 1987, Kerr 1984b, 1984a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Campbelltown Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Harpers Hill Stockade, Newcastle</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>South Head Road Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-45</td>
<td>Maitland Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-</td>
<td>Pennant Hills Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-49</td>
<td>Blackheath Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>substantially altered, archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987, Lavelle 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Darlinghurst Gaol Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Duck River stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Gibralter Road Gang Camp, Mittagong</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Iron Cove Shell Gang</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (shell burning)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Mount Clarence Stockade</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Pulpit Hill Work Camp</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>work camp (road gang)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>Stonequarry Creek Cattle Station, Cawdor</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-</td>
<td>The Oaks Government Cattle Station, Cawdor</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>agricultural establishment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorp 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824-29</td>
<td>Fort Dundas, Melville Island</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>archaeological site, passively managed</td>
<td>settlement with convict workers, though not a penal establishment.</td>
<td>Crosby 1978, Connah 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828-39</td>
<td>Convict Barracks, Moreton Bay</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>convict barracks</td>
<td>demolished</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829-36</td>
<td>Female Factory, Brisbane</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>female factory</td>
<td>overbuilt by GPO. Survival of archaeological remains appears unlikely.</td>
<td>Operated as Female Factory until increased numbers and proximity to male convicts caused move to Eagle Farm site.</td>
<td>Sparkes 1992; Kerr 1984a:116;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-39</td>
<td>Female Factory, Eagle Farm</td>
<td>Qld</td>
<td>female factory</td>
<td>possible archaeological site beneath airport runway.</td>
<td>Site was agricultural establishment 1829-33, then Eagle Farm Womens Prison 1836-39. The original Brisbane Female Factory was on the GPO site, 1829-36. Moved to Eagle Farm for greater room and distance from Brisbane.</td>
<td>RNE Database; Sparkes 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803-04</td>
<td>Risdon Cove</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>archaeological site, largely disturbed, managed actively</td>
<td>first European settlement in Tasmania</td>
<td>McGowan 1985; Connah 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Anglesea Barracks, Hobart</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>military barracks</td>
<td>Largely intact and still managed as an army establishment. Building date from 1818 (hospital).</td>
<td>Oldest military establishment still operating in Australia. Provided military base for the supervision of the convict colony.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Hobart Gaol</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>convict gaol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerr 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASMANIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1803-04</td>
<td>Risdon Cove</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>archaeological site, largely disturbed, managed actively</td>
<td>first European settlement in Tasmania</td>
<td>McGowan 1985; Connah 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Anglesea Barracks, Hobart</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>military barracks</td>
<td>Largely intact and still managed as an army establishment. Building date from 1818 (hospital).</td>
<td>Oldest military establishment still operating in Australia. Provided military base for the supervision of the convict colony.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Hobart Gaol</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>convict gaol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerr 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Convicts places**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1826-27</td>
<td>Richmond Gaol</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>small gaol</td>
<td>intact</td>
<td>Small gaol for local control. Many forms of small gaol existed for both convict and civil control. Said to be Australia's oldest gaol.</td>
<td>Kerr 1984c:87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827-</td>
<td>Hobart Prisoners Barracks</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>convict barracks</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td>barracks for 400 men, with a treadmill</td>
<td>Kerr 1984c:77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-47</td>
<td>Bagdad Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-47</td>
<td>Pontville Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-47, 49</td>
<td>Bridgewater Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-49</td>
<td>Glenorchy Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-49</td>
<td>Oatlands Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-73</td>
<td>Eaglehawk Neck Guard Station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>guard station</td>
<td>Military Quarters and garden survive, in altered state</td>
<td>Weatherboard house built 1832 and only surviving building.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-</td>
<td>Tasman Peninsula</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>Penal Establishment</td>
<td>significant parts remain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834-49</td>
<td>Point Puer Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-</td>
<td>Ross Bridge</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>bridge</td>
<td>intact</td>
<td>bridge built by, and decorated by, convict artisans</td>
<td>Byrne 1976, Connah 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-39</td>
<td>Snake Banks Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-49</td>
<td>Campbell Town Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-44</td>
<td>Perth Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>Several buildings survive.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990; RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838-50</td>
<td>Pilton Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-45</td>
<td>Lovely Banks Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-47</td>
<td>Cleveland Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-48</td>
<td>Old Wharf Probation station, Hobart Town</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-51</td>
<td>Ross Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-41</td>
<td>Greens Pond Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-42</td>
<td>Sandy Bay Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-?</td>
<td>Paradise Probation Station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>Numerous stone building mounds, some walls to 1.5m high.</td>
<td>Private lands</td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:52-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-42</td>
<td>Flinders Bay Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td>plan in Brand 1978:67</td>
<td>Brand 1990; Brand 1978:67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-44</td>
<td>Slopen Island Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td>Plan in Brand 1978:77</td>
<td>Brand 1990; Brand 1978:77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-48</td>
<td>Fingal Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station and hiring depot</td>
<td>The structures still standing: Superintendent's Quarters (extended as modern residence); the hospital (occupied as residence); overseer's apartments (now vacant). These are built of brick. Rest of site shows archaeological crop-marks.</td>
<td>Western edge of Fingal town, off Esk Highway. On Private Land. Important site in remains and design of probation building. Plans and maps in Parham &amp; Noble.</td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:21-28, Brand 1990:255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-48</td>
<td>Jericho Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>Probation Station survives as two sections of standing pise wall, which are protected by a modern shelter roof and fence. Rest of area—archaeological remains known. Standing ashlar stone cottage nearby is the Superintendent's Cottage, recently restored</td>
<td>Located 40 s-w of junction of Old Midlands Highway and Mud Walls Road. Plans in Parham &amp; Noble.</td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:12-20, Brand 1990:22; McGowan 1984,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-48</td>
<td>Jerusalem Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Convicts places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-48</td>
<td>Rocky Hills Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>One building reported as being used as a barn, other in 'advanced state of decay'</td>
<td>plan in Brand 1990. Clover-leaf form station.</td>
<td>Brand 1990; RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-48</td>
<td>Southport Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>No extant structures, site ploughed over time, archaeologically very disturbed</td>
<td>Plans in Brand and Parham &amp; Noble.</td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:9-11; Brand 1990:226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-50</td>
<td>Saltwater River Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>survives in altered condition</td>
<td>early design to implement separation system and three classes. Plan in Brand 1978:89</td>
<td>Kerr 1984:136-7; Brand 1990; Brand 1978:89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-51</td>
<td>Brown's River Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-44</td>
<td>Seven Mile Creek Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>考古证据，保留建筑平台。 面积被严重破坏的重型伐木车辆。</td>
<td>On private land</td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:34-7; Brand 1990:226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-45</td>
<td>Wedge Bay Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-47</td>
<td>St Mary's Pass Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>No above ground remains. Covered by modern road and housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:40-3; Brand 1990:226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-50</td>
<td>Darlington Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5. Convicts places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1843-44</td>
<td>Long Marsh Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>buildings and dam said to be in ruins (1980)</td>
<td>Station established at dam site to build dam, remains of which are 20m high, building said to be in ruins, and pathways visible</td>
<td>Brand 1990; RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843-47</td>
<td>Deloraine Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>Built over by commercial area of Deloraine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:47-8; Brand 1990:225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843-49</td>
<td>Parson's Pass Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843-50</td>
<td>Dynnyrne Nursery Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843-51</td>
<td>Ross Hiring Depot</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>hiring depot</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-47</td>
<td>Hope Island Probation Station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>Four extant structures of random rubble construction, and a well, and dry stone walls. All in serious disrepair/semi-collapse.</td>
<td>On Hope Island off Dover.</td>
<td>Parham &amp; Noble 1994:63-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-47</td>
<td>Kerry's Lodge Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-47</td>
<td>Oyster Cove (Earlley's Inlet) Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerr 1984:138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-48</td>
<td>Antill Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-48</td>
<td>New Norfolk Royal Engineers Depot</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>engineers depot</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-50</td>
<td>Anson Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-</td>
<td>Campbell Street Probation station, Hobart Town</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-46</td>
<td>Mersey Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-47</td>
<td>Nichol's Rivulet Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-47</td>
<td>Port Cygnet Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-48</td>
<td>Long Point Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-48</td>
<td>Lymington Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-</td>
<td>Falmouth Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-</td>
<td>Forge Probation station, Hobart Town</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-</td>
<td>Macquarie Plains Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-</td>
<td>New Town Hiring Depot</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>hiring depot</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-</td>
<td>Woolpack Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-47</td>
<td>Western Tiers Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-48</td>
<td>Avoca Bridge Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-48</td>
<td>Hamilton Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-51</td>
<td>Launceston House of Correction (female)</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>female factory</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td>cruciform design separate prison.</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:93-4; Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-</td>
<td>Buckleman's River Bridge Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-</td>
<td>Huon Island Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-49</td>
<td>New Norfolk Invalid Depot</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>invalid depot and lunatic asylum</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td>A series of wards opening onto three sides of a central courtyard. Lunatic asylum added 1831</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a:69, 77; Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1847-49</td>
<td>Dromedary Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-49</td>
<td>Spring Hill Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-</td>
<td>Port Arthur Separation Prison</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>Pentonville model prison</td>
<td>partly intact, partly ruined</td>
<td>Modified Pentonville model, operating under much more severe management style</td>
<td>Kerr 1988:64-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-55</td>
<td>Ross Female House of Correction</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>house of correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-51</td>
<td>Tunbridge Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-51</td>
<td>Cocked Hat Hill Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-51</td>
<td>St Peter's Pass Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>Dunrobin Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-51</td>
<td>Gordon River Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-</td>
<td>Douglas River Probation station</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>probation station</td>
<td>condition unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-55</td>
<td>Ross Female Factory</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>female factory</td>
<td>archaeological site owned by the state &amp; administered by NPWS. One standing cottage remains. Located corner of Bard and Portugal Streets.</td>
<td>Plan in Truscott 1985:9</td>
<td>Truscott 1985: Brand 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-</td>
<td>Port Arthur Penitentiary</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>penitentiary</td>
<td>Survives as ruined shell. Actively managed</td>
<td>Built on classification system, upper floor converted to separate cage system.</td>
<td>Kerr 1988:58-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829-</td>
<td>Cascade Female Factory, Hobart Courthouse</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>Female factory</td>
<td>Wall around factory survives</td>
<td>A severely administered female prison and work centre.</td>
<td>Aitkinson &amp; Aveling 1987:283-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-50</td>
<td>Military Officers Quarters, Eaglehawk Neck</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>Military housing/ administration</td>
<td>survives altered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Convicts places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1831-77</td>
<td>Port Arthur Penal Establishment</td>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>penal settlement</td>
<td>Partly intact, actively managed</td>
<td>Built to replace Macquarie Harbour, abandoned in 1833. First permanent buildings built 1833-44.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803-</td>
<td>Sullivan's Bay</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>archeological site, no extant remains</td>
<td>very short lived convict-supported settlement (2 months)</td>
<td>Coulls 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826-28</td>
<td>Corinella, Western Port Bay</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>settlement</td>
<td>archaeological site, no extant remains, investigated at length in unsettled remains</td>
<td>short lived convict-supported settlement (15 months)</td>
<td>Coulls 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-43</td>
<td>Port Phillip Gaol</td>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>convict gaol</td>
<td>State remains, investigated at length in settlement (15 months)</td>
<td>Similar three-storey design used at several other country locations</td>
<td>Kerr 1984a: 106-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of convict usage</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type of place</th>
<th>Condition / Status</th>
<th>special features / notes</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851-</td>
<td>Commissariat store, Fremantle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>commissariat store for Convict Administration</td>
<td>survives modified</td>
<td>now Maritime Museum</td>
<td>AHC 1989; Campbell 1979:92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-</td>
<td>Terraced warden's houses, Fremantle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>civil housing</td>
<td>survive intact</td>
<td>7-41 Henderson Street</td>
<td>AHC 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-1886</td>
<td>Fremantle Prison (The Convict Establishment)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>prison, Pentonville model</td>
<td>substantially intact, actively managed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerr 1988:65-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-73</td>
<td>Residency, Albany (Hiring Depot)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>civil housing, Superintendent of hiring station, Convict Hiring Depot</td>
<td>survives altered</td>
<td>Superintendent's house and administration building for Albany Hiring Depot</td>
<td>AHC 1989. RNE database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of convict usage</td>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type of place</td>
<td>Condition / Status</td>
<td>special features / notes</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-56</td>
<td>Lynton Convict Hiring Depot</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>hiring depot</td>
<td>survives as a series of ruins and historical archaeological sites. Bobycoat et al describes the condition of each with photos and plans as at 1982.</td>
<td>near Northhampton (35km n-w). Consists of quarters, commissariat store, dpeot, bakehouse, blacksmith's shop, lockup, hospital, limekiln, cottage, and officer's house, plus other minor structures.</td>
<td>Bodycoat et al 1982; Lilley &amp; Gibbs 1983; Campbell 1979:97; RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-56</td>
<td>Guildford Commissariat Store</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Hiring Depot Commissariat</td>
<td>Building survives, as commercial property.</td>
<td>Other buildings in Guildford were built by convicts, but for colonial use.</td>
<td>AHC 1984:6/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>Pensioners cottage, Bussendean</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>pensioners cottage</td>
<td>survives intact. Used for storage.</td>
<td>Built for Pensioner guard John Law Davies.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-68</td>
<td>Fremantle Lunatic Asylum and Invalid Establishment</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Lunatic and Invalid depot</td>
<td>survives intact, though modified.</td>
<td>built to house both convict and civil lunatics and invalids.</td>
<td>Campbell 1979:101; Kerr 1988:69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862-</td>
<td>Convict Hiring Depot, Toodyay</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>hiring depot</td>
<td>survives with some alteration. Actively managed as Newcastle Gold Museum.</td>
<td>became police station 1898.</td>
<td>RNE Database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theme "transportation of civil and military criminals, political exiles and 'vagabonds' to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a mechanism for the control of law and order in the home state" could be addressed in several ways. One approach might be to select a small number of prominent places which demonstrate the major aspects of the use of transportation as a sentence of deterrence. These include:

