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Globalisation, entrepreneurship and the South Pacific

Reframing Australian Colonial Architecture 1800–1850
In 1957, Clinton Hartley Grattan, one of Australia’s most important foreign observers, wrote of the shadow of the “urban” in legends of the Australian “bush”. 1 He argued that the early frontiers of Australian settlement were frontiers of men with private capital, or entrepreneurs, and those frontiers thus carried more elements of the urban than is commonly realised. Such early colonial enterprises around Australia’s south and southeastern coasts, and across the Tasman included sealing, whaling, milling and pastoralism, as well as missionary, trading and finance ventures. In advance of official settlements in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, entrepreneurs mapped coastlines, pioneered trade routes and colonised lands. Backed by private capital they established colonial infrastructural architecture effecting urban expansion in the Australian colonies, New Zealand and beyond. Yet this architecture is rarely a subject of architectural histories.

Grattan also pointed to the fact that the early years of European colonisation did not just witness the importation of Euro-American civilisation into Australia. Australia had an impact back on Britain that was “not measurable exclusively by the quantity of wool it sent there”. With wool Australia exported new scientific knowledge about sheep breeding, industrial management of large pastoral enterprises and much else besides. It was a two-way exchange. For this reason, “Globalisation, entrepreneurship and the South Pacific” (GESP) takes its cue from the title of Bernard Smith’s seminal study, European Vision and the South Pacific, which showed how European ideas were altered by contact with the South Pacific. 2 It is a five-year interdisciplinary research programme that commences with scholarly expertise from RMIT University, University of Tasmania, University of Sydney aimed at using transnational and trans-colonial perspectives to recalibrate the way the early colonial histories of Australian architecture and building may be understood and represented. It is interested in the possibilities of re-interpreting colonial architecture here in terms of its interconnections, as increasingly advocated by architectural historians engaging transnational paradigms to understand both the local and global.

GESP takes, as a point of departure, colonial cultures of entrepreneurship operating and building regionally and globally. In Van Diemen’s Land, for example, corporations such as banks (Derwent, Cornwall, Australasian), family businesses (Henty, Robertson, Lawrence, Rieby et al) and investment entities (Van Diemen’s Land Company, Clyde Company, Port Phillip Association, Learmonth et al), as well as individuals (whalers, sealers etc) all played a role in colonial expansion and settlement. With entrepreneurialism in sight, the GESP programme aims to research the ways in which architecture (civic and domestic) and building (warehouses, stores, mills, factories, stock infrastructure etc.) can be understood as elements in a global and imperial arrangement of corporate and private acquisition, speculation and investment spanning Europe and India, Australia, New Zealand, the Americas and beyond. As recently pointed out by Alex Bremner, it was the built “infrastructure” of settlement, trade and commerce – or...
“grey architecture” – that comprised the majority of what we might consider as imperial and colonial architecture. Despite, or perhaps because of their prevalence, these are buildings – from houses to warehouses – hitherto understudied in Australia’s colonial architectural histories which have focused on the architecture of institutions and the agency of individuals. Yet dispersed arrangements of such buildings connected regions, countries, colonies, cities and outposts. They might thereby be seen as the infrastructure that supported a known corresponding architectural canon, with potential to shed new light upon it. At the same time, they may recast the architecture and building of Van Diemen’s Land and of the colonies around the Tasman within the full reach of their diffuse historical and cultural geographies.

Possible themes of the programme include: early-nineteenth-century networks and flows of capital, resources and skills between Van Diemen’s Land and Port Phillip, Sydney, Norfolk Island, and New Zealand; the translation of imperial and colonial networks of entrepreneurship, trade and commerce into architecture and building in the Australian colonies; new regional frames of reference for interconnected architectural histories around the Tasman Sea; and, new modes of mapping and spatialising these histories. While its focus is historical subject matter, GESP proposes a variety of research methodologies and methods including field research, archival research, digital mapping of global networks and flows, spatial reconstruction, symposia, critical writing and design studio speculation. It envisages providing new insights and techniques for understanding and representing the beginnings of European urban settlement in Australasia.

This slim volume collects the short papers presented in Hobart, October 2016, on the themes of GESP with perspectives from philosophy, transnational history, business/economics history, Australian and New Zealand architectural history, cartography and digital humanities. The papers map shared interests in establishing new frames of reference for the region’s architectural history; its communication and audiences. From a philo-historiographical standpoint, Stephen Loo speculates upon the historiographical limits which globalisation, entrepreneurship and the South Pacific will likely approach. Philippa Mein Smith discusses the idea of the Tasman World understood as a “working region” constituted by the many links that make it, yet to be fully explored by the region’s architectural historians. Bernard Mees uses an outline history of Australia’s first multi-national bank, the Australasia (established with offices in Sydney, Hobart and Launceston in 1835 and later across the Tasman), to consider intersections of business and architectural histories. Andrew Leach questions prevailing nationalist paradigms of Australia’s architectural histories that deal with the first half-century of European settlement. Harriet Edquist’s presentation on Henty & Co provides a glimpse of the “grey” or infrastructural architecture of globalisation, entrepreneurship and the South Pacific during the first half-century or so of European colonisation. This question of architecture ranges from the intangible global infrastructure that supported the flows described by the idea, through to its tangible traces in buildings. These architectures simultaneously register the agency of early private colonial enterprise and its role in urban development. GESP thus now seeks to bring the tools of architectural history to the early industries that supported European settlement and expansion around the Tasman including those exploiting natural resources – sealing, whaling, sheep, grain and timber – and those of institutions – finance and religion – to re-imagine an architectural history of the region.

Stuart King and Harriet Edquist
co-convenors and editors
In terms of the proposition put forward in the GESP programme to examine colonial industries as a way of interrogating the role of so-called grey architecture in Australian architectural historiography, the Henty family offers a useful case study. Between 1800 and 1850 Henty enterprises grew from small scale but successful farming and local banking practices in south-east England to a multi-faceted business venture that stretched along the southern colonies of Australia to Mauritius, the Cape of Good Hope, England, New Zealand and the Americas.

The Henty family had deep historical roots in Sussex but they emerge clearly in 1796 when twenty-one-year old Thomas Henty sold up his properties in Littlehampton which he either acquired himself or inherited. As a fifteen-year old he had been sent to manage a farm in Preston, Sussex, and after the Littlehampton sale established himself as a farmer in West Tarring. Around this time he acquired merino sheep from King George III’s flock and in the ensuing years became one of the most successful sheep breeders in south-east England. Before the eighteenth century, export of merinos from Spain was a capital crime but by the second half of that century they could be found in Saxony, Hungary, Prussia and France, and, eventually through the agency of Joseph Banks, the royal flock at Kew. Henty maintained a correspondence with sheep breeders in New South Wales and when he emigrated he was well known in the colonies for his expertise. Furthermore, in 1805 Henty, in partnership with others, founded a bank in Worthing with branches in Arundel, Steyning and Horsham. At the time of emigration his sons Charles and James were bank managers at Arundel and Worthing, respectively.

Of interest to this project thus are the global networks of stock and capital that allowed Henty to contemplate migration with his family, over 40 dependents, valuable merino stock and horses. At the time global livestock breeding networks were extensive; the merino bloodlines for example stretched from Spain through Europe, England, Cape Colony, North America and Australia. But Henty also raised thoroughbred horses based on the famous Egremont stud and the family held the ambition of exporting horses from the colonies to India. Initially foiled by competition from the Cape, it was realised by Francis Henty at Merino Downs in Port Phillip.

In 1829, the Henty family comprised Thomas and his wife Frances, seven surviving sons James, Charles, William, Edward, Stephen, John, Francis and daughter Jane. Much of the success of their enterprise lay in the capacity to diversify their business interests. While Thomas Henty’s initial aim was to establish himself as a colonial sheep farmer in the Swan River Colony, this was only the starting point of a diverse family enterprise, known as Henty & Co, that operated from the Swan (Western Australia), Launceston (Van Diemen’s Land /Tasmania), Portland and, eventually, Melbourne (Port Phillip/ Victoria).