- places of primary housing of transported convicts, such as Hyde Park Barracks, and Fremantle Prison which demonstrates the theme after the introduction of the Pentonville system;

- places of secondary punishment, such as Kingston on Norfolk Island and Port Arthur

A tentative assessment is that Fremantle Prison, Kingston, Port Arthur and Hyde Park Barracks are all integral to the theme, in that they each are outstanding examples of different aspects of convict control and its use as a deterrent to crime in the home state. None by itself adequately demonstrates the theme, but in combination they reflect the major aspects of the theme that are of outstanding universal significance. The development of penal philosophy, and its demonstration in some of the places suggested here and below, is important in that it reflects changing attitudes to transportation as a deterrent and a reforming process, an issue central to the understanding of the theme.

An alternative approach might be to see the whole convict establishment as exemplifying the theme, and seek to represent in as few places as is feasible the range of convict administration and experience that existed in Australia. For the purposes of further assessment, the places included in this list would include:

- First Government House, representing the administration by Britain of both the convict and associated free settlement of the colony;

- Hyde Park Barracks and Fremantle Prison, representing the control of convicts working on public works;

- Cockatoo Island Convict Station, Sydney, representing the second stage of more separated control of convicts on public works;

- Wisemans Ferry and Devines Hill Stockades and the Great North Road, NSW, representing gang-labour systems and the work achieved in establishing transport and communication systems in the colony;

- Probation station in Tasmania (possibly Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or Ross Probation Station), representing later development in the use of convict labour for public work, reflecting changing penal philosophies;

- Kingston on Norfolk Island, and Port Arthur/Tasman Peninsula, representing places of secondary punishment, the extreme extension of the severity of the transportation system;

- Hartley Courthouse, NSW, or Lynton Hiring Depot, WA, representing the local administration of road-gangs, assigned and ticket-of-leave convicts and their free masters.

- a place or a landscape (such as near Braidwood, or in Tasmania) otherwise representing the assignment system and the integration of convict administration with the free colony.
Of these, First Government House, Hartley Courthouse, Lynton Hiring depot, and the assignment place or landscape are seen as being peripheral to the global theme. They do not add so substantially to the understanding of the global theme that their absence from a serial nomination would be a serious omission. Hyde Park Barracks, Cockatoo Island, the Wiseman's Ferry/Great North Road sites, and a probation station are assessed as being integral to the theme, addressed in this way, as they demonstrate clearly important aspects of the experience of convict control, and would make a serial nomination more clearly demonstrative of the role of the Australian experience in understanding the global theme.

The theme "transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a strategic tool of colonialism and the expansion or maintenance of regional spheres of influence" could be represented by places that demonstrate strategic motives on the part of the British. Places include:

- Kingston and perhaps other first settlement sites on Norfolk Island, representing the extension of the NSW penal settlement to Norfolk Island to secure access to the assumed resources of timber and flax to be found on the island;

- First Government House Site, Sydney, representing the planting of a British penal colony in the Pacific, as a strategic base of potential importance in accessing the China trade and the resources of the Pacific.

- some Tasmanian convict site, possibly in Hobart, to represent the settlement of Tasmania, in response to perceived French interest in Van Diemen's Land;

In the context of this theme, Kingston is assessed as being essential to it, being able in its own right to demonstrate the use of convict transportation as a tool of strategic colonisation. First Government House requires more assessment—it is certainly an important symbol of British colonialism, but its associations with convictism as such are less apparent than in the case of Kingston. While comparative overseas examples are not able to be individually assessed in this context by the consultants, the places identified here clearly represent the particular history of British colonialism and convictism in the Pacific region, which is an integral component of the global theme. As yet no place has been identified that clearly demonstrates the response to the French interest in Tasmania.

From this discussion, it is recommended that the following places be assessed further in the following sections of this study:

- Wiseman's Ferry and Devine's Hill Stockades, NSW, and the section of the Great North Road between them, representing the use of convict gang-labour in establishing a transport and communication system in the colony; (addressing theme 1 and 2)

- a Probation station in Tasmania (possibly Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or the Ross Probation Station), representing later development in the use of convict labour for public works, and changing penal philosophies; (addressing theme 1 and 2)

- Hyde Park Barracks, demonstrating the primary housing of transported convicts; (addressing theme 2)

- Fremantle Prison demonstrating the theme of treatment of convicts after the introduction of the Pentonville system; (addressing theme 2)
• Cockatoo Island Convict Station, Sydney, representing the second stage of more separated control of convicts on public works; (addressing theme 2)

• Port Arthur/Tasman Peninsula, representing places of secondary punishment, the extreme extension of the severity of the transportation system; (addressing theme 2)

• Kingston and perhaps other first settlement sites on Norfolk Island, representing the extension of the NSW penal settlement to Norfolk Island to secure access to the assumed resources of timber and flax to be found on the island (addressing theme 3); and the second settlement places demonstrating secondary punishment (addressing theme 2)

• First Government House Site, Sydney, representing the planting of a British penal colony in the Pacific, as a strategic base of potential importance in accessing the China trade and the resources of the Pacific. (addressing theme 3)

These places have to be assessed in terms of their authenticity and management before they are assessed against the World Heritage Criteria. This is addressed in Section 6 and 7.
6. AUTHENTICITY AND MANAGEMENT

The requirements of the World Heritage Convention regarding the authenticity and management of places raises a number of general issues. While this report is not a study of the Convention itself, it is important to briefly identify and discuss these general issues.

6.1 ISSUES OF AUTHENTICITY AND MANAGEMENT

Authenticity

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention state that,

'A monument, group of buildings or site...will be considered to be of outstanding universal value for the purpose of the Convention [if] it meets one or more of the following criteria and the test of authenticity. Each property nominated should therefore...

(b) (i) meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components (the Committee stressed that reconstruction is only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture)."

This test of authenticity raises a number of issues with regard to the assessment of any place for the World Heritage List. These issues are discussed below.

Nara Document on Authenticity

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in association with other parties produced this document in 1994. It is the result of a process which, perhaps, represents the first major review of the concept of authenticity by the international heritage conservation community since the Charter of Venice (1964). The Document was conceived specifically with regard to the World Heritage test of authenticity although it may also apply to all levels of conservation.

The document states that,

'9. Conservation of cultural heritage...is rooted in the values attributed to the heritage. Our ability to understand these values depends, in part, on the degree to which information sources about these values may be understood as credible or truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning, is a requisite basis for assessing all aspects of authenticity...

11. ...heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong...
13. Depending on the nature of the cultural heritage, and its cultural context, authenticity judgements may be linked to the worth of a great variety of sources of information. Aspects of these sources may include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external aspects of information sources.

The basic intention of the Document is to re-focus consideration of authenticity given different and equally valid cultural approaches to conservation. For example, these approaches may value historic fabric or traditional activities. The test of authenticity is related to the ability of a heritage place to credibly and truthfully convey information about cultural heritage values. Such information may reside in a variety sources. The values, information sources and judgements about authenticity must all be understood or made within the cultural context of the place.

The Document may be regarded as shifting the focus of authenticity from a narrow view of the fabric of place as the sole or major repository of cultural values to a broader view of place as one source of information, and possibly not the most important source of information about cultural values.

**Definition of Authentic - Reconstruction based on complete and detailed documentation of the original versus Conjecture**

In general terms, the concept of authenticity includes that which is, 

'reliable, trustworthy; of an undisputed origin, genuine...'

In the context of the *Nara Document on Authenticity* it seems clear that a similar concept applies. The phrasing used is as follows.

'...the degree to which information sources about these [cultural] values may be understood as credible or truthful...'

In their book regarding World Heritage cultural places, Feilden and Jokilehto describe authenticity as,

'...materially original or genuine (as it was constructed) and as it has aged and changed in time. Authenticity derives from the definition of the resource, and so authenticity may be understood in different ways depending on the context of its historical significance...historical authenticity should generally reflect the significant phases of construction and utilization in different phases of its historical time line."

In cases where reconstruction has taken place, the *Operational Guidelines* contrast authenticity with conjecture. The *Operational Guidelines* refer to,

'...reconstruction... [being] only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture.'

While the contrast with conjecture seems straightforward, the reference to reconstruction and to 'the original' design, material, workmanship or setting of a place raises other issues. Reconstruction in the context of the *Operational Guidelines* must not be confused with its use in the Australian conservation context. Reconstruction is not defined in the *Operational Guidelines*. To confuse matters somewhat, the likely international reference to consult for its definition, the *Venice Charter*, does not refer to
reconstruction but to restoration. In Australia, the Burra Charter defines reconstruction as follows.

1.8 Reconstruction means returning a place as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the fabric. This is not to be confused with either recreation or conjectural reconstruction which are outside the scope of this Charter.

The concept of an original design or other original aspects indicates an overly simple characterisation of heritage places. It suggests that places may have one original and therefore culturally significant state. In reality, many heritage places are the result of a layering of history, of use and change, and it is the values related to this layering which is important. It would therefore be inappropriate to automatically focus attention on the original state and ignore the values related to later uses and changes. Feilden and Jokilehto make a similar point.

This issue is not the core of the matter to which the Operational Guidelines refers in this sub-paragraph. It is a secondary though still important matter. The Nara Document on Authenticity re-focuses consideration of this matter by referring to,

'Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning, is a requisite basis for assessing all aspects of authenticity....'

In other words, authenticity is not just a matter of considering the original state but also the subsequent state or characteristics of a heritage place which may also have meaning.

Authenticity of Materials and Workmanship

These two aspects of authenticity are specifically identified in the Operational Guidelines. One related issue is the use of original materials and workmanship techniques in later work affecting a place compared to modern or non-traditional materials and techniques. While original materials and techniques provide a higher level of authenticity, it has been suggested that, in the context of conservation or restoration activity,

'...the use of modern or non-traditional materials [and techniques] may be justified in the interests of long-term conservation.'

In other words, authenticity may not be prejudiced by the use of modern or non-traditional materials and techniques.

Another issue arises with regard to the growth or change of a place over time as part of ongoing cultural processes. At what time, if ever, do non-original or non-traditional materials and techniques become part of the significant story of a place and therefore of heritage value?

Authenticity of Setting

The test of authenticity can be readily understood with regard, for example to a house if its values relate to its design. The values reside in the physical expression of the design, the stone, the windows, the roof and so on. The values are confined to the house itself and its boundaries are clear. However, the concept of the setting of a place may be open to several interpretations.

In a strict sense, the setting of a place may be considered similar to the example given above about a house. If the values of a place also reside in its setting, such as the
garden of a house, then the boundaries of the setting can be accurately defined. The authenticity of the setting is therefore related to the cultural values within a known area.

However, the setting of a place may have another interpretation which is not based on the central and identified values of a place but rather on a more general aesthetic set of values. Care needs to be exercised regarding the setting of places to ensure the values of the setting considered are those which are central to the place.

The loss by a place of its historic setting does not seem to be a sufficient reason for a place to fail the test of authenticity.

'Should they [places] have been excluded [from the World Heritage List] because their settings were inappropriate? The ICOMOS view has been in favour of inclusion, for reasons connected with the properties themselves: their qualities are so high that they should be considered independently of their settings...'

On the other hand, if it is possible to conserve an appropriate setting for a place,

'...ICOMOS has invariably recommended inscription conditional upon the definition of an adequate buffer zone around the property.'

**Authenticity of Function**

In addition to authenticity of material, workmanship and setting, ICOMOS also considers authenticity of function. This aspect is not identified in the Operational Guidelines. However, the scope of its consideration is not clear and appears to be limited to non-building or non-structural fabric associated with places. For example, function is equated with the plant and equipment associated with an industrial place and not just the industrial building itself.

**Condition and Integrity**

In the context of Australian conservation activity, the terms condition and integrity are commonly used rather than authenticity. Documents relating to Australian places considered as part of this project are therefore more likely to refer to condition and integrity.

In a general sense the terms integrity and authenticity may be considered similar. Integrity is commonly understood as the degree of physical intactness of a place in relation to its original or significant state. This can be complicated where there are many layers of history, use or fabric. While integrity has been commonly associated with the fabric of places, as the range of heritage values of places are being better understood so integrity is increasingly being associated with non-fabric aspects of places.

Condition is commonly understood as the physical state of preservation of the fabric of a place.

**Ruinous Places or Sub-Surface Remains**

Places which are in ruins or exist only as sub-surface remains challenge the lay understanding of authenticity as applied to historic places. This contrasts with those places which are standing and apparently complete buildings or structures. In these latter cases it may be thought that such places are authentic while ruins are not.
However, given the preceding discussion it is clear such perceptions must be tested by an understanding which reaches beyond appearances. Places which are ruins or exist only as sub-surface remains may be authentic both regarding the information about cultural values which they convey as well as in terms of design, material, workmanship or setting. Such places may or may not be less authentic than if they were standing buildings or structures.

It must be noted in contrast that standing and apparently complete buildings or structures may not be authentic either regarding the information about cultural values which they convey or in terms of design, material, workmanship or setting. This is the point of the qualification about reconstruction contained in the Operational Guidelines.

Management

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention state that,

'A monument, group of buildings or site...will be considered to be of outstanding universal value for the purpose of the Convention [if] it meets one or more of the following criteria and the test of authenticity. Each property nominated should therefore...

(b) (ii) have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural property or cultural landscapes. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level or well-established traditional protection and/or adequate management mechanisms is therefore essential and must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws and/or management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of cultural sites, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.'

These management requirements raise a number of issues with regard to the assessment of any place for the World Heritage List. These issues are discussed below.

Assessment of Management

The effective management of heritage places potentially covers a wide range of topics. Accordingly, the assessment of the adequacy of heritage place management in the context of the World Heritage Convention may have to consider this range of topics depending on the place nominated. The following list of topics has been drawn from Feilden and Jokilehto to indicate the matters that may have to be assessed. The list may not be comprehensive for all possible places and the topics are not in priority order.

• Management objectives for the place
• Management planning based on an understanding of the place in the broader physical, planning and economic context
• Statutory context
• Non-statutory context
- Convict Places and World Heritage Report -

- A full inventory and documentation of the buildings and their contents, or site and landscape
  - the significance of the place is documented and understood
- Minimum appropriate level of maintenance
- Visitor management
- Interpretation
- Research planning
- Facility development
- Administration
- Review of the management plan
- Information management
- Personnel
- Resource programming including cost control

**Protection and Management Mechanisms**

Such mechanisms may take a wide variety of forms. The *Operational Guidelines* refer to legal and traditional forms however, there are other ways in which heritage places are managed.

In the Australian context, management may take place within a legal framework which might be general in nature, such as a general heritage Act, or place specific such as legislation to establish an authority to manage a particular place. While such legislation establishes the broad objectives for place management, it rarely provides the level of detail necessary for effective management. Traditional management is also undertaken where places continue in some traditional use.

There is a third major form of management which relates to conservation management. There are a large number of heritage places which are not in traditional management and for which legislation either does not apply or offers only very general guidance. Such places may be subject to detailed conservation management which draws upon the philosophical and practical framework of the *Burra Charter*. This management usually results in the preparation of a conservation management plan.

All of these mechanisms suggest an active form of management. However, in many cases the conservation of heritage values and places may be satisfactorily achieved by passive conservation. This may include remote places where no action is necessary to ensure conservation.

**Conservation of the Nominated Cultural Property or Cultural Landscape**

The management objective identified in the *Operational Guidelines* is, '...to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural property or cultural landscapes.' More specifically, it is the outstanding universal values of such places that are to be conserved. Therefore, in assessing the adequacy of management it is necessary to
consider the extent to which management mechanisms have identified outstanding universal values and provided for their conservation.

Another related matter which management must address satisfactorily is public access.

Legal Mechanisms

Legal mechanisms are likely to be adequate if they include provisions for the identification of cultural values, especially outstanding universal values, and their conservation. In this context, conservation provisions may include an objective requiring the conservation of cultural values as well as strategies for achieving this.

Strategies may include the review of development proposals affecting a place, a requirement for conservation management planning, monitoring the condition and integrity of a place, a mechanism for funding conservation, and an ability to require conservation action and stop potentially damaging actions.

Traditional Mechanisms

Traditional mechanisms are likely to be adequate if they are well-established and achieve the conservation of cultural values, especially outstanding universal values. The identification of cultural values may not be necessary on the part of those undertaking traditional activities however, it must be demonstrable that the conservation of values is inherent in the activities.

Effective Implementation

The Operational Guidelines stress the need for assurances that management mechanisms are or will be effectively implemented. This forms part of the assessment of the adequacy of management. Not only must mechanisms be theoretically adequate, they must achieve in practice their conservation intent.

Boundaries

While the definition of appropriate boundaries for a place is not referred to specifically in the clause dealing with cultural criteria for World Heritage nominations, it is an important related matter. Indeed, the Operational Guidelines are largely silent on this matter.

Some guidance is offered regarding cultural landscapes and this may be considered in relation to other cultural places.

'40. The extent of a cultural landscape [or indeed any cultural place] for inclusion on the World Heritage List is relative to its functionality and intelligibility. In any case, the sample selected must be substantial enough to adequately represent the totality of the cultural landscape that it illustrates.'

The definition of boundaries raises an issue related to the values of a place and its appropriate management. If the values of a place are well understood then identifying an appropriate boundary should be straightforward. However, multiple land ownership and differing forms of management and use regarding one heritage place may complicate the determination of the boundary.

For example, an extensive heritage place may have several owners, government and private, and the place may be used for a variety of purposes, some perhaps related to conservation but others may not be. Accordingly, there may be differing management regimes, only some of which may have a conservation objective. Determining the boundary of the place requires a reconciliation between the heritage values, which may
be extensive, and more limited areas whose management fulfils the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.

Limitations on the Assessment of Authenticity and Management

The assessment of authenticity and management as part of this project suffer two problems. The first is obtaining adequate and current information about these aspects. The second problem is the changes that may take place, both in the fabric of the place and its management, in the time between preparing this report and, if appropriate, the preparation of a nomination. While every effort has been made to gather adequate and current information within the constraints of the project, it must be realised that some information is not readily available, and the information obtained will have to be checked close to the time of any nomination.

6.2 AUTHENTICITY OF AUSTRALIAN PLACES

The process of assessing places for World Heritage nomination is an iterative, not a lineal one. While the assessment of authenticity is placed here in the report, the ability to assess authenticity of a place requires the identification of aspects of the place which might be of World Heritage value, which is done by applying the World Heritage Criteria in Section 7. Hence the assessment provided in Section 7 is the underpinning to some of the following discussion.

The following sub-section provides an assessment of the authenticity of the places identified in Section 5 as likely to be part of a World Heritage nomination. The structure of the sub-section reflects the three identified themes of outstanding universal value. Theme 2 has two options, one which focuses on a few sites as symbolising the convict experience, and a second which identifies more places which would demonstrate more fully the scope of the theme. After the description for each theme, further brief explanatory text is repeated followed by a list of the identified places. Comments are provided for each place under the following headings.

- Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship
- Authenticity - Values

The separation of the comments on authenticity into the component parts of fabric and values reflects the discussion above about the current Operational Guidelines and the change in emphasis in the Nara Document on Authenticity. In the following text RNE refers to information from the Register of the National Estate database.

Theme 1: transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise distant places for the immediate or long-term economic benefit of the home state

Demonstrated through convict places related to the development of the colonial infrastructure and assistance to settlers to achieve self-sufficiency and then create export commodities.

Wiseman's Ferry and Devine's Hill Stockades, NSW, and the section of the Great North Road between them, representing the use of convict gang-labour in establishing a transport and communication system in the colony. The values of the place relate to its ability to demonstrate the use of convict gangs to extend the transport infrastructure of the colony, and to demonstrate the work practices and living conditions under which the convict labourers existed in order to undertake such work.
• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.

Wiseman's Ferry Stockade - buildings in ruins and sub-surface archaeological sites are comprised of fabric largely authentic to the period of the operation of the stockade. The design and setting of the stockade can be interpreted directly from the surviving fabric.

Devine's Hill Stockade - sub-surface archaeological site is comprised of fabric largely authentic to the period of the operation of the stockade. The design and setting of the stockade can be interpreted directly from the surviving fabric.

Great North Road - almost in original form. (RNE) Condition varies - some parts heavily rutted and damaged because of recent use, retaining wall has fallen in places and the inlets of four culverts blocked. Otherwise reasonably preserved. Track overgrown in parts. (Comber 1991:30)

• Authenticity - Values

Wiseman's Ferry Stockade and Devine's Hill Stockade - The stockade sites have the ability, through archaeological research and interpretation of extant remains, of demonstrating the living conditions of the convict labourers in an authentic way. The evidence has been subject to attrition by decay and some disturbance, but still has substantial archaeological integrity.

Great North Road - appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme. It demonstrates in surviving fabric the extension of the transport system and the work practices which utilised convict labour.

A Probation Station in Tasmania (possibly Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or the Ross Probation Station), representing later development in the use of convict labour for public works, and changing penal philosophies. The value of the probation stations named is their ability to demonstrate the development of the probation system to facilitate closely-controlled public works.

• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.

Cascade - relatively undisturbed, only comparatively complete probation station in Tasmania on one property. Standing buildings are in poor condition, but are largely intact. Other buildings are represented by archaeological sites.

Saltwater River - current condition and authenticity of fabric unknown.
Ross - western half of Ordnance Store reconstructed, Barracks restored. (RNE)

- Authenticity - Values
  Cascade - appears moderately to highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.
  Saltwater River - Current information insufficient
  Ross - Current information insufficient

Theme 2 (Option A): transportation of civil and military criminals, political exiles and vagabonds to overseas or otherwise distant places as a mechanism for the control of law and order in the home state

A small number of prominent places which symbolise the use of transportation as a sentence of deterrence.

Hyde Park Barracks and Fremantle Prison as places of primary housing of transported convicts, the latter demonstrates the theme after the introduction of the Pentonville system.

- Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.

Hyde Park Barracks - The masonry walls are original, with some reversal of bricks as a conservation process. Internal timbers and floors are original, with introduced engineered support systems to provide additional structural support. Original roof was of timber shingles but is now corrugated iron. The main barracks building is intact and fully demonstrates its design features. Parts of the surrounding structures have been removed over time. The building complex has been conserved.

Fremantle Prison - largely intact, the 1856 hospital in the north-east corner of the compound has sympathetic additions built in 1900, the circa 1856 old workshops in the south-east corner are much modified but still part of the wall system. Post convict structures include the circa 1890 women's prison and the 1900 new workshops. There is likely to be archaeological evidence of the demolished new division block of 1908 to the north of the main building. Almost all the major blocks of original buildings are intact. (RNE) Most of the convict fabric is intact, as are later developments which have not altered the appearance or integrity of the original. Some internal spaces have been altered. (Hoare et al 1990:64)

- Authenticity - Values
  Hyde Park Barracks - appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme. In particular, the spaces occupied by convicts are intact.
Fremantle Prison - appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

Kingston on Norfolk Island and Port Arthur as places of secondary punishment. The values of these places lies in their ability to demonstrate the range of activities and structures associated with secondary punishment penal settlements.

- **Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.**

  Kingston - large group of standing buildings from the convict era, some modified during the Pitcairn period. (RNE) Extensive landscape of sub-surface remains, ruins and standing structures. The landscape of the settlement is able to be directly related to that of the convict era. Extensive conservation work has seen gutted buildings re-roofed and internally restored. The many buildings, landscape elements, and the absence of later constructions, makes the design features of the settlement very obvious.

  Port Arthur - many buildings remain either intact or as ruins. (RNE) Extensive landscape of sub-surface remains, ruins and standing structures. Some post-convict structures exist in the site, but the original design and setting is apparent.

- **Authenticity - Values**

  Kingston - appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

  Port Arthur - appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

**Theme 2 (Option B): transportation of civil and military criminals, political exiles and vagabonds to overseas or otherwise distant places as a mechanism for the control of law and order in the home state**

An alternative might be to see the whole convict establishment as exemplifying the theme, and seek to demonstrate in as few places as is feasible the range of convict administration and experience that existed in Australia.

**Wiseman's Ferry and Devine's Hill Stockades, NSW, and the section of the Great North Road between them**, representing the use of convict gang-labour in establishing a transport and communications system in the colony.

- **Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.** see above

- **Authenticity - Values** appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

**A Probation Station in Tasmania (possibly Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or the Ross Probation Station),** representing later development in the use of convict labour for public works, and changing penal philosophies.
• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship. see above
• Authenticity - Values appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

**Hyde Park Barracks**, demonstrating the primary housing of transported convicts.

• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship. see above
• Authenticity - Values appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

**Fremantle Prison**, demonstrating the theme of treatment of convicts after the introduction of the Pentonville system.

• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship. see above
• Authenticity - Values appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

**Cockatoo Island Convict Station**, Sydney, representing the second stage of more separated control of convicts on public works.

• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.
  Complex was unusually complete for a convict barracks; former hall almost intact; despite their roofless state these two buildings, the Military Guard Room and separate kitchen, are in sufficient state of preservation to be recognisable for their former usage; Barracks complex - north east and north west wards have been converted for use as air raid shelter; Officers guard room now much added to. (RNE) Ten components of the penal period have been identified and further documentary analysis of the authenticity of these components is possible (using Department of Housing and Construction no date).

• Authenticity - Values The values of the place seem to be able to be authentically reflected by the surviving fabric.

**Port Arthur/Tasman Peninsula**, representing places of secondary punishment, the extreme extension of the severity of the transportation system.

• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship. see above
• Authenticity - Values appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

**Kingston on Norfolk Island**, second settlement places demonstrating secondary punishment.

• Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship. see above
Theme 3: transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise distant places as a strategic tool of colonialism and the expansion or maintenance of regional spheres of influence

Represented by places that demonstrate strategic motives on the part of the British.

Kingston and perhaps other first settlement sites on Norfolk Island, representing the extension of the NSW penal settlement to Norfolk Island to secure access to the assumed resources of timber and flax to be found on the island. This theme is represented only by the archaeological remains of the First Settlement (all remaining extent structures relate to the second settlement).

- Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.
  
  Archaeological sites and landscape elements can be interpreted to reflect the First Settlement.

- Authenticity - Values
  
  Archaeological remains are authentic evidence of the First Settlement at several sites. In some cases the sites have been built over by Second Settlement structures, while in others the archaeological sites have not been redeveloped.

First Government House Site, Sydney, representing the planting of a British penal colony in the Pacific, as a strategic base of potential importance in accessing the China trade and the resources of the Pacific.

- Authenticity - materials, design, setting and workmanship.
  
  Archaeological remains of FGH building constructed 1788 and alterations and additions 1794, 1801, 1811, 1818, 1826-1845. Demolished 1846-47. Foundation plaque discovered 1899. Other works include roads from 1840's; terrace houses 1870's; excavation in February-March 1983 and subsequently reveals footings, drains and other artefacts. (RNE). Site now conserved beneath a plaza forecourt of a museum building.

- Authenticity - Values
  
  Only known physical evidence from first year of mainland colonial settlement. (RNE) Appears highly authentic in its ability to convey information about this theme.

6.3 MANAGEMENT OF AUSTRALIAN PLACES

The following sub-section provides an assessment of the management of the places identified in Section 5 as likely to be part of a World Heritage nomination. In 6.2 above, the individual places were placed into their thematic framework, reflecting the three identified themes of outstanding universal value. This section identifies the
management situation of each of the places listed in 6.2. Comments are provided for each place indicating management issues (including ownership, legal protection, management use and purpose, conservation planning and implementation).

**Wiseman's Ferry and Devine's Hill Stockades, NSW, and the section of the Great North Road between them.**

Wiseman's Ferry Stockade - owned by NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service (State Government) - Legal protection - classifiable as a relic and therefore protected under the *Heritage Act 1977*. Able to be gazetted as an Historic Sites under NPWS Act, but not yet so gazetted. Management - a draft Conservation plan is believed to exist - Implementation - NPWS intentions are unknown.


Great North Road - Section of road subject of this proposal is owned by NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service as part of Dharug National Park. - Legal protection offered historic relics under *NPWS Act 1974* on Parks land, also classifiable as a relic and therefore protected under the *Heritage Act 1977*. Management - as part of Dharug National Park. A draft Conservation plan believed to exist, as well as a Management Plan for Dharug National park. - Implementation - Unknown. (Comber 1991: 1 and 31)

**A Probation Station in Tasmania (possibly Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or the Ross Probation Station).**


**Hyde Park Barracks and Fremantle Prison**


Kingston and other first settlement sites on Norfolk Island, and Port Arthur


other first settlement sites on Norfolk Island - ownership mixed, some Commonwealth, others private freehold. Legal protection, Commonwealth owned property under *Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975*, private property under Norfolk Island planning act. No active management of sites outside Kingston/Arthurs Vale Area. No conservation plans exist.


Cockatoo Island Convict Station, Sydney,


**SUMMARY**

In summary, all of the places identified appear to satisfy the requirement of authenticity in terms of both their materials, design, setting and workmanship, and their values. All but two of the places are in public ownership and protected by government management and by heritage legislation sufficient to satisfy the requirement for responsible management of World Heritage nominated places. The two exceptions are two of the Tasmanian probation stations, which are in private ownership. The extent to which these places might be protected under new heritage legislation enacted late in 1995 has yet to be ascertained. Satisfactory management control, such as necessary for nomination, may prove not to be feasible.
7. AUSTRALIAN CONVICT PLACES—OF WORLD HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE?

7.1 THE WORLD HERITAGE CRITERIA FOR CULTURAL PROPERTIES

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention state that,

'A monument, group of buildings or site...will be considered to be of outstanding universal value for the purpose of the Convention if it meets one or more of the following criteria and the test of authenticity. Each property nominated should therefore:

(a) (i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; or
(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, monumental arts or town-planning and landscape design; or
(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilisation which is living or which has disappeared; or
(iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; or
(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; or
(vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the World Heritage Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances or in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural);

and

(b) (i) meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components (the Committee stressed that reconstruction is only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture).
(ii) have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural property or cultural landscapes. The existence of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level or well-
established traditional protection and/or adequate management mechanisms is therefore essential and must be stated clearly on the nomination form. Assurances of the effective implementation of these laws and/or management mechanisms are also expected. Furthermore, in order to preserve the integrity of cultural sites, particularly those open to large numbers of visitors, the State Party concerned should be able to provide evidence of suitable administrative arrangements to cover the management of the property, its conservation and its accessibility to the public.' (UNESCO 1995, paragraph 24.)

In this context,

'Monuments' are architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings, and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

'groups of buildings' are groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

'sites' are works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view.

(UNESCO 1995:6-8)

Outstanding Universal Value

The fundamental concept of the World Heritage List is to identify places of outstanding universal value. The extract from the Operational Guidelines provided above includes the criteria for determining whether a place has such value. While not wishing to detract from the full text of the criteria, it is useful to focus on the key phrases in the criteria which help define outstanding universal value. These phrases are as follows (emphasis added).

- masterpiece of human creative genius
- important interchange of human values
- unique or at least exceptional testimony
- outstanding example...which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history
- outstanding example...which is representative of a culture

7.2 Applying the World Heritage Criteria to Australian Convict Places

Australian convicts places consist of buildings (or 'monuments' in the wording of the Criteria), groups of buildings and sites. In some cases a distinctive landscape has been created. The analysis of convictism on an world-wide scale, and its manifestation in
Australia, indicate that it represents a distinctive and significant stage or phase in human history, relating to the growth of human populations, particularly in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the expansion of global colonial and trading empires by European powers. The appropriate World Heritage Criterion to apply to Australian convict places therefore appears to be Criterion (iv)—'outstanding example(s) of a type of building or architectural ensemble or landscape which illustrates significant stage(s) in human history'. The degree to which particular places can be said to be 'outstanding examples' has then to be determined.

The following discussion takes the places identified as significant to global convict transportation themes in Section 5, and found to satisfy the requirements of authenticity and secure management discussed in Section 6 and considers them in the light of the World Heritage Criteria. In line with the assessment model described at 1.2, it is necessary to distinguish those places which are essential to the understanding of the global convict transportation theme, from those places that are integral or peripheral to its understanding. Places that are essential to the understanding of the global theme might be considered for nomination to the World Heritage List in their own right, while those that are integral to it might form part of a group or serial nomination. Places that are peripheral to the themes may well be of great national importance, but do not have outstanding universal value in demonstrating the global themes.