Spearheaded by James, Stephen and John who arrived at the Swan towards the end of 1829, the family’s colonial fortunes were reliant, not on sheep, but on the trading ventures established between Western Australia and Launceston that by 1832, when the
rest of the family arrived, were international in scope. James operated from Fremantle and King River and when he transferred his operations to Launceston, Stephen remained at the Swan (until 1836 when he joined the family enterprise in Portland), trading between the two colonies in their own schooner, the Thistle. In fact, the family traded and explored right along the southern coast of Australia and the islands.

In Fremantle, James had built a store near the river mouth before he had a house while in Launceston he built his house next to his warehouse in Cimitiere street as though to emphasise their interdependence. When he re-established himself in Melbourne after financial collapse in the late 1840s, he did so with a grand warehouse in Little Collins Street. Thomas arrived in Van Diemen’s Land in 1832 and rented a property a short distance from Launceston to accommodate his family, servants and stock but in 1836 bought Red Hill on the Tamar River as a pastoral property. When he died in 1839 Edward and Francis, the only sons to carry on the farming tradition, had established themselves in Portland and on the Wannon river in Port Phillip. But the Portland venture, like Swan River, began as a trading and industrial concern. Initially bankrolled by Henty & Co in Launceston, Edward and Francis’s first enterprises were trade, agriculture, sheep, and boiling down works. Later the brothers became whalers, even as they had, on the advice of Major Thomas Mitchell, gone north and taken up vast swathes of land on the Wannon which made their fortunes. Charles remained a banker in Launceston where he also owned considerable land while William, a lawyer, handled the family companies’ legal business from Launceston, where he stayed for twenty-five years, and from Brighton UK. In various partnerships William and his brothers invested heavily in town real estate. Sister Jane married Samuel Bryan, who had emigrated in the 1820s and had substantial land holdings in Launceston and elsewhere. Henty and Bryan properties in Launceston were sometimes adjacent and Bryan invested in Port Phillip with the brothers.

In an 1840 statement of claims to the colonial government about land titles in Port Phillip, the brothers stressed that the land they occupied was brought under cultivation and surrounded “by a proper fence”. Indeed, the fence assumes a considerable force in their claim to legal title. Furthermore, their “civilizing” activities on their Wannon runs were evidenced by “nine yards, shed, large barn, store, stable, carpenter’s blacksmith’s, and shoemaker’s shops, dairy and other buildings”. Further, from Portland to the interior they had constructed “an excellent road” crossing three rivers “by means of bridges of their own construction”.

The Henty brothers (with the exception of the unsuccessful John, and William who returned to England) went on to establish themselves as significant figures in colonial society occupying grand houses in Launceston (Beulah), Portland (Burnwood, Claremont) and Melbourne (Offington, Field Place, Findon, Richmond Hill) that belong to the canon of nineteenth-century Australian architecture. These buildings may be understood however as late manifestations of Henty & Co. The foundations they rested on, descriptions of which occupy pages of diary entries, letters, legal correspondence and deputations to the colonial governments, were the trade routes, mercantile transactions and arrangements of built infrastructure that connected their establishments to each other across southern Australia, and to global and colonial enterprises.
Van Diemen’s Land
Before and After
Royal Engineers' Flows and the Networks
Early architecture and building in Van Diemen’s Land was mostly “grey.” Architecturally pretentious and ambitious buildings were built. But the official priorities and commercial imperatives of colonisation mostly realised a grey architecture or “infrastructure” of settlement, trade and commerce. As observed by GA Bremner, it comprised the majority of what we might consider as imperial and colonial architecture.\(^1\) Van Diemen’s Land was no exception.

In its physical form, such architecture was not necessarily non-expert building. Arguably the most prolific (and expert) architectural office in Van Diemen’s Land in the mid-nineteenth century was the Office of the Royal Engineers established 1835 to assume responsibility for all convict and military infrastructure and building that was financed by the British imperial government.\(^2\) The Royal Engineers operated in Van Diemen’s Land (renamed Tasmania in 1856) until the early 1870s. During these decades they were involved surveying, physical infrastructure such as roads, ports, piers and docks, and building – the buildings of penal settlements and probation stations, military barracks (Figure 1), lodges, guard houses, stores, batteries, magazines, etc. through to convict churches, hospitals (Figure 2). At times, the Royal Engineers drew upon the expertise of the civil architects of the Colonial Public Works Department, notably John Lee Archer, James Blackburn and William Porden Kay. Similarly, the Royal Engineers were involved in civilian infrastructure and buildings under the jurisdiction of the Colonial Architects. As a corps of the British Imperial Army, the Royal Engineers may be understood as a company in the broader sense of an incorporated entity. Engineers were deployed widely across the British Empire and they were highly mobile, establishing and operating as a global network. For the Royal Engineers, Van Diemen’s Land was one location or station among several; one node within regional and global fields of practice.

Their career trajectories and movements can be mapped via the engineers’ service records to reveal their wider fields of practice. The career of Captain Roger Kelsall – the first of the Commanding Royal Engineers (CREs) in Van Diemen’s Land – before and after Van Diemen’s Land is yet to be found; however, the career of James Conway Victor, CRE in Van Diemen’s Land from 1842 to 1849, and attributed as the designer of the engineers’ offices and an imposing military gaol at Anglesea Barracks, Hobart, both designed in 1846, were typical. Preceding his station in Van Diemen’s Land, Victor’s service abroad had included stations in the (Iberian) Peninsula War (1812-14); Canada (1814-17); he was on special service in Africa (1825-26); (again in) Canada (1827-31); and the West Indies (1836-39). After Van Diemen’s Land he served briefly in Malta (1854) and Turkey (1854) before retiring in December 1854. Victor was succeeded by Captain John Twiss who assumed command in Van Diemen’s Land Royal from 1848 to 1853. Twiss had previously served in Gibraltar (1824); Jamaica (1824-27); and Mauritius (1831-39). He had arrived in Van Diemen’s Land in 1844 and was immediately deployed to command the Launceston Ordnance Office (1844-48), during which time he also travelled to South Australia and Western Australia to advise on fortifications in those colonies. After Van Diemen’s Land, Twiss was stationed in Mauritius (1855-60) and then the United Kingdom until he retired in 1866. Twiss was succeeded by Captain Roger George Hamilton, who served as CRE from 1853 to 1859. Hamilton’s tour of service abroad had included stations at Corfu (1834-39); New South Wales (1843-44); and Van Diemen’s Land, stationed on Norfolk Island (1844-50). He was in Ireland (1850-52) before returning to Van Diemen’s Land (1852-59) and subsequently served in Cape of Good Hope (1863-68), Canada (1869-72) and Nova Scotia (1872). Hamilton was succeeded by Colonel William Delvès-Broughton (1859-62) who had previously been stationed in Bermuda (1826-29); on special service in America (1840-45); and Hong Kong (1858-62). Francis Rawdon Chesney was the CRE in Tasmania from 1862 to 1867 having arrived via service in Hong Kong (1845-47) and New Zealand (1850-57). He subsequently served in Barbados (1870-73) and Mauritius (1873-76). The last CRE in Tasmania was Captain Richard Warren in the post from 1867 to 1871. His previous foreign service was in the West Indies (1849-54); Nova Scotia (1859-60); and Canada (1860-62). After Tasmania, he was stationed in Ireland (1871-75); St Helena (1875-77) and; Ceylon (1878-82).

Perhaps the most well-known of the Vandemonian Royal Engineers was Sir William Denison on special service as Governor of Van Diemen’s Land from 1847 to 1853 and subsequently Governor of New South Wales and Governor General of Australia from 1855 to 1861. Prior to his governorship in Van Diemen’s Land held served with the Royal Engineers in Canada, on the Rideau Canal that connects Ottawa and Kingston. According to his Australian biographer, Denison brought to Van Diemen’s Land a special interest in “building docks, harbours and bridges, draining swamps, digging canals and extending irrigation” and is credited with establishing key infrastructure in the colony.\(^3\) That included the completion of Hobart’s New Wharf, which Captain Victor (CRE at the time) complained about to his London superiors was an extravagance, while Denison argued its developmental and commercial benefits to the colony.\(^4\)

Below the CREs were subordinate officers whose tours of service were similarly mobile and who also played important roles in establishing infrastructure in Van Diemen’s Land. Among them were William Hadden, Charles Akers, Robert Warren and, significantly, Andrew Clarke who commenced his career with the Royal Engineers in Van Diemen’s Land (1846–48); was in New Zealand (1848–49); on special service as aid de camp to Governor William Denison in Van Diemen’s Land (1849-53); Surveyor General in Victoria (1853-58); in the Gold Coast, Africa (1860); Director of Works at the Admiralty in England (1864-73), Governor of the Straits Settlement (1873-75); member of the Council of the Viceroy of India, stationed in Bengal (1875-80); Commandant of the School of Military Engineering at Chatham (1881-82) and; finally, Inspector General of Fortifications in England (1882-86), credited with the design and construction of the floating dock at Ber muda (1869) and the navy docks of Portsmouth, Chatham and Malta.\(^5\)

Tracing careers of the Royal Engineers stationed in Van Diemen’s Land aims to locate the colony and its infrastructure within a global network of engineering and architectural expertise and practices. It serves several purposes aligned to the ideas of “Globalisation, Entrepreneurship and the South Pacific”. By invoking the notion of grey architecture to
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Design for Proposed Hospital at the Norfolk Plains, Van Diemen’s Land, Royal Engineer’s Office, Hobart (1837). MQF 1/1272, UK National Archives.
incorporate the work of the Royal Engineers more fully into the existing historiography, it aims to extend, in at least one direction, the category of “colonial architecture” beyond common architecturally defined limits. It simultaneously expands often narrow consideration of agency in architectural production. It invites an investigation of typological and technical developments through the associated networks. And, perhaps most significantly, it offers an example of a multidirectional or networked pattern of early colonial engineering and architectural practice: not only were experiences in Britain and other colonies brought to Van Diemen’s Land, but the experience of provisioning the infrastructure of settlement in Van Diemen’s Land / Tasmania was arguably brought to bear elsewhere within the Tasman World and beyond.

2 An office of the Royal Engineers was simultaneously established in the Colony of New South Wales.
The Colonial Architectural History of the Tasman World, 1788–1850
In spite of how much we know about the historical fabric of Britain's first Tasman Sea colonies, the terms on which that knowledge has been framed remain, after several decades, defined by the question of Australia and New Zealand's respective national identities.  

We are, however, well aware that the world at which Sydney sat as a centre (of sorts) up to the 1840s was described by changing cartographies informed by the rise and fall of industries, the shift from tentative to determined occupation, and varied institutional responses to trade, land and "natural resources" on both British and indigenous sides of the equation across a widely spread maritime territory. What kind of architectural history might come out of attending to Sydney as one moment in a pan-Tasman map in which activities of various kinds operated (more or less) concurrently, and which positions New South Wales as a node in the British world and the Anglosphere?  

History as such is well ahead of architectural history in responding to this question, and the work is yet to be done of recasting the historiography of Australasia's architecture to better respond both to historical mobility and to a conception of the region that responds to the mobile reality of the first half-century of the colonial experience. The architectural history of the colonies' varied industries offers one way to break open a subject on which few architectural historians (noting a couple of exceptions) have expended effort for some decades. And might yet table studies that reflect the historical realities of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Architecture arguably works on three levels within this problem. The first of these is at the level of architecture with a capital A, and hence the subjects of those architectural histories that have been written over the last half century or more. We know that opportunity fostered mobility across the nineteenth century, and this level of enquiry would not focus solely on architects as such, but on those figures who, like Samuel Marsden, ensured an even uptake of architectural ideas and models on both sides of the Tasman.

The second level is that of a minor architecture—not exactly the vernacular architecture of dwellings, stores, and forges, which were built of necessity wherever the empire sought a new toehold, but instead those buildings and structures in which the broader concerns of imperial power and colonial enterprise were explicitly (rather than implicitly) at stake. The most obvious of these are the various sealing and whaling stations that were established around New Zealand by entrepreneurs striking out from Van Diemen's Land (Tasmania) and New South Wales, and which presented both an economic imperative to harness the marine resources of the Tasman Sea and South Pacific, and a moral imperative to monitor and curb the lawlessness of Britons behaving badly beyond the jurisdiction of the Crown. These structures were by and large architecture with a little "a" and while they have escaped earlier generations of architectural historians, by now we have caught up with other disciplines in working with an expanded concept of our subject that now accounts for buildings both artistically intentioned and otherwise. Regularly consigned in their assessment to archaeology, much of this work entered a
state of disrepair tracking its obsolescence. What happens when we put the informal architecture of enterprise into play alongside the formal, capital A, architecture of colonisation, reflecting the historical entanglements that have been so thoroughly addressed beyond the field of architectural history?

The third level is that of the analogue. We are by now so familiar with the idea that institutions and networks of expertise have their own architecture that it is hardly a leap to speak of an architecture of colonial enterprise comprised of trade routes recounted cartographically or in terms of a financial geography. Nor is it difficult to position as a fertile starting point for fresh research a series of cartographic layers in which the imbricated architectures of trade, empire, settlement, and the missions give up a rather different form for the pan-Tasman experience of the early decades of the nineteenth century. In this sense the natural extension of British rule from New South Wales to New Zealand in the 1830s followed in the footsteps of the first Christian missions and the rogish opportunism of maritime commerce.

The Declaration of Independence of New Zealand drafted in 1834 and 1835 by representatives of the Confederation of United Tribes sought a relationship directly with the Crown and hence recast the lines of colonial authority to circumvent Sydney (and its tariffs). That the chiefs designed a New Zealand flag evidences their understanding of what we could now read as the architecture of colonisation: extending from documents and ensigns to the structures connecting that territory’s resources to global trade, to the first churches of the missionaries sent out from Parramatta, to the British Residence that, too, made the trip across the Tasman.

Returning to the capital A architecture informed by a fresh set of historiographical cross sections first concerned with a “grey” architecture will undermine the nationalist habits that have shaped, and continue to shape, the significance of a large and complex body of buildings and ideas realised at a crucial moment in the history of this region.


Flows at the Limits

Historiography of Colonial Tasmania
On the one hand, a history of networks and flows of capital, resources and skills in colonial Australia and New Zealand can be mapped through the influence it has had, and traces it has left, on tangible infrastructure, landscape, individuals and their social lives. On the other, such a history, or more accurately, its historiography, will continuously be challenged by the intangibility of the subject matter itself, namely the contingent registers of the presence and impact of entrepreneurship, finance and resilience. Movement, as ontological to networks and flows – whether the spread of influence, transformations in economic value, ephemerality of the history of emotions, or transduction of information from one materiality to another – continuously problematise history’s evidentiality, and resist its imperatives for the concrete, the visible and the articulable.

As a research program, “Globalisation, Entrepreneurship in the South Pacific” (GESP) provides opportunities to critically investigate the philo-historiographical implications of writing a history of flows and networks. The evidence of flows is never uncomplicatedly “found”. There is always a need for the historian to “follow a flow” (after Deleuze) rather than identifying and describing it. The historian is an itinerant, immanent to the flows she is studying: intuiting, intensifying, delving, transducing and translating – hence confabulating – while ambulating, performing.

GESP shows us what happens when colonial (architectural) history meets economics and capitalism, mediated by philosophy – namely the history of ideas and philosophy of history. This provides opportunities to reconceptualise what is meant by historiography, to critically engage the forces which shape its epistemologies, and the ontological role it plays in the definition of the human, its societies and relations with non-human others. What follows, which must perforce be cursory, are several conjectured historiographical limits which GESP may encounter in its performative wanderings. Activity at these limits define GESP as a historical project that paradoxically displaces its own limits in the very same moment or movement that it realises them.