In order to satisfy the World Heritage Criteria, it is necessary to demonstrate that the places assessed are authentic, and have adequate management regimes in place to guarantee their protection. Of the 10 places or areas identified in Section 5 as being essential or integral to themes of outstanding universal value, all but two are legally protected and subject to a management mechanism that is capable of satisfying the 'management' filter applied in Section 6. The exceptions, at this stage, are the probation stations on the Tasman Peninsula, which are in private ownership with, as far as is known, no legal protection, and with no established management mechanisms that would satisfy the World Heritage Criteria. They are included in this assessment, however, as the legal and management status could change before any nomination was presented for consideration.

Only one of the places identified is assessed as likely to satisfy Criterion (iv) in its own right—that is Kingston on Norfolk Island. Kingston is assessed as essential to the understanding of themes of universal significance, and is an 'outstanding example of an architectural ensemble and landscape which illustrate a significant stage in human history'. However, the outstanding universal value of the Australian chapter in the global story is better told by a combination of a number of places that reflect integral parts of the overall picture.

A fuller picture of the outstanding universal value of convict places in Australia in demonstrating the global themes would be presented through a serial nomination. Such a nomination would include Kingston and a number of places which are integral to the understanding of the outstanding universal value of the series. Based on the discussion in Section 5 above, the places which would make up a series nomination are:

- Kingston on Norfolk Island
- Port Arthur, Tasmania
- Fremantle Prison, Western Australia
- First Government House Site, Sydney,
- Wiseman’s Ferry and Devine’s Hill Stockades, and section of the Great North Road, NSW.
• an outstanding Probation Station site in Tasmania (either Cascade and Saltwater River on Tasman Peninsula, or the Ross Probation Station),
• Hyde Park Barracks, Sydney
• Cockatoo Island Convict Station, Sydney,

In combination these eight places are a series which demonstrates in an outstanding way all three of the themes identified in this study as being of outstanding universal significance. These themes coincided in a period of time from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, and define the characteristics of a significant stage in world history, namely the expansion of European nations reflecting major population growth and economic/technological advances, which led to colonialism and the forced movement of people to satisfy the needs of geo-political expansion and control within the home state.

The eight-place series (counting the Tasmanian probation station(s) as one place) is an outstanding collection of buildings, ensembles and landscapes which illustrate one major component of this stage in human history, that of convict transportation. Though British in its detail, in clearly representing the three themes of outstanding value, the series reflects in an outstanding way aspects of human experience common to all convict transportation systems throughout this stage of human history.

Specific information about each of these places is provided in Appendices 1-8. For the preparation of a series nomination this information would have to be re-worked into a single nomination.

7.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PURSUING WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION

This study has indicated that a number of Australian convict transportation places merit nomination to the World Heritage List, either in their own right or, preferably, as part of a series nomination.

A number of places already on the World Heritage List were listed specifically for, or are coincidentally associated with, aspects of the topic of the forced movement of people. These are listed in the table below. However, convict transportation has not been a singled out as one of the themes of outstanding universal value so far considered in these listings.

Table 6. World Heritage Listed places relating to the forced movement of people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Place</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of Listing</th>
<th>Cultural Criteria</th>
<th>World Heritage Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auschwitz Concentration Camp</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Testimony to important historical event. Focus on mass killings carried out under Nazi regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place and Condition</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forts and Castles - Volta, Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Most characteristic examples of European fortified trade ports in the tropics, historically important for their role in pre-colonial European/African trade, and an important role in the slave trade in the 18th century and in the 19th century in its suppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island of Goree</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>History associated with slave trading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fortaleza and San Juan Historic Site</td>
<td>USA (Puerto Rico)</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Highly characteristic examples of important architectural and engineering developments including technology transfer from Europe to the Americas. Association with events of exceptional historical significance. No mention of slavery or convicts other than complex includes a prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Havana and its Fortifications</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>iv and v</td>
<td>Architectural merit, the most impressive historic city centre in the Caribbean. No mention of slaves or convicts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is based on a variety of documents including World Heritage nominations, ICOMOS assessments, the minutes of World Heritage Bureau and Committee meetings, and Swadling (1992). However, the documentation available was not comprehensive for all places.

It is **recommended** that the Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories further document the places identified in this report as potentially meriting nomination, and pursue further the various consultative processes required to ensure a smooth nomination process, and to satisfy the World Heritage Committee's requirement for guaranteed protection through verified management processes.
8. WHERE TO FROM HERE?

8.1 GAPS IN INFORMATION

In the course of the project it became clear that certain information relating to the establishment of various contexts was not readily available. Obtaining this information is highly desirable. These areas of further work are described below.

- Information about Places in other Countries - in particular: confirming the absence of sites in the USA; and establishing the existence, nature and authenticity of sites in Malacca, Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Confederation of Independent States. Preliminary approaches are being made to a number of authorities in these places seeking current information.

- Information about Places in Australia - relating to work camps and other small-scale convict sites, especially their survival, authenticity and management. In particular, obtain the complete study of Tasmanian probation stations.

- Information about Places in Australia - consolidated information about places relating to convict assignment.

8.2 ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR A NOMINATION

If a World Heritage nomination is to be prepared then certain additional information will be needed. In part, this is foreshadowed in Section 6. The gaps identified in 8.1 above also need to be addressed, and filled where they are critical to supporting the World Heritage context of the nomination. The further assessment of some places will hinge on additional documentation, as they are relatively poorly described in the readily available literature.

Some of the places suggested for further consideration in this report are more tentative than others, and will have to be more fully assessed when additional documentation and liaison with the States is in hand. These places include, in particular, the Tasmanian probation stations, and Cockatoo Island and First Government House in NSW.

The current management circumstances of each place that might be part of a series nomination will have to be documented at the time of nomination. This will require cooperation from State land management and heritage authorities. Boundaries of nominated places, both delimiting the extent of the significant area and the area under direct management and legal protection would be part of the documentation at this stage. It is very difficult to define boundaries as a result of the current desk-top study.

Documentary material, additional to that located during this study, will most likely become available through liaison with the manager of the property. This material needs to be integrated into the nomination information, and properly referenced. Current maps and plans would be best collated at this stage.

Site-specific information such as current condition descriptions and up-to-date photographs would have to be gathered through liaison with the managers of places, and/or site visits.
8.3 ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION REQUIRED BEFORE NOMINATION

The liaison between the Commonwealth and the States and Territories is clearly a matter in which the Department is far more experienced than the consultants, and the Department will, it is presumed, map out the nature of State/Commonwealth liaison at the appropriate stage. Issues that the consultants consider important to address in this consultative process have been provided separately to the Department.
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APPENDICES

DOCUMENTATION OF PLACES FOR POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION
APPENDIX 1

DOCUMENTATION OF PLACES FOR POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION

KINGSTON AND ARTHUR'S VALE HISTORIC AREA, NORFOLK ISLAND

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for the World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion, illustration and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. SPECIFIC LOCATION

1(a) Country
Australia

1(b) State, Province or Region
Norfolk Island Territory

1(c) Name of Property
Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area (KAVHA)

1(d) Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates
Norfolk Island is located approximately 1676 km east-north-east of Sydney, in the South Pacific Ocean at Latitude 29°04' south and longitude 167°57' east.

2. JURIDICAL DATA

2(a) Owners
Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area (KAVHA) is owned by the Commonwealth of Australia, and administered by a Management Board with equal representation by the Commonwealth of Australia and the government of the Norfolk Island Territory.

2(b) Legal Status
Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area (KAVHA) is a Commonwealth Crown Reserve

2(c) Responsible Administration
Senator the Hon. John Faulkner
Minister for the Environment, Sport and Territories
Parliament House
Canberra 2601

Mr Stuart Hamilton
3. IDENTIFICATION

3(a) Description and Inventory

No major buildings were constructed during the First Settlement, the convicts and guards being housed in many small buildings. These were burnt when the settlement was abandoned, so that no extant buildings survive from this period, though several significant archaeological remains exist, including the original 1788 Government House foundations.

The Second Settlement establishment was centred at Kingston, and was arranged with the military and civil accommodation on the inland side of the coastal flat, and the convict barracks and gaol on the foreshore. An area of swampy land lay in between. This planned layout is reflected in the surviving arrangement of buildings at the site.

The remaining standing buildings and substantial ruins at Kingston include:

- Old Military Barracks (1829+)
- Commissariat Store (now All Saints Church) (1835)
- New Military barracks (1836)
- Government House (1829+)
- 9 cottages providing quarters for military and civil officers (1832-47)
- perimeter walls and archaeological remains of Prisoner's Barracks (1828-48)—includes the Protestant Chapel, which has been reconstructed.
- perimeter walls and archaeological remains of the New Prison ('Pentagonal Prison') (1836-40, 1845-7)
- ruins of the Hospital, built on First Settlement remains (1829)
- Surgeon's Quarters and kitchen, on site of First Settlement Government House (1827)
- Landing pier (1839-47)
- beach store (1825)
- Settlement guard house, on foundations of First Settlement building (1826)
- Crank Mill (1827-38)
- Royal Engineer Office and stables (1850)
- double boat shed (1841)
- Police Office (now boatshed) (1828-9)
- flaghouse (1840s)
- Constable's quarters, partly standing (1850-53)
- Blacksmiths shop (1846)
• salt house (1847)
• windmill base (1842-3)
• cemetery (1825-present)
• many stone walls, wells, drains, building platforms and archaeological sites of former buildings.

3(b) Maps and/or plans

Extensive maps and plans of areas and individual buildings are available through the AHC Library and Australian Construction Services, Sydney office. All conservation works have been extensively documented by archaeological, historical and architectural recordings, as is reflected in the bibliography.

The boundary of the KAVHA reserve would be an appropriate management boundary for the place.

3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation

An extensive photographic record of the place exists in these reports and in the photograph collection of the AHC and Australian Construction Services, Sydney office.

3(d) History

Norfolk Island was first settled as a penal settlement in 1788, abandoned in 1814, and re-settled in 1825 until 1855.

FIRST SETTLEMENT

The most convincing motive for the settlement of Norfolk Island, within weeks of the First Fleet arriving in Sydney in 1788, is that the British administration believed the tall pine trees and flax observed by Cook on the island could provide a possible regional supply of naval materials to support the Royal Navy in the Indian / South-East Asian region, and that the French had their eyes on the same resource. Without such an explanation it is very difficult to suggest a motive for settling such a remote location with such urgency. (see Frost 1994).

Lieut. Phillip Gidley King in the Supply established a settlement at what was first called Sydney (renamed Kingston during the Second Settlement) and commenced cutting Norfolk Island pine, experimenting with the cultivation of flax, and establishing agricultural areas to support the colony. The early buildings were timber framed and weatherboard clad. The First Settlement was simply an extension of the main NSW convict settlement, and not, as it was during its second settlement, a place of secondary punishment.

The settlement grew slowly, but by 1791 numbered 1,172 convicts, and two new agricultural settlements had been established, at Charlotte's Field (soon renamed Queensborough, often shortened to Queensboro') and Phillipsburgh in 1790. No major buildings were constructed during the First Settlement, the convicts and guards being housed in many small buildings. The settlement was abandoned in 1814, and the buildings fired, so that no extant buildings survive from this period, though several archaeological remains exist, including the original Government House foundations.
SECOND SETTLEMENT

Norfolk Island was re-settled in 1825 as an establishment for the secondary punishment of convicts who had committed crimes while in the colony after their transportation there. At this time the penal settlements at Maria Island and Moreton Bay were also established, and those at Sarah Island and Port Macquarie had been in operation for only a few years. Port Arthur was to follow in 1830. This development of penal settlements marked a period of more severe, and more closely administered, convict punishment, especially for secondary offenders, which resulted from the Bigge Reports findings. Governor Darling summed up the attitude to the purposes of the settlement by stating that "My object was to hold out that settlement as a place of the extremest punishment short of death...".

As transportation to NSW ceased in 1840, Norfolk Island began receiving convicts direct from England, as well as secondary offenders from the mainland. This period coincided with a change in penal philosophy, with experiments in more humane treatment with a view to reformation through punishment and exposure to moralising influences. On Norfolk Island this was represented by the reign of Alexander Maconochie as commandant from 1840-44, but the experiment was ultimately ineffectual.

Norfolk Island was finally abandoned as a penal settlement in 1855, the remaining convicts being relocated to Port Arthur. (Kerr 1984a; Clive Lucas Stapleton and Partners 1988; Wesley 1994). The island was re-settled in 1856 when the descendants of the Bounty mutineers were re-located from Pitcairn Island.

3(e) Bibliography

See annex.
All conservation works have been extensively documented by archaeological, historical and architectural recordings, as is reflected in the bibliography section of the report. Most of these documents are readily available through the AHC Library. The key document is the Norfolk Island: Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area: conservation management plan, compiled in 1988 by Clive Lucas Stapleton & Partners for Australian Construction Services and the Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area Management Board. This document summarises the history of the place and its component parts, and assess them in a rigorous manner

4. STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION

4(a) Diagnosis

The First Settlement is represented by archaeological sites, several of which have been studied. Some Second Settlement buildings were built on top of First Settlement structures, and the earlier foundations incorporated into the later structure, while other sites are largely undisturbed by later developments.

27 buildings or groups of connected buildings from the Second Settlement have been conserved ('reconstructed' in Burra Charter terms). Many other buildings and landscape modifications exist as archaeological sites, and other features such as road alignments, culverts, drains and the cemetery survive. All of the extant buildings within the Kingston site are Second
Settlement structures, the only modern structures being a toilet block and dressing shed at Emily Bay beach. The Kingston landscape retains much of the form given it during the Second Settlement period.

4(b) Agents responsible for preservation / conservation

Same as 2(a)

4(c) History of preservation / conservation

The majority of these buildings lacked roofs, but had walls standing to full height, by the 1960s. Restoration occurred from the late 1960s through to the present day. In addition, approximately ten ruined buildings or substantial perimeter walls (as in the case of the New Gaol and Prisoners Barracks) have been stabilised.

4(d) Means of preservation / conservation

The Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area (KAVHA) is managed by a Management Board comprising members representing the Commonwealth and Norfolk Island Territory governments. The Commonwealth and Norfolk Island governments provide funds for the conservation and management of the KAVHA area.

4(e) Management Plans

A comprehensive Conservation Management Plan was adopted in 1988, which forms the basis for all works within the KAVHA area.

5. JUSTIFICATION

5(a) Cultural Property

The Kingston and Arthur's Vale Historic Area is nominated [as part of a serial nomination] for inscription on the World Heritage List as an outstanding example of a type of architectural ensemble and landscape illustrating significant stages in human history (Criterion (iv)).

The analysis of convictism on a world-wide scale, and its manifestation in Australia, indicate that it represents a distinctive and significant stage or phase in human history, relating to the growth of human populations, particularly in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the expansion of global colonial and trading empires by European powers.

Kingston can be interpreted in the context of two of the global themes. The first theme, "transportation of civil and military criminals, political exiles and 'vagabonds' to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a mechanism for the control of law and order in the home state", is reflected in the operation of the Second Settlement as a place of secondary punishment, the extreme expression of the severity of the transportation system. Norfolk Island was a place of extreme punishment, but perhaps more importantly, was represented as such to the convict population of NSW, and, together with Port Arthur, became accepted in Britain as representative of the severity of the fate facing any convict transported to Australia. In this context, the horror of Norfolk Island was used as a tool in the control of crime in Britain and Ireland.
The second global theme, "transportation of unfree labour to overseas or otherwise-distant places as a strategic tool of colonialism and the expansion or maintenance of regional spheres of influence" is reflected in the First Settlement of Norfolk Island as a principal component of the NSW penal settlement in order to secure access to the assumed resources of timber and flax on the island, thought to be vital to Britain's strategic positioning in the Pacific and Indian Ocean regions. The Norfolk Island settlement is assessed as being essential to this theme, as it is a very clear demonstration of the application of the theme to British convictism and colonialism, Britain being one of the four European powers involved in convictism in this period. The only other British penal settlement that might be essential to the theme is Singapore, in the Straits Settlements, which post-dates the Norfolk Island settlement by 40 years.

The buildings and landscape of Kingston can be interpreted as an 'outstanding example of an ... architectural ensemble ...[and]... landscape which illustrates significant stage(s) in human history', in that they constitute an authentic place which is essential to the understanding of the global themes. In this context, it is believed that Kingston is eligible for World Heritage listing both in its own right, and as an element of a series nomination.
APPENDIX 2

DOCUMENTATION OF POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION PLACES

PORT ARTHUR AND THE TASMAN PENINSULA

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. SPECIFIC LOCATION

1(a) Country

Australia

1(b) State, Province or Region

Tasmania

1(c) Name of Property

Port Arthur Historic Site and Coal Mines Historic Site.

1(d) Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates

Port Arthur and the Coal Mines are located on the Tasman Peninsula in south-eastern Tasmania. Port Arthur is located at latitude 43°09' south and longitude 147°51' east, and the Coal Mines at latitude 42°57' south and longitude 147°42' east.

2. JURIDICAL DATA

2(a) Owners

Port Arthur and the Coal Mines are both owned by the Tasmanian Government. The management of Port Arthur is the responsibility of the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, and the Coal Mines the responsibility of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

2(b) Legal Status

Both the Port Arthur and Coal Mines Historic Sites are crown land reserves.

2(c) Responsible Administration

The Hon. John Cleary MP
Minister for National Parks and Wildlife
Parliament House
Hobart
Tasmania
3. IDENTIFICATION

3(a) Description and Inventory

At Port Arthur, buildings which remain standing or as substantial ruins include:

- Commandant's House (1830s)
- Guard Tower (1835)
- Church (1836)
- Hospital (1842)
- Penitentiary (1844, converted 1854-7)
- Asylum (1864-8)
- Model Prison (1848-52)
- 'Lithend' dockyard cottage (1841)
- Medical Officer's House (c.1847)
- Commissariat Officers House (c.1845)
- Roman Catholic Chaplain's House (c.1843)
- Assistant Surgeons House (1848)
- Pauper's Mess (1865)
- Overseer's Cottage (1858)
- Smith O'Brien's Cottage (1847)
- 'Sunnybanks' shipwright's house (1830s)
- Court house and library (1848)
- Tower Cottages (1854)
- C of E Chaplains House (1842)
- Government Cottage (1853-4)
- Point Puer Building Ruins
- Isle of the Dead Cemetery.
- Limekiln

The integrity and condition of the Probation Station sites at Cascade and Saltwater River is not known, though it is believed that substantial buildings and archaeological remains survive. At the Coal Mines substantial ruins of prisoners barracks, and coal mining remains survive. The Coal Mines site is documented in Bairstow and Davies 1987.

3(b) Maps and/or plans

A large collection of maps and plans is held by the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority. Copies of these maps and plans sufficient for a nomination may be available through the AHC.

3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation
A large collection of photographs is held by the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority. Photographs sufficient for a nomination may also be available through the AHC.

3(d) History

Port Arthur was established as a convict timber getting establishment in 1830, and as a penal settlement for secondary and special punishment in 1832. Between 1831 and 1836 about 7% of convicts were given secondary punishment. The Tasman Peninsula was a natural prison, having only one land access point, the narrow Eagle Hawk Neck, which was able to be strictly guarded. Prisoners from Sarah Island and Maria Island were transferred to Port Arthur, allowing the other penal settlements to be closed down. From 1833 Port Arthur and the Tasman Peninsula was the only exclusively penal settlement in Van Diemen's Land, housing convicts who had re-offended in the colony, those offending while on the voyage out, those sentenced for particularly atrocious crimes in Britain, and gentlemen convicts, who were kept separate from ordinary convicts in fear that with their greater education they might incite revolt. In 1833 a separate barracks was constructed on Point Puer for boy convicts, the numbers of which were increased after 1837, reaching 455 by the end of 1838. In 1842 Governor Franklin was instructed to 'assimilate the system of management at the juvenile establishment at Point Puer with that at Parkhurst Prison'. Parkhurst was a reformatory for criminal boys set up in Britain in the mid-1830s. B.J. Horne was sent out with a number of Parkhurst convicts to oversee this process.

By 1838 Port Arthur had become a significant industrial centre in the colony, producing shoes and other items, and coal from the Coal Mines on Tasman Peninsula. Ship building also became an important activity at Port Arthur, evidenced by the associated buildings and slipways which still survive. The settlement was extensively rebuilt in the 1840s and 50s, but retained the same basic layout. Some of the existing buildings relate to this later re-development, such as the Penitentiary (converted from a granary and mill 1854-57). This building development was in response to increasing numbers of convicts arriving in the colony, peaking at 5,329 arrivals in 1842.

Port Arthur remained a penal settlement, even though transportation to Tasmania ceased in 1853, receiving convicts returned from Norfolk Island when it was closed down, and housing the remaining convicts under sentence, invalid or insane. It finally closed in 1877, by which time at least 12,500 convicts had served sentences there.

The whole of the Tasman Peninsula was, in effect, a penal colony from the 1830s to the 1850s, and a number of Probation Stations were established there. The Cascade Probation Station on Tasman Peninsula (1841-56) has been identified by Kerr as perhaps the best example representing the intended conceptual approach to probation (Kerr 1984:133). The Saltwater River Probation Station is one of the earliest designs embodying all of Director of Probation System Forster's requirements to implement the new system. This 1843 addition to an earlier station was a predecessor of the clover-leaf model, the most evolved form of Probation Station to be designed. (Kerr 1984:136-7)

3(e) Bibliography
An extensive bibliography is provided as an annex.

4. **STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION**

4(a) **Diagnosis**

The integrity and condition of the Port Arthur and Coal Mines sites are well documented.

The integrity and condition of the Cascade and Saltwater River Probation Stations is unknown.

Cascade and Saltwater river Probation Stations are both on private land, are not protected by any heritage legislation, and are not actively managed.

4(b) **Agents responsible for preservation / conservation**

Same as 2(a)

4(c) **History of preservation / conservation**

A number of the buildings at Port Arthur have been restored since the 1970s, and others, notably the Penitentiary, are ruins that have been stabilised.

4(d) **Means of preservation / conservation**

Needs description of current PAHSMA and NPWS management activities for both places.

4(e) **Management Plans**

A Strategic Management Plan for Port Arthur was published in 1994.

5. **JUSTIFICATION**

5(a) **Cultural Property**

Port Arthur and the Coal Mines are an historical and architectural ensemble which merits inscription on the World Heritage List under criterion (iv) for cultural properties. Port Arthur, because of its particular history and the extent and range of surviving evidence, is the exemplary example of a convict secondary punishment settlement, matched only by Norfolk Island. This reputation was part of the common knowledge of the place, and in this respect was intended to, and indeed did, act as a deterrent to crime both in Britain and Ireland, and Australia. The fact that in reality only a relatively small proportion of convicts were ever sentenced to secondary punishment did not detract from the place establishing the enduring image of convictism for a large part of the British, colonial and international public mind.