History and geography – The network and flow of economics, entrepreneurship, innovation and human capital in the Tasman past is more geography than history: it is something that can be mapped. A map is a primary mode of spatialisation and striation that concretises flows, hence it is arguably a mechanism of colonisation. However, the projects in GESP are concerned about the capacities of individuals, bodies, machines and natural systems, constantly in the state of change and transformation which continuously remake, hence decolonise, the mapped material geographies into active living diagrams.

History and material culture – The colonial history of trade and entrepreneurship involves natural resources including agriculture, minerals, forests and animals; and their supporting infrastructure of water, land, sea and power. These natural resources and infrastructures have their own material histories, with complex interrelations between the biological, social, technological and political. Take, for example, the colonial history of water and its connection to globalisation and the building of an empire. Water is not merely an inert material that can be quantified and exchanged, it is a bio-assemblage with its own historicity that is entwined with technological, social, cultural and material practices, and with other natural systems. Water has a “geo-bio-history” of its own as it makes possible complex speciation and affiliations within an ecology, while holding within it traces of the composition and decomposition of geological histories beyond human occupation they have encountered in the past. The geo-history of water and hydro-bio-politics are registered only indexically in the shape and practice of material cultures: from significant landscape elements, to mining dams, pumps and grey architecture supporting those industries, to swimming pools in urban centres. Furthermore, there is Quentin Meillassoux’s question of ancestrality: how does historiography deal with the material appearance of something like water in geological time, where the bio-historical truth of its existence precedes any possibility of a correlation between human (observation) and world (observed), as it is prior to current scientific methods of geological understanding?

History and economics – There are interesting epistemological limits when economics meets history. In economics, the “market” for example is a generality (a concept or a condition) which has a metahistory connected to a history of ideas; while in history, there are “markets” as concrete singularities, namely actual buildings and places: the “marketplace”. The colonial history of economics is a constant negotiation between generalities and singularities. The colonial state could be said to be the main force of coding and territorialisation towards singularities, by determining spatial boundaries, homogenising roles and establishing norms. Here language plays the role of codification and fixing identities. The structure of authority, economics or entrepreneurship is related to linguistically coded rituals and regulations through the legitimising narratives of texts, rules, archives, dress, property, finance and myths.

The organisation of corporations such as banks and trading companies however produce a constant flow of money, resources, food, clothes, tools and infrastructure that frequently circulate against the barriers imposed by government organisations. For example, the spread of commercial organisations has the effect of increasing social mobility, thus creating then extending the reach of the middle classes. Social mobility decreases the density of community networks, and therefore has a strong deterrioralising effect. We can say that conflict increases the degree of territorialisation, while trade makes pliant the limits of the territory and tolerance of heterogeneity.

Furthermore, economic forces do not move in constant linear time, take for example futures speculation and investment, rates of accumulation of power, interactions between communities and organisations, speeds of technological innovation, slowness of adaptation and the quickness of entrepreneurship, etc. Besides the markets, historical temporalities in economics are connected to innovation and creativity of suppliers, competitors, distributors and the public, responding to local conditions; as well as to the resistance by geography and geology to yield resources and goods, and the degree of subservience of the labour force.

How does “grey architecture” or colonial infrastructural architecture, play into this
economic history? Grey architecture deals less with direct “retail”, but in wholesale organisations engaged with economies on a distributed scale, as opposed to economies of centralisation and agglomeration. What stylistic, symbolic and functional parts of such colonial architecture dispersed across the colonies are implicated in economics of mass movement of goods, resources and people? What role does grey architecture play in the revaluation of value – e.g. infrastructure spending to house convicts as labour, where its impact is not only on profit, but production of differential societal value systems, or a gift economy (benevolent society buildings, etc.).

We may argue that in a project like GESP, history is a record of resistances to overcodification by the colonial State, which is folded onto itself as attempts to escape its own codification as a historical project. History here exudes a power of ongoing non-linearity and creativity, an “autocritical” capacity. In a postcolonial culture where forgetting is a predicate for so many narratives of place and white belonging, Ross Gibson says “we need to imagine across gaps and quandaries in the evidence; we need to venture out … past what is accepted as admissible for discursive conviction”.

The task of the historian is therefore to translate, or more accurately to mediate, intervene and facilitate the co-existence of, on one hand, the coagulation of force into materiality and, on the other, the continuing forces of transformation. Every historical fabulation powers us up in our receptivity, so that our capacity to affect others increases, and new constellations of storytellers, or publics, emerge.

3 From Craig Lundy’s discussion of creativity in Deleuze’s notion of “universal history.” See Craig Lundy, *History and Becoming: Deleuze’s Philosophy of Creativity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012)
In 1961, Syd Butlin’s history of the Bank of Australasia and the Union Bank of Australia was published by Longmans in Melbourne. The two banks had merged in 1951 as the ANZ and the company’s board of directors decided that a history should be written to celebrate the achievements of the two leading banks before their names were forgotten. Founded in 1835, the Bank of Australasia had pioneered branch-banking and deposit-taking in Australia, having founded its first three offices simultaneously in Sydney, Hobart and Launceston. The Australasia was also the first multinational bank in Australia, being London-based and directed. Previously, colonial banks such as the Bank of New South Wales had largely raised capital from shareholders and only operated locally, along the lines of an English county bank.

Butlin’s history of the Australasia and the Union Bank was hailed in the (then) recently established journal Business Archives and History. Butlin and his brother Noel were leading economic historians of the day when whole economic history departments flourished at the country’s leading universities. In 1967, the Economic History Society of Australia and New Zealand took over responsibility for Business History and Archives (retitling it the Australian Economic History Review) as all manner of histories of Australian economic development, focusing on key companies or industries, were produced by university-trained historians. Butlin’s history of the ANZ had been supported by a team of research assistants who scoured the scattered branches for material to help Butlin in his task. Along with his dissertation, Butlin’s history of the ANZ are landmarks in Australian business history.

Yet 1961 was also the year of the founding of the Australian Society for the Study of Labour History (ASSLH). Established as a radical project, ASSLH soon had a membership of over 500 academics, unions, teachers and libraries. To the economists, ASSLH represented anti-business history, however, as its members set out to record, celebrate and explain the achievements of the labour movement. Since the 1960s,
economic and labour history have remained two separate camps, one increasingly
dominated by econometric work, the other continuing its championing of trade unions
and the history of industrial relations.

With the rise of business schools in the 1990s, economic history departments were
abolished and many labour historians found themselves teaching in departments of
management and organisational studies. Business history was officially linked as a field
of research with labour history by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, while economic
history was bracketed under economics. A separate field of accounting history also
emerged, confined to accounting departments. Business history had fragmented across
business schools and arts faculties, with both economic and labour history showing clear
signs of declining. A business and labour history group at the University of Sydney was
mirrored by a similar body at Auckland University of Technology, and in 2009 the two
groups sponsored the creation of a new business history association that aimed to act
as an umbrella body: the Academic Association of Historians in Australian and New
Zealand Business Schools (AAHANZBS). AAHANZBS seeks to be the main voice
that represents historians of all stripes in business schools in Australia and New Zealand,
and has built up relationships with similar organisations internationally.6

Business history in the sense epitomised by Butlin’s history of the ANZ is also now
reflected in international handbooks. The first to appear was Oxford University Press’s
Handbook of Business History, edited by Harvard’s Geoff Jones and the University of
Amsterdam’s Jonathan Zeitlin.7 It and the forthcoming Routledge Companion to
Business History (edited by a team led by the University of Newcastle’s John Wilson),
however, map out a very different field than that represented by the works of the Butlin
brothers.8 Business history in these handbooks includes the history of international
business, entrepreneurship, corporate governance and business ethics – most of the topics
surveyed in business management courses have now become part of the business history
canon. From theories of foreign direct investment to marketing, the influence of business
education to assessments of the nature of networks and supply chains, the field has
undergone a remarkable expansion. If Butlin were writing his history of the ANZ now, it
would necessarily have emerged as a very different work. Writing business history today
demands engagement with a much broader array of critical approaches and theoretical
considerations.

The Bank of Australasia’s Launceston branch began as a continuation of the Cornwall
Bank, founded in 1828. Bringing the Cornwall into the newly launched multinational
was supported by local entrepreneurs such as the Hentys who had been involved in
county banking in England.9 But the investors in the Australasia were English, the bank
being founded along the lines of the Scottish joint stock banks, which unlike those in
England and Wales, had branch networks and paid interest on deposits.10 The Australasia
brought an international focus to banking in the colonies as it expanded first to the Port
Phillip district and later to Queensland and New Zealand. Established at a time when
currency was still unstable and the failure to honour contracts was rife, the Australasia
also helped stabilise aspects of the economic system that we otherwise take for granted
today.

In a time when commercial governance was much less pronounced and risk the order of
the day, networks like those established by the Australasia were paramount. As in many
developing economies today, trust was a key issue in business practice at the time, with
family networks and reputation representing essential features of commercial governance.11
Colonial businesses operated in societies with considerable convict populations and a
more prominent role of the state. But above all, banks like the Australasia sought to
profit from the burgeoning colonial economies, writing loans and funneling profits back
to London as the most significant of the Anglo-Australian banks of the nineteenth
century.

2 Business Archives Council of Australia, Business Archives and History (Sydney: Business Archives Council of
Australia, 1989-66).
3 S. J. Butlin, Foundations of the Australian Monetary System 1788–1933 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press,
1933).
4 Australian Society for the Study of Labour History, Report of the Annual General Meeting (Canberra: The Society,
1962).
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7 Geoff Jones and Jonathan Zeitlin, eds., The Oxford Handbook of Business History (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
2003).
8 John F. Wilson, Steven Torre, Abe de Jong, Emily Buchnea, eds., The Routledge Companion to Business History
9 Butlin, Australia and New Zealand Bank, chapter 1.
Withers (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press), 202-21.
Transnational History

Transnational history studies connections and exchange across national borders. Transnational historians concern themselves with connections, networks, links, flows, mobility, circuits, circulation, or movement of ideas, things, people, and practices, and less often of capital, across national boundaries. Initially the field aimed to decentre the nation, notably in the United States, an aim that is anachronistic for studies of colonial Australia or New Zealand. More recently transnational historians strive to complement national, international or comparative frameworks in order to render national histories less parochial. The starting point continues to be human interconnectedness. Recent arguments for “connected histories of empire” trace links across imperial borders and draw on both global and imperial history.

To give one example: the Australian colonies and New Zealand exchanged policies and people to a remarkable degree. Struck by the two-way migration across the Tasman Sea, which was less migration than shifting house, Rollo Arnold called the Australasian movement of people the “Perennial Interchange”. Studies of policy transfer offer insights that this project could develop. Influenced by actor network theory, practitioners in this area place increasing emphasis on “coercive” policy transfer, as practised by the British Empire. The notion of coercive policy transfer is highly relevant for a convict colony like Van Diemen’s Land. Networks carry stories, and narratives are what make policies transportable. It is tempting to ask if the same applies to the transfer of colonial architecture.

At the time transnational history was coming on stream, I had my interest in the southern hemisphere and the Pacific world sparked by the experience of co-authoring the book A History of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific with Donald Denoon for the Blackwell History of the World series. From that project I learned the lesson that ours is not a self-evident region, even when we limit ourselves to the South Pacific. Yet the peoples of our region constructed their own identities in relation to others, and influenced those of their neighbours. That is, identities in Australia, New Zealand, and the South Pacific formed in interaction.

This work ignited my interest in connections and interactive identities, especially in the southern hemisphere. Interconnections and interactive histories seemed more relevant to everyday life than boundaries of the nation state. Another message from this book is that to reify the region, and not just Van Diemen’s Land or Australia, makes the Pacific a significant player in the processes and impacts of globalisation. As Matt Matsuda wrote recently in Pacific Worlds, our view of the Pacific changes if we see it as “a multiplicity of locally connected histories”.

An “oceanic perspective” as advocated by J. G. A. Pocock is helpful here. Pocock thinks in terms of an archipelago of histories, by which he means histories generated by voyages...
crossing oceans, and “by settlements and contacts”.” These are useful concepts when thinking about how the history of Tasmania relates to Australian history and to the Pacific or Asia-Pacific as a region. In his call for a new British history in 1973 at the moment of Britain’s turn to Europe, Pocock referred to the dispersed “British cultural star-cluster”, whose core had cooled and “moved away”.10 In response, he sought histories written from New Zealand (and by inference from Australia) which were not nationalist but sought “new and interesting ways of defining [each star’s] tangential identity by remapping the various systems within which it moves”.11 Historians of the British world were the first to heed this call, which retains potency for the writing of transnational histories.

**A Tasman World**

Australia has shared a modern history with New Zealand since the beginnings of colonisation. Yet national narratives ignore or omit the traffic and communities of interest that have crossed, and spanned, the Tasman Sea since the 1790s. This is where transnational approaches are useful to explore how the Tasman world operated and still operates, as a net of oceanic traffic lanes rather than a divide.

James Belich argued that a Tasman world operated in the nineteenth century but did not define what he meant when he wrote that New Zealand departed from “its old, Tasman, world in 1901”, at the point that the Australian colonies federated.12 In my view the Tasman world was, and is, a working region, defined by the depth and range of trans-Tasman links. It is the sum total of the traffic and relationships that constitute the myriad communities of interest which at different times span the Tasman Sea. The Tasman world’s scope reaches as far as that traffic travels. As a product of colonisation, the Tasman world has a British history, one that developed from a learning empire (as well as plundering empire) whose modus operandi was to exchange ideas, capital, things, and people habitually and with ease.

The book Remaking the Tasman World started with the proposition that the Tasman world which thrived at the end of the nineteenth century did not end with federation of the Australian colonies. It sought to examine how the Tasman world continued to exist despite the creation of national borders and separate national histories. **Remaking the Tasman World** therefore explores the trans-Tasman relationship on a variety of levels, presenting a combined narrative about the nature of the Tasman world as it was remade in the twentieth century:13 The concept of a Tasman world has particular explanatory power for the nineteenth century, and for efforts to locate Van Diemen’s Land within webs of empire.14

**Tasman Connections in Tasmania**

**Taieri** (1855), Marine Terrace, Battery Point, Tasmania (figure 1)

Taieri is a district in Otago, south-west of Dunedin, cut through by the Taieri River. It is a fertile farming area, often referred to as the Taieri Plains. This house in Marine Terrace is evidence that its first owner, Charles Derwent Dowdell, had strong links through trade with southern New Zealand. Dowdell was a timber merchant and ship owner, and it is likely that some of the timber used to construct the house was transported from across the Tasman.

**Mona Vale** (1868), near Ross, Tasmania (figure 4)

The architect William Archer designed this grand house in the Midlands for his brother-in-law Robert Quayle Kermode, who died in 1870. It was the third house built on the property, south of Ross. There are several aspects of this homestead that have transnational significance:

- **The name Mona Vale**
- **The role and status of the house as “the place to be”**15
- **The family connections with Canterbury and Christchurch, New Zealand**
- **The associations of this house, and its New Zealand relative, with the colonial economy**
- **A woman’s input into family enterprises.**

The Kermode family were beneficiaries of the early arrival in Van Diemen’s Land of William Kermode, Robert Quayle Kermode’s father, who obtained a free land grant in 1821 on which the family built progressively superior houses: first in timber, then brick, then stone. Typically, the name of Mona Vale linked back to the family home in the Isle of Man, although this name was also aspirational in that Mona Vale was probably named after the castle seat of the Dukes of Atholl.16 Mona Vale is a grand country house which exudes status consciousness. It is little known that this notable Tasmanian house is connected to another grand house (though less grand) in Christchurch, New Zealand.