Port Arthur demonstrates the evolution of one of the key aspects of the convict system as a tool to deter crime, the secondary punishment system. It grew to be the second largest convict establishment in Australia, after Norfolk Island, and reflects the changes in penal philosophy over the period of its growth. It also demonstrates the decline of the convict transportation establishment after transportation ceased, being the last
convict settlement to close down in 1877. It has a variety of residential buildings, ranging from the housing of the Commandant and civilian staff, through the cottage occupied by political prisoners, to the Penitentiary and the severe interpretation of the Pentonville penal system represented in the Model Prison. It has a number of surviving industrial buildings and sites, demonstrating the work of convict labour, including the dockyards and associated buildings, limekiln, and mill remains. The Coal Mines Historic Site is an industrial site detached from the main Port Arthur establishment.
FREMANTLE PRISON, FREMANTLE, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. SPECIFIC LOCATION

1(a) Country
Australia

1(b) State, Province or Region
Western Australia

1(c) Name of Property
Fremantle Prison

1(d) Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates
Fremantle Prison is located at latitude 32°03' south and longitude 115°45' east.

2. JURIDICAL DATA

2(a) Owners
Minister for Works, Western Australia.

2(b) Legal Status
Fremantle Prison is a crown reserve No. 24042. The place is also protected under the Heritage Act of Western Australia and the Australian Heritage Commission Act.

2(c) Responsible Administration
Minister for Works
Parliament House
Perth, Western Australia
Building Management Authority

3. IDENTIFICATION

3(a) Description and Inventory
The Fremantle Prison is an intact and until recently (1990) still operated as a prison. The building are therefore still all standing and in relatively good condition. Nearly all buildings are constructed from local limestone rock.

The transportation-era complex includes:

- the 1857 main cell block, chapel and wards
- walls, gate house complex and residences
- yards and refractory cells
- service building and hospital
- south-eastern workshops.

Later components include:

- Western Workshops (1900-01)
- New Division (1907)
- conversion of service building to female division and addition of an eastern range (1889-1909)

3(b) Maps and/or plans

The Building Management Authority of Western Australia has access to an extensive collection of map and plan material that could be drawn upon to support a nomination.

3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation

The Building Management Authority of Western Australia has access to an extensive collection of photographic material that could be drawn upon to support a nomination.

3(d) History

**Fremantle Prison** was built to the design of Comptroller General of Convict in Western Australia, Capt. E. Y. W. Henderson, based on the Pentonville model, as constructed at Portland Prison in Britain. Originally designed to have four wings, the final two-wing plan was approved in 1852, and completed in 1857. The final design was for four tiers of cells of the exceptionally small size of 7ft x 4ft. This small cell-size was because the cells were intended to be used for night time accommodation only, the convicts working outdoors during the day. In correspondence with Jebb, the British Controller of Prisons, designer of Pentonville and approver of the plans, Jebb indicated that the use of corrugated iron cell partitions (as at Portland Prison) would reduce cost and be easier to ventilate than stone cells. However, Henderson proceeded to build with stone, and retained the reduced cell size, which made the Fremantle cells cramped and poorly ventilated. (Kerr 1988:65-66; Kerr 1984:164-66).

The prison in Henderson's original proposal was to hold 570 men, 240 in 'association' (dormitory) rooms and 330 in separate cells. Jebb did not approve of 'association' rooms, but Henderson persisted. The chapel, detached in Henderson's plan, was now to be attached to the main wings, as at Pentonville. (Kerr 1984a:166). The prison passed from Imperial (British) to colonial (WA) management in 1886.

Fremantle Prison remained in operation until 1990, and is the most intact convict prison complex in Australia.
3(e) Bibliography

A bibliography for the place is annexed.

4. STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION

4(a) Diagnosis

Fremantle Prison is in an exceptionally intact form, due to 133 years of continuous use as a prison. While changes have occurred during that period, the substantial nature of the original construction, in limestone blocks, and the piecemeal nature of changes, has meant that the original underlying structure remains intact, or is readily reconstructed from surviving evidence, both physical and documentary. The decision to manage the prison as an historic reserve, the recognition of conservation of the heritage significance of the place as the underlying objective of management, and the application of state and national heritage legislation to the place, will ensure ongoing management that will conserve its World heritage values.

4(b) Agents responsible for preservation / conservation

Same as 2(a)

4(c) History of preservation / conservation

Fremantle Prison was in continuous use as a prison until 1990. Changes have occurred throughout the life of the prison, but the basic fabric is substantially intact, to the degree that it can be regarded as highly authentic in terms of the values ascribed to it.

Since 1990 the prison has been managed as an historic site, with public visitation and appreciation as the principle objective.

4(d) Means of preservation / conservation

Since 1990 the prison has been managed by Trustees under the guidance of the Building Management Authority. The objectives of the Reserve and the operation of the Heritage Act ensure management will continue to be directed towards conservation of the heritage values of the place.

4(e) Management Plans

A conservation plan was adopted in 1992, J. S. Kerr, Fremantle Prison: A Policy for its conservation, Building Management Authority.

5. JUSTIFICATION

5(a) Cultural Property

Fremantle Prison is an architectural ensemble which merits inscription on the World Heritage List under Criterion (iv). It demonstrates clearly one of the identified themes of outstanding universal significance, the forced transportation of convicts from Europe in order to control law and order in the home state. The prison epitomises the impact of the mid-nineteenth century penal reformers, who shaped the form of convict life in Australia.
and other British Colonies. The Prison is thought to be the fullest expression of the Pentonville Prison model in any of the British penal colonies, though further research is required to verify this claim.

The Prison represents the last period of convict transportation to Australia, and the fully developed British form of that movement. The Prison is the most intact convict-era prison in Australia, and allows the closest observation today of the true conditions in which many convicts served out their sentences in the nineteenth century.
APPENDIX 4

DOCUMENTATION OF POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION PLACES

HYDE PARK BARRACKS, SYDNEY

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. SPECIFIC LOCATION

1(a) Country
Australia

1(b) State, Province or Region
New South Wales

1(c) Name of Property
Hyde Park Barracks

1(d) Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates
Located at Queens Square, Sydney, at latitude 33°52' south and longitude 151°12' east.

2. JURIDICAL DATA

2(a) Owners
New South Wales State Government
(Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales)

2(b) Legal Status
Wholly owned by government and reserved for conservation.

2(c) Responsible Administration
Minister for the Arts
New South Wales Parliament
Sydney

Dr Peter Watts
Director
Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales
Sydney

3. IDENTIFICATION

3(a) Description and Inventory
Hyde Park Barracks is a three-storey brick building with a simple internal design, with a central corridor and cross corridor braking up the spaces into a series of large rooms, used for the accommodation of male convicts. The building was surrounded by an open yard, with a perimeter wall which incorporated offices, kitchens and rooms for staff, and pavilions at the corners incorporating cells. This perimeter wall and one pavilion survive on one side only. The building has a gabled roof with pediment decoration incorporating a clock and inscription commemorating Governor Macquarie's role in its construction. The symmetrical arrangement of windows and pilasters gives the building an elegant simplicity.

3(b) Maps and/or plans

The Historic Houses Trust and NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning have an extensive collection of maps and plans of the place.

3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation

The Historic Houses Trust and NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning have an extensive collection of photographs of the place.

3(d) History

Hyde Park Barracks was designed by the emancipist architect Francis Greenway, and built between 1817 and 1819. The building was one of the first in the Sydney area to exhibit an appreciation for architectural taste, reflecting Governor Macquarie's perception of the permanent nature of the colony. The barracks were intended to improve the degree of control over convicts working in the Sydney area, who had, previous to the completion of the barracks, been responsible for finding their own accommodation at nights, and hence were not under any supervision. The barracks housed up to 800 convicts, and was used as convict accommodation until 1848, by which time 8,000 convicts had passed through it. The building was subsequently used as a depot for immigrant women, from which they were hired out as domestic servants or married to local men. It also served as a poorhouse for destitute women. In the twentieth century the building housed a range of courtrooms and administrative offices. The barracks were extensively restored in the early 1980s, and stripped back to the original fabric for public display purposes.

3(e) Bibliography

The bibliography is provided in an annex.

4. STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION

4(a) Diagnosis

The barracks is now managed for its heritage values, and for public display. While substantial parts of the surrounding perimeter walls have been removed over time, sufficient remains to provide an understanding of the original design, and the main building has been conserved. Some of the rooms in the perimeter wall section have been converted for administrative and catering purposes, having been extensively modified by previous adaptations of the building.

4(b) Agents responsible for preservation / conservation
Same as 2(a)

4(c) **History of preservation / conservation**

Hyde Park Barracks was converted to use as courtrooms in the early twentieth century, and buildings gradually infilled the yard space between the barracks and the perimeter wall. New court and administrative buildings replaced the perimeter walls to the east and south-east, while part of the southern wall was removed to make way for road widening.

In the 1980s the building was resumed for museum purposes, and the twentieth century accretions were removed and the original fabric revealed and conserved. The building is now actively conserved as a museum and display space managed by the Historic Houses Trust of NSW.

4(d) **Means of preservation / conservation**

The Historic Houses Trust is responsible for the conservation of the building on behalf of the state government. Funds are provided from admission receipts and leasing of parts of the complex, and from HHT funding.

4(e) **Management Plans**

A Conservation Plan has been prepared for the main barrack building (Emmett 1990), and another is currently being prepared for the perimeter wall buildings (Clive Lucas Stapleton & Partners 1995).

5. **JUSTIFICATION**

5(a) **Cultural Property**

Hyde Park Barracks is the earliest surviving convict barrack building in Australia, and reflects the changing philosophy of control of convicts, which moved progressively towards greater supervision and restraint. The building is an outstanding example illustrating this development of convictism in Australia, part of the broader story of convict transportation which was a significant stage in world history. As such, Hyde Park Barracks merits listing under Criterion (iv).

As part of the series nomination, Hyde Park Barracks reflects the early moves to tighten control over convicts, so as to improve law and order and to better utilise the convicts on public works. Its handsome design, breaking away from the previous emphasis of purely functional design for public buildings, reflected Governor Macquarie's views of the permanence of the new colony, and its growth into a new period of expansion based on convict labour providing support for both government and private development.
APPENDIX 5

DOCUMENTATION OF POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION PLACES

FIRST GOVERNMENT HOUSE SITE, SYDNEY

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. **Specific Location**

   1(a) **Country**
   
   Australia
   
   1(b) **State, Province or Region**
   
   New South Wales
   
   1(c) **Name of Property**
   
   First Government House Site
   
   1(d) **Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates**
   
   Located at Bridge Street, Sydney, at latitude 33°52' south and longitude 151°12' east.

2. **Juridical Data**

   2(a) **Owners**
   
   New South Wales State Government
   (Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales)
   
   City of Sydney
   
   private landowner
   
   2(b) **Legal Status**
   
   Partly owned by local and state government and partly reserved for conservation.
   
   2(c) **Responsible Administration**
   
   Minister for the Arts
   New South Wales Parliament
   Sydney
   
   Dr Peter Watts
   Director
   Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales
3. IDENTIFICATION

3(a) Description and Inventory

Archaeological remains of the Government House built for Governor Phillip in 1788, immediately after the arrival of the First Fleet and the European settlement of Australia. Extensive foundations and other archaeological remains of the main house and a series of outbuildings and gardens have been identified through a major archaeological campaign. Large sections of the site have been preserved without disturbance for future research. The site is now conserved beneath the courtyard of a new museum buildings commemorating the site, with windows into key areas of the excavations to allow public viewing.

3(b) Maps and/or plans

The Historic Houses Trust and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning hold extensive maps and plan collections, which could be drawn upon for a nomination.

3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation

The Historic Houses Trust and Department of Urban Affairs and Planning hold extensive photographic collections, which could be drawn upon for a nomination.

3(d) History

The First Fleet arrived in Australia from Britain in January 1788, marking the first settlement of Australia by European people. In May that year Governor Arthur Phillip ordered the commencement of construction of a Government House, which became the centre for administration and power in the penal colony. As the most tangible symbol of the transfer of British power to the new colony, Government House was central to the story of control and punishment of convicts, and the planting of British influence on the shores of the Pacific.