**Mona Vale Christchurch** (early 1900s) (figure 3)

As a heritage building which survived the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011, Mona Vale in Christchurch is even more significant to the city now than before the earthquakes. New Zealand’s Mona Vale acquired its name from the Tasmanian family connection. For Robert Quayle Kermode’s sister, Annie Kermode, married George Henry Moore, a friend of her brother, also from the Isle of Man, who worked as a cadet at Tasmania’s Mona Vale. In partnership with his father-in-law George Henry Moore, Annie Quayle Moore, in a grandiose homestead in North Canterbury that burnt down in 1890, Mona Vale in Christchurch represented Annie’s escape from her father after he died in 1905.17

There are no architectural links between the Tasmanian and South Island Mona Vales. But there are several shared frames of reference relating to how architecture manifests flows of capital. One is family ties forged through trans-Tasman migration. Annie Moore bought the Christchurch Mona Vale as a town house, which she named in memory of her mother Annie Kermode, after her mother’s beloved family home. Another is the connection these houses demonstrate with developing a colonial economy in Tasmania and New Zealand: the links between these architecturally distinctive houses are products of an early phase of globalisation.
Conclusions/Questions

If networks carry stories and stories organise social action, how did narratives convey what became Australian – and New Zealand – colonial architecture?

What were these narratives?
Who were the storytellers (architectural entrepreneurs)?
What and where were these networks or interconnections?
How do narratives connect buildings or places?


9 Pocock, The Discovery of Islands, 19.

10 Pocock, The Discovery of Islands, 42.

11 Pocock, The Discovery of Islands, 43.


14 This term is borrowed from Tony Ballantyne, Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand’s Colonial Past (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2012). For Ballantyne, these webs are a trade in ideas, whereas economic webs and commodities also need to be considered.


Mapping a Personal Geography
Maps represent geography, including geographies of warfare. They range from simple notations of immediate battle plans to elaborate full-colour printed or computer-delivered products. They strive to show the terrain and elements of and on that terrain that has or will perhaps determine the outcome of a military engagement.

The geography portrayed in most maps of military campaigns do not provide any information about the personal geographies of a campaign or battle. These elements are missing. Personalisation is impossible when immediate geographical information is required to be represented prior to a battle or afterwards, as a record of the actual clash and its aftermath.

Personal geographies can be used to give an insight into the human stories of traveling to battle, the preliminary movements, the battle itself and combatant’s reflections on what has happened. Mapping personal geographies can be done by assembling a montage of geographically-related artefacts, notes, annotations, photographs, films and maps. This contribution provides the background behind building a personal “geo-historical StoryMap” from records and artefacts of an individual who enlisted, fought and died during the Gallipoli campaign in the Dardanelles in 1914. The StoryMap example provided is the story of my great-uncle John Henry Cartwright, who enlisted in the Australian Imperial Forces (AIF) in 1914 to serve ‘King and Country’.

To Begin
In June 2009, I was undertaking research to ascertain the availability of maps and geographically-related information that was produced by France related to the Gallipoli campaign of 1914–1915 at the Service Historique de la Défense, Département de l’Armée de Terre Division, Château de Vincennes in Paris archive. I was provided with a reference work on the contents of the archive and five dust-covered boxes, the sum total of the collection from the French Gallipoli Campaign held there. In Box 20N33 was a commercially-produced Colour map of Europe and Turkey, folded and reinforced with linen at the folds. The map had been annotated with pencil line showing a soldier’s ‘travel line’ from Paris to Marseilles to Bizerte, Tunisia and then sailing between Sicily and Malta, then south of Crete and finally turning to sail north to a point (marked “E”, by hand) just to the east of Lemnos (Figure 1).

Although a rough pencil annotation on a commercial map, it is a ‘close-up’ record of one of the many stories of a soldier’s journey in wartime. This can be deemed to be an affective map, one that is enhanced by personal input.

This find was the catalyst for my exploration of cartographic (and cartography-related) techniques that I could employ to tell a personal story of my great uncle’s journey from a small country town in South Gippsland to the Great War.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From whom received</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/11/15</td>
<td>Bowers</td>
<td>Wounded, Thursago</td>
<td>Dunlelie</td>
<td>11/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/15</td>
<td>Meagher</td>
<td>Admitted no. 1 General</td>
<td>Heligoland</td>
<td>20/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/11/15</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Poisoning low temp</td>
<td>Heligoland</td>
<td>27/11/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/15</td>
<td>Bickle</td>
<td>Reported Missing</td>
<td>Dunlelie</td>
<td>8/12/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/16</td>
<td>Previously reported</td>
<td>Killed in Action</td>
<td>D'nelles</td>
<td>8/8/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of a man who has re-engaged for, or enlisted into Section D, Army Reserve, particulars of such re-engagement or enlistment will be entered.

P.T.O.
My previous undertakings that built stories around geographically referenced materials began with the use of interactive multimedia tools, beginning with videodisc (Queenscliff videodisc), then CD-ROM and, more recently, using Web-delivered media. This particular exercise allowed me to further explore how the geo-narrative might be designed, built, communicated and used via a Web mapping application.

A personal Geography of Warfare: John Henry Cartwright

The Australian War Memorial, in Canberra, has digitised the records of all Australians who served in World War I. The online resources included Australian Imperial Force (AIF) records, reports from the Red Cross that formally established his demise, to the records of the posthumous awarding of military medals to his family. All artefacts have been scanned by the Australian War Memorial and are made available as PDFs.

An example of one these records are shown in figure 2.

Using these records, I was able to trace John Henry Cartwright’s route to the Gallipoli campaign - from Korumburra, Victoria to the Broadmeadows training camp, to Egypt, Greece and then to the Dardanelles, where he met his fate – missing in action 18 August 1915, later reported killed in action.

The “glue” that held these nodes of the narrative together was location – a precise latitude and longitude from a military field report, a place (for example Shrapnel Gully, Gallipoli), a street address (from scanned correspondence), a place name (for example, Suez, Heliopolis or Dardanelles from military records – see figure 2) or the description of a transportation route or the name of a ship (for example H.M.A.T Scotia in the record in figure 2, from Heliopolis back to the Dardanelles after being wounded, hospitalised and sent back to the battlefield). Once the digitised archives were identified and their exact Web address found and locations of the nodes of the narrative determined (in 3D space + time) the storyline could be built.

For King and Country: John Henry Cartwright’s Gallipoli campaign 1914–1915

Esri Inc.’s StoryMap was used to build the narrative. The application is available free of charge via the ArcGIS Online Web site https://www.arcgis.com/home/index.html. Once registered, users can build mapping applications, including StoryMaps.

Once the nodes of the story are identified, the initial step is to build a .CSV (Comma delimited) spreadsheet (This format is needed to work with the Esri package). It contains the name of the story node and instance (the node might be mentioned more than one time in the narrative), a caption, longitude & latitude of the node and a URL (Uniform Resource locator) of the image that will be used to illustrate this stage of the narrative.

The For King and Country: John Henry Cartwright’s Gallipoli campaign 1914-1915 product is shown in Figure 3).

I was generously supported in this endeavour by my colleague, Dr. Kenneth Field, of Esri Inc., USA, an expert in GIS and map design and production. We were able to build an on-line mapping application (using Esri’s StoryMap application) by linking to digitised records, maps, imagery and film at the Australian War Memorial and other Australian and international archives with digitised resources.

To Conclude

This contribution provides the background behind the building of geo-narratives in general and the StoryMap For King and Country: John Henry Cartwright’s Gallipoli campaign 1914-1915. It illustrates how contemporary Web-facilitated and delivered applications can be used to build mapping applications that contain rich media.

Using these affective representations of geography, which link (and insert) other complementary artefacts allows users to build mental models of realities, including the personal reality of warfare.

It’s what cartography does. It takes dispersed geospatial information and makes it comprehensible.

Narratives of 3-space + time, like the project illustrated here provide encapsulated “snapshots” of reality. And, in so doing, they provide a “sense” of geographical “place”, a personal place that might otherwise not be understood if “just” a conventional map was used.

Visually Analysing Colonial Entrepreneurship, Architecture and Science
My aim in this short paper is first to sketch briefly the background to my interest in the proposed “Globalisation, Entrepreneurship and the South Pacific” programme, and then to indicate the likely form of my contribution.

I have long been interested in digitally representing and analysing data illustrative of the history of science and relations between Europeans and the indigenous peoples of Oceania and Australia between 1760–1900. I began exploiting the analytic and communicative potential of web-based software and services in 1996 with funding from the Australian Vice-Chancellor’s Committee. With several colleagues, I designed online teaching resources aimed at enabling getting students to explore whether aspects of the social history of health in colonial and early twentieth century could be taught via the World Wide Web.

The experience of building this courseware, Pictures of Health, was useful in various respects. It proved that web-based resources could help undergraduate students in history and cognate disciplines better understand the challenges to making sense of historical evidence posed by its fragmentary nature and the personal subjectivities of the inquirer. But it also highlighted problems inherent in creating resources comprising hyper-related historical data.

In the late 1990s, a number of literary scholars, notably George Landow, celebrated the invention of hypertext as allowing readers the kind of interpretative freedom called for by post-structuralist theorists. They saw the technique as providing a means of reading and constructing knowledge in non-linear ways, so as to overcome what Derrida, De Man and other theorists saw as the intellectual tyranny of conventional, linear narratives. Yet while Pictures of Health proved that hypertext could excite curiosity and generate fresh perspectives on historical questions of long-standing interest, it also showed that historical data could become so densely hyper-interwoven as to render it extremely difficult to make meaningful comparisons, connections and conclusions.

So it was that my interest in web-based tools and services next found expression in a project that, between 2000-04, explored how best to exploit the advantages of web-based hyper-text and visualisation. This venture secured major ARC SPIRT (i.e. Linkage) funding with the National Library of Australia as an industry partner. The formally specified goal of the project was to research and develop techniques and standards for web-based presentation of historical research and its outcomes. However, the project outcomes included creating a resource built employing what was learnt in respect of the technical and conceptual challenges of presenting history via the Web (see Turnbull and Falla, 2008).

The resulting resource, South Seas, was an online edition of the key journals of James Cook’s momentous first Pacific voyage (1768–71). I had long been interested in the ethnographic reportage produced during Cook’s sailing in the Endeavour, and was particularly intrigued by the many obvious and also the many subtle differences in how places, people and events occurring during the course of the Endeavour voyage were reported in the various journals kept by its leading participants. Given the length and detailed nature of these sources, plus the fact that they were only accessible in print to a handful of well-resourced scholars, I came up with the idea of presenting them online in a form that would enable easy comparison of Cook, Banks and Parkinson’s differing observations of occurrences in the immediate aftermath of their experiencing them. Also, I interrelated these records with an electronic version of the complete text of the official account of the voyage, allowing readers to compare what was recorded during the course of the voyage with what was reported in the official account.

Parts of South Seas were made freely available online from the outset of the project. My aim was to secure public feedback on the design and content of the site. This strategy quickly alerted my colleague, Chris Blackall, and I, to great interest in a couple of interactive maps that Chris had drawn and we had put online using Adobe’s Flash animation package. It seemed to us that a key element of this edition of the Endeavour journals should be a series of maps of the track of the Endeavour, coupled with maps of places where time was spent ashore that would allow readers to “journey with Cook” and access relevant daily entries in his journal and those of his companions (Figure 1).

A first phase of South Seas was completed in 2004. Since then, I have undertaken a number of digital projects with visual navigational and analytic elements. They include a recent re-design of the online version of the Tasmanian Companion to History, for which I am constructing a number of maps – a number layering surviving historical maps of Tasmania so as to allow users to trace changes in the island’s urban and rural environments. I have also begun work on an online edition of the Journals of George Augustus Robinson, which will be a collaboration with colleagues at the University of Tasmania, and Aboriginal knowledge custodians and traditional owners of the island’s northern regions.
Over time, my approach to digital mapping has developed in the direction of using open source applications that enable a clear separation of data sources from the means by which they are visualised (Figure 2).

The maps for the *Tasmanian Companion*, for example, entail the visualisation of data which has been put into an OGC-standards compliant format and presented via web-browsers using the OpenLayers JavaScript library. On *South Seas*, the only practical way at that time of producing lightweight, browser-friendly maps entailed a laborious process of importing geo-data into MapInfo, exporting the resulting maps to Adobe Illustrator, and then importing them into Adobe Flash to create hyperlinks to the *Endeavour* voyage texts. In short, the links were “hard-baked” into the maps, rendering them extremely time-consuming to update or re-purpose.

Since *South Seas*, my interest in digital mapping has shifted from its usefulness in enabling purposeful navigation of web-based resources to exploring its potential as a means of historical analysis.

In 2013, I worked with specialists in data mining and semantic analysis of large textual corpora at Queensland University of Technology (QUT) on building PaperMiner, a prototype of a service for visualising the place and time at which concepts found expression in the texts of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Australian newspapers. Essentially, the National Library of Australia provided us with a copy of the OCR’d text of Trove’s digital corpus of Australian Newspapers. The corpus was analysed using open source data mining and text analytics software so as to create indexes of concepts (Figure 3).

A web interface was built enabling searches to be performed on the corpus and the results displayed on Google maps. Using MIT’s Simile application, the displayed results could be filtered by time. Additional geo-data could also be associated with Trove content.

Besides this digital work, I have been engaged in research on colonial science, with a particular interest in anthropological collecting in Australia and the Pacific. Here too, I employ digital tools and techniques to investigate and analyse my research data. And this has led to my participation in a major ARC-funded project aiming to build a digital facility that supports the repatriation of Indigenous human remains. Within an Indigenous data-governance framework, this project will gather, preserve and make accessible a critical and extensive record of repatriation information worldwide. The project is expected to support repatriation practice and scholarship and improve the opportunities of repatriation for social good.

This is the context of my interest in this proposed “Globalisation, Entrepreneurship and the South Pacific” programme. My contribution to the venture will likely focus on visually and semantically analysing data illustrative of the connections between science, entrepreneurship and architecture in Tasmania during the first half-century of
so of European settlement. It seems to me that these connections are under-explored. Moreover, there is an increasing amount of relevant data being made available in digital form by entities such as the Tasmanian Heritage and Archives Office, the University of Tasmania Library, and the University’s internationally acclaimed “Founders and Survivors” project exploring the convict era.

As a first step in contributing to this project, I plan to draw on my previous experience and undertake a digitally-based analysis of the *Clyde Company Papers*. The Clyde Company, a joint stock pastoral company was formed in Scotland in 1836 and took up land in the Port Phillip District that year. It was a highly successful venture which was dissolved in 1857-58. Remarkably, near all its records survive and were published by Oxford University Press between 1941-71 under the editorship of P.L. Brown. They not only contain a wealth of information about the early history of the Port Phillip District, but also contain much information relating to Tasmania before and after the creation of the company. Initially, I plan to focus on two things: geo-referencing entities appearing in the text of the Papers and mapping what connections there may be between scientific inquiry and pastoralism using network visualisation software, and text analytics software.


Bridging History’s Divide: Enlivening History and its Practices for the Future
Over recent years there have been substantial scholarly and creative explorations at the intersections between digital humanities, design and archive studies on the ways that history can be reimagined and engaged with through digital technologies. History in this context can be framed as anything that is in the past, for example the distant past, for example, 1800 to 1850s of interest to GESP, or the recent as in what happened a moment ago. Archives as formal structures are being challenged through contemporary practices of personal archiving and digital curation of image databases and social networking platforms. And with this so is the “thing” we call history. In this brief text I wish to propose a way for us to think about how we might engage with a history such as colonial architecture 1800–1850, and its relationship to broader contexts of globalisation, entrepreneurship and the South Pacific, by framing this history through the lens of living archives.