The first nine Governors of the New South Wales colony were to live at the First Government House and to extend the original building, until it was replaced by a new and larger Government House and was finally demolished in 1845. The site was subsequently partly covered by road alignments, brick terrace houses, and a series of timber-framed buildings, and eventually a car park. A large part of the site, however, remained undisturbed by major redevelopment, and as a result the archaeological remains of the foundations and related artefacts were largely protected.

The survival of the archaeological site was identified in 1983, as the site was being investigated for major high-rise redevelopment. Subsequent excavations demonstrated the extent of the remains, and after extensive public debate the State Government decided to protect the site, which it owned, from redevelopment.

3(e) Bibliography

A bibliography is provided in an annex.
4. **STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION**

4(a) **Diagnosis**

First Government House Site is conserved as an archaeological site sealed by sterile sand, waterproof membranes and paving. Public access to the site is provided by several windows inserted into the deposit revealing excavated sections of the foundations, and by the display of material recovered from the site in the adjacent museum. Future conservation and presentation of the place is assured by the state planning controls which cover the site, the government ownership of the site, and the endowment of a trust fund to provide ongoing funding for conservation. The Historic Houses Trust of New south Wales provides a high level of conservation expertise in its management of the place.

4(b) **Agents responsible for preservation / conservation**

Same as 2(a)

4(c) **History of preservation / conservation**

The existence of the archaeological site was confirmed by research in 1983, and the extent of the remains detailed in a series of archaeological excavations which ran from 1984 to 1993. The site was protected from proposed development by the transfer of development rights to an adjacent block, which has subsequently been redeveloped and incorporates the new Museum as part of that development.

4(d) **Means of preservation / conservation**

The site has been partly excavated and the results of that work published. The site is now managed and protected as part of the 'Museum of Sydney on the site of First Government House', and has been stabilised beneath the forecourt of that museum, with windows into key parts of the site for public viewing. Funding for the ongoing management of the site is provided by a trust fund based on funds received in payment for the transfer of development rights for the site to an adjacent block.

4(e) **Management Plans**

A Management Plan combining the management approaches of the Historic Houses Trust and the neighbouring landowners whose land also contains parts of the place is currently being developed by consultants.

5. **JUSTIFICATION**

5(a) **Cultural Property**

The First Government House Site represents the planting of British power in the Pacific region, through its establishment of a penal settlement in New South Wales. As the residence and administrative headquarters of the first nine governors of the colony, First Government House was both the symbolic and real hub of Britain's presence in the region, a presence based on the labour of transported convicts. The site is the archaeological expression of a building of outstanding importance, illustrating the stage of human history which linked the forced movement of peoples to the colonial expansion of European states. As such it merits inscription on the World Heritage List under Criterion (iv).
3(b) Maps and/or plans
3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation
3(d) History
3(e) Bibliography

4. STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION

4(a) Diagnosis
4(b) Agents responsible for preservation / conservation
   Same as 2(a)
4(c) History of preservation / conservation
4(d) Means of preservation / conservation
4(e) Management Plans

5. JUSTIFICATION

5(a) Cultural Property

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED BEFORE THIS NOMINATION CAN BE COMPLETED.
APPENDIX 7

DOCUMENTATION OF POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE NOMINATION PLACES

GREAT NORTH ROAD AND ASSOCIATED STOCKADE SITES, NEW SOUTH WALES

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. SPECIFIC LOCATION

  1(a) Country
  Australia

  1(b) State, Province or Region
  New South Wales

  1(c) Name of Property
  Great North Road and associated stockade sites.
  (Divine's Hill Section of the Great North Road, and Devine's Hill
  Stockade site, Dharug National Park, and Wiseman's Ferry Stockade site.)

  1(d) Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates

  Located both sides of the Wiseman's Ferry crossing of the Hawkesbury
  River, New South Wales. Wiseman's Ferry Stockade is located on land
  owned by National Parks and Wildlife Service, and the Devine's Hill road
  and stockade are within Dharug national park. Location centred on a point
  at latitude 33°23' south and longitude 150°59' east.

2. JURIDICAL DATA

  2(a) Owners
  National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales

  2(b) Legal Status
  Devine's Hill road and stockade are gazetted within Dharug National Park,
  and Wiseman's Ferry is owned by NPWS.

  2(c) Responsible Administration
  Minister for Conservation
  Parliament House
  Sydney

  Director
  National Parks and Wildlife Service
Sydney

3. **IDENTIFICATION**

3(a) **Description and Inventory**

The Old Great North Road was the first major road to be built between Sydney and the Hunter Valley to its north. The nomination is for a small section of the road as it ascends Devine's Hill, just north of the Hawkesbury River at Wiseman's Ferry, and two stockade sites in the same area.

The construction of the nominated section of road involved extensive cut and fill along the side of a steep ridge leading up from the crossing point on the river. The embankments supporting the road are faced with stone masonry, and stone culverts and drains are incorporated. The workmanship on different sections has been identified with particular convict work gangs, and the nature of their labour and skills analysed. The road has been closed to vehicular traffic since the mid-1980s.

The stockade sites (or road-gang camps), contain the ruined remains of stone rubble structures which housed the convict labourers and their guards. The stockade sites are partially overgrown with regenerated vegetation.

3(b) **Maps and/or plans**

National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales has surveyed plans for the stockade sites and the road section.

3(c) **Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation**

National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales has a photographic collection documenting the place and works undertaken by them.

3(d) **History**

In response to increasing convict numbers in the New South Wales colony, and the difficulty and expense of sending second offenders to distant penal settlements such as Norfolk Island, it was decided in 1826 to send second offenders to work in road gangs cutting new roads away from the main settled areas. This had the double benefit of employing the convicts in hard labour and extending the colonies transportation system at the same time. The introduction of such hard work was also a part of a systematic attempt to revive the threat and fear of transportation as a punishment for crime in Britain.

The Great North Road in the vicinity of Wisemans Ferry was constructed between 1827 and 1832. The work was carried out by convict gangs working in chains, who were housed in temporary huts at the stockade camps which were spaced at regular intervals along the road wherever work was continuing. When the road gangs moved on to new sections of the road, the stockade camps were dismantled and the materials re-used or sold. Hence none of these sites survives with standing buildings, and few have been shown to have substantial ruined or archaeological evidence. The Wisemans Ferry and Devines Hill stockades, however, are relatively well preserved, with collapsed stone walls and stone foundations in-situ.
3(e) Bibliography

A bibliography is attached in an annex.

4. STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION

4(a) Diagnosis

4(b) Agents responsible for preservation / conservation

Same as 2(a)

4(c) History of preservation / conservation

The road itself has not been used as a major thoroughfare for most of this century. The road was finally closed to vehicular traffic in the mid-1980s when the National Parks and Wildlife Service acquired the road, partly to protect the stone culverts from heavy vehicles that had broken several of them, and partly to control unauthorised vehicle access to the adjacent national park.

Some work has been carried out by the National Parks and Wildlife Service, such as removal of encroaching vegetation, stabilisation of unstable stone work, and repair of some culverts and drains. However, there is evidence that movement of the stone retaining walls is occurring, and substantial funds are needed to repair and stabilise this potentially damaging decay.

4(d) Means of preservation / conservation

At the present time management is passive rather than active

4(e) Management Plans

A draft Management Plan has been prepared by NPWS.

5. JUSTIFICATION

5(a) Cultural Property

The Great North Road and associated stockade sites are an important part of a series nomination as they clearly demonstrate the use of transported convict labour to extend the infrastructure underpinning the colonial expansion by European powers. The place also demonstrates dramatically the nature of the convict experience that was used as a threat to dissuade the population of the home country from committing crime. These two themes reflect the global use of convict transportation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the Great North Road structures are an outstanding architectural ensemble which illustrate this significant stage in human history.
DOCUMENTATION OF NOMINATION PLACES

COCKATOO ISLAND Convict STATION, SYDNEY

The following information is presented under the headings used in the Nomination form for World Heritage List. The information would need considerable expansion and selection of supporting documentation before a formal nomination could be made, and information for several places might be combined into one serial nomination.

1. SPECIFIC LOCATION

1(a) Country
Australia

1(b) State, Province or Region
New South Wales

1(c) Name of Property
Cockatoo Island Convict Station.

1(d) Exact location on map and indication of geographical coordinates
Located on Cockatoo Island in Sydney Harbour, at latitude 33°51' south and longitude 151°11' east.

2. JURIDICAL DATA

2(a) Owners
Commonwealth Government
(Department of Defence)

2(b) Legal Status
Commonwealth owned land

2(c) Responsible Administration
Minister for Defence
Parliament House
Canberra

3. IDENTIFICATION

3(a) Description and Inventory
The convict-era buildings and works on Cockatoo Island were built mainly on the crest of the island. Subsequent development took place around the convict buildings, and particularly closer to the shoreline. Although the convict establishment buildings and area have been subject to considerable...
change, they represent the only intact convict public works establishment surviving in NSW.

The convict-era remains consist of:

Prisoners' barracks and mess room
Military guard-house and kitchen
Superintendent's residence
Grain silos carved out of rock
Clerk of Petty Sessions Quarters
Military Officer's Quarters
Free Overseer's Quarters

Other buildings such as a cell block, and one of the Free Officer's quarters have been removed over time.

3(b) Maps and/or plans

Kerr 1984b gives a series of plans of the place, and a source for these.

3(c) Photographic and/or cinematographic documentation

Kerr 1984b gives a series of photos of the place, and Defence may have others.

3(d) History

A convict gang was sent to Cockatoo Island in 1839 to construct a penal establishment to receive prisoners transferred from Norfolk Island. The work was under the supervision of Captain George Barney of the Royal Engineers. The security offered by the harbour location relieved the need to build a more expensive penitentiary in Sydney. The establishment, which used convict labour to dig a dry-dock and for related dockyard construction, remained in operation, housing both transported convicts and colonial prisoners until 1869, when the prisoners were transferred to Darlinghurst Gaol. In 1871 the buildings were re-used as an Industrial School and Reformatory for Girls, and the Island's name was changed to 'Biloela'. Dockyard activities occupied the eastern end of the island, while the Industrial School and Reformatory occupied the western end, the two separated by a tall corrugated iron fence.

The Industrial School and Reformatory was removed in 1888, and the area again proclaimed a prison as a temporary measure to ease Sydney's current demands on prison accommodation. The whole island was transferred to Commonwealth control in 1913 for use as a dockyard, and has remained in that ownership since that date.

3(e) Bibliography

A bibliography is attached as an annex.

4. STATE OF PRESERVATION / CONSERVATION

4(a) Diagnosis

4(b) Agents responsible for preservation / conservation
4(c) History of preservation / conservation

4(d) Means of preservation / conservation

4(e) Management Plans

A conservation policy was developed for the site in 1988 (Phillip Cox Richardson Taylor and Partners 1988) following an assessment by Kerr in 1984 (Kerr 1984b).

5. JUSTIFICATION

5(a) Cultural Property

The Cockatoo Island Convict Establishment was a reversion from the previously predominant trend in convict administration, in that a new penal establishment was located within a short distance of the centre of population rather than far removed from it. The isolation was provided by the harbour rather than great distance.

Further in-depth assessment of Cockatoo Island is necessary before its place in a series nomination can be finally decided.

---

2
4 Clause 9.
5 Feilden, B and Jokilehto, J 1993, Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites, ICCROM, pp.16-17.
7 Australia ICOMOS 1988, Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter), Australia ICOMOS.
8 Emphasis added.
10 This question is posed in Cleere 1995.
12 Cleere 1995, p.65.