Digital technologies and the practices of socially-based media open up exciting opportunities for cultural organisations and institutions, and their archives. As noted by Anne Burdick et al. (2012), the digital humanities (the integration of digital technologies with the humanities) have enormous promise and capacity to challenge the norms of libraries, archives and museums as caretakers of a controlled view to the past, and to open up to transparent engagements with the future. This future promise, places scholars, citizens, audiences and performers on a level and public playing field; a playing field that supports the past as an active agent in the present and the future. The contents of archives are no longer collected and bound to be “holdings”; rather they are augmented social and cultural agents. Realising this ambition for an animated or living archive requires a complete rethink of how we design and engage with history and the archives that hold it. We must design archives with end users in mind:

- Digital curation of image databases and social networking platforms.
- Libraries, archives and museums as caretakers of a controlled view to the past, and to open up to transparent engagements with the future.
- Archives as formal structures are being challenged through contemporary practices of personal archiving and digital curation of image databases and social networking platforms.
- This implies a user-centered approach to the construction of archives that builds multiplicity of use-scenarios into the very architecture of the archive; breaks down partitions between collections and bricks-and-mortar institutions (through, for example, open application programming interfaces); engages real or potential user communities from the outset (in processing, tagging, and metadata development); and integrates curatorial and content production tools into access portals.

**Designing to Enliven**

Between 2001 and 2014, I was one member of an interdisciplinary research team that was exploring and ultimately realised a “living archive” of the Circus Oz performance archive. This project had many challenges not only in the processes of design and realisation, but also in the scholarly and theoretical frameworks that the various researchers brought to the project. The details of the project are available in the project website (archive.circusoz.com), the research blog that documents the process and surrounding discourses (circusarchive.net/blog). In this project the cultural heritage that was being reimagined and reframed was that of a performing arts company which could be said to be fundamentally different to colonial architecture, which would be in part true, but then not. For it could be equally argued that heritage is heritage, and if the aim of a project is to engage publics and scholars in the value and contribution of the past for the future, then we may be able to learn from initiatives from different domains. In this case the fundamental conceptual model that underpins the Living Archive is the augmentation of the static records in order to realise new modes of audience engagement and conceptual frameworks of performance through the digital technologies. It was proposed that the archive is a record of the past that can be accessed in the present, which may be used for knowledge in the future. This could be knowledge about the circus articulated by scholars, writers or journalists, or it could be knowledge for the circus – knowledge of past acts and performances that can be used for the design of future ones.3

It is my proposition that the GESP project provides an interesting and challenging opportunity for us to explore and design ways to enliven our colonial past so that publics of all forms and contexts can engage with the potential insights that lay there about this particular period in Australia and the South Pacific’s history. Enlivening this past will provide opportunities to not only learn what we don’t know of what happened then, but more importantly to learn from then not as a series of static references, but then as a socio, cultural, material and economic ecology that had profound influences on who we have become and what might be possible for the future.

---

1 Anne Burdick, Johanna Drucker, Peter Lunenfeld, Todd Presner, and Jeffrey Schnapp, *Digital_Humanities* (Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press, 2012).
2 Burdick et al., *Digital Humanities*, 48.
In 1821, Thomas Scott stopped at a hut on Macquarie River, just outside today’s town of Ross in Tasmania’s Midlands. He sketched it out, noting that it was “Built of Mud and thatched with grass, of the most rude description”.1 His drawing shows this – a rough hut with a dog sleeping in a bark shelter nearby, a small kitchen garden almost out of frame. Scott noted that when he drew it there were no huts within six miles. Although the British had been in Van Diemen’s Land for nearly twenty years by then, and travelling through the centre of the island from Hobart to Launceston for fifteen, settlement in the Midlands was still at a very rudimentary stage.

My current research looks at land settlement in these earliest years of the Van Diemen’s Land colony, examining the priorities that informed settler choice of land grants, and the impact of rivers and roads on land accessibility. Very distinct stages of land settlement have become clear, each reliant on its predecessor to create particular conditions. One of the most significant factors in shaping Tasmania of today is the transition from rivers to overland routes for transportation, opening new areas not served by navigable waterways for British alienation. How this transition affected estate design, both in architecture and layout, is yet to be explored.

Each of the settlement stages in Van Diemen’s Land reveals a lot about the influence of Britain on settler priorities in the colony. Favourable comparisons were often made between the landscape here and in England, as the “park-like” plains drew in hopeful settlers.2 From the 1750s, British colonies around the world, from West Virginia to Van Diemen’s Land were given the same set of instructions about how they were to lay out settlements. They were to follow a well-established “long-lot” pattern, in which long strips of land stretched from the river to the hinterland. The width of each plot would be one third of the length, so that the river access and good land would be equally distributed.3 These plots were found throughout the New South Wales colony, particularly in areas granted to the former convicts.4 They provided community, safety, and the ability to pool resources.

Reports by visitors to the colony, tell us what the settlers were supposed to aspire to on their little patch of land and how they failed. Deficient fences and untidy fields were particularly noteworthy, while the newspapers and almanacs were full of guides to planting successful kitchen and decorative gardens.5 But while the landholders were under the most regulation about land grants, they were also the least caring about achieving the British ideal. This shaped the landscape throughout the following decades.

In the first decade of the Van Diemen’s Land settlement, the settlers often used the land as they found it. They had been told where to put their grant, but the records show that they were only using a third of the available land.6 They did not clear the land beyond absolute necessity, planting around tree trunks, burning off the ground cover, approximating the grant boundaries. This was survival farming – they did not aim to make their fortune. But while these long-lots provided an effective method of controlling
emancipist settlement, they also provided a gateway into land less accessible by river. In New Norfolk (Figure 1) this is particularly clear. The earliest grants were located on the Derwent River before the Plenty Rapids which stopped river-travel.

By the mid-1810s, settlers were moving into the much admired Macquarie Plains. As with many of the named "plains" around the island, these were probably a cultivated Aboriginal hunting ground interrupted by the arrival of the British. Lying just beyond New Norfolk, they are past the Plenty Rapids that marked the end of the navigable Derwent River. From 1817, there was a push to get free settlers out into the colony, and the people who moved out had some wealth, as well as ambition. Larger acreages were granted to them, with the hope they would convert the 'plains' into profitable export empires.

By 1823, grants required a minimum of £500, a mechanism perhaps intended to exclude people of lower status and wealth from buying land. In Britain the agricultural revolution was reshaping the landscape, as the elite expanded their estates by enclosing commons and draining marshes. The colonies gave them an opportunity to build estates of unimaginable sizes. An Australian way of using the land was quick to emerge, the "Britishness" seen in their landscapes a result of settlers using practices they already knew, rather than trying to recreate England.

The increasing numbers of free emigrants to the colony had a significant impact on its appearance, and not only because they had much larger properties. Figure 2 shows the split between the two stages, the tight long-lot or "riverine intensive" properties at 1, and the "open extensive" at 2. It can be easy to skip straight over stage one to stage two, to ignore the small grants. But this means ignoring their significance for the Macquarie Plains stage two settlement. Without this first stage, Macquarie Plains was inaccessible. Transport to New Norfolk was primarily by the river for several decades, but beyond that was unnavigable. By establishing a settlement before the rapid, it was possible to build a road to transport goods from that point, thus opening up the plains.

In summary, what this pattern shows is a shift from river to road, as the settlers could move from the tether of the river for their daily transportation. The roads that were built were rough, and often the rivers were safer, but land routes were being established. This paper opened with a description of a mud and grass hut built relatively late in the colony's earliest history. We come back to it now. Even wealthy settlers often began with a rough central passage cottage, such as at Brickendon in Longford, until they had the time and means to build a grander house. But how did the shift from a river focused transport system to an overland network turn their eyes, and therefore their buildings and created landscapes, from the river to the roads?
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