Conservative and reverent souls: the growth of historical consciousness in Tasmania 1935–60
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In the 1970s and 1980s it was fashionable to claim that Tasmanians lacked interest in their history or attempted to distort it. In 1978 historian Lloyd Robson noted that the convict inheritance lived on 'in the minds of many Tasmanians' and reinforced 'their determination to live down their past and pervert their history by stressing respectability'.¹ In 1983 historian Kay Daniels thought that Tasmania was a 'society which is still uncomfortable with its past, which sees its history as in some ways marked by a shameful inheritance' while in 1988 writer and expatriate Tasmanian academic Peter Conrad suggested that Tasmania had 'unwritten its own history' to conform with 'a self-protective incuriosity about origins'.²

Undoubtedly, there is much to these claims. The fifty years after Tasmania's settlement in 1803 left an indelible mark. Its origins as the penal colony of Van Diemen's Land and the decline of its indigenous people cast a shadow over its later history and encouraged cultural amnesia.³ But as the second most important colony, it benefited from Imperial money: the colonists were enterprising, the economy prospered. And in the late Georgian and early Victorian period many fine public and private buildings were erected throughout the island.⁴ There was much to celebrate as well as to lament. In this article I will chart the rise of historical consciousness in Tasmania from 1935 to about 1960. It concentrates on the role of historical societies, professional societies and community bodies in seeking to preserve, protect or highlight Tasmania's historical traditions. History enthusiasts commemorated the exploits of explorers, pioneers, soldiers and businessmen. They sought to preserve buildings, erect monuments and lay plaques. They sought to create a positive version of the past and largely ignored darker deeds.

To analyse the way Tasmanians responded to their history we can draw on the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. In the mid-1870s Nietzsche wrote that history was 'necessary for the living man in three ways: in relation to his action and struggle, his conservatism and reverence, his
Nietzsche linked each of these needs with three types of history: the monumental, the antiquarian and the critical. According to Nietzsche, monumental history served the needs of the man of action who turned to the past for moral inspiration and example. New nations typically told tales of heroes and stories of great events as building blocks in the construction of myths of national progress or national destiny. As for the antiquarian, Nietzsche claims he was 'careful to preserve what survives from ancient days'. He continued: 'All that is small and limited, moulder and obsolescent, gains a worth and inviolability of its own from the conservative and reverent soul of the antiquary migrating into it and building a secret nest there. The history of his town becomes the history of himself'.

Antiquarian history sought to revive, restore and even re-enter the past. David Lowenthal saw a link between the decline of monumental history and the rise of antiquarian history. If the past cannot be incorporated into 'our own creative acts, we concentrate instead on saving its remaining vestiges. The less integral the role of the past in our lives, the more imperative the urge to preserve its relics'. Critical history is for those who suffer the burdens of history and who see a radical rejection of the past as a precondition for their deliverance. According to Nietzsche, 'man must have the strength to break up the past, to apply it, in order to live. He must bring the past to the bar of judgement, interrogate it remorselessly and finally condemn it... Every past is worthy of condemning'.

In these different ways, Nietzsche asserted, history was necessary for humans because it injected meaning, perspective and inspiration into their lives. In their relationship with the past, historical societies in Tasmania embodied Nietzsche's three types of history. This was especially true of the Tasmanian Society. There was an element of the critical type in the sense that the Tasmanian Society rejected if not condemned any interest in Tasmania's convict past and gave it hardly any attention at all. The society illustrated the monumental type by turning to the past for stories of great deeds, by drawing moral inspiration from the struggles of the pioneers and by wanting to commemorate their achievements. But above all it illustrated the antiquarian type in its obsession with preserving the past—exactly whose past I will come to. In the first section I will consider early evidence of the growth of historical consciousness in Tasmania before studying the period from the 1930s in more depth. Major themes such as the preservation of historical buildings, the erection of memorials and the celebration of historical anniversaries will be examined.

1. 1899–1927

In recent years Australian historians such as Brian Fletcher, Tom Griffiths and Graeme Davison have traced what can be called the roots of historical consciousness in Australia. They have concluded that interest in Australian history was not initiated in the universities but in local communities throughout the continent. Numerous local history societies began to discuss, write, commemorate, preserve and empathise with Australia's past long before university history departments and showed much emotional attachment to that history.

In Tasmania the course of interest in local history followed the general trajectory of the other States. The history taught in Tasmanian primary schools was mainly British history, but at least from 1910 some Tasmanian history and the discovery and exploration of Australia were included in the syllabus. At the University of Tasmania, Australian history was taught as small part of British history and in the 1930s Tasmanian history was still ignored. The only lecturer was Charles King, who became Professor in 1935, and history as a discipline remained 'an academic backwater' in the interwar years. King had little time or energy (and perhaps no desire) to teach, let alone initiate research into Tasmanian history.

Interest in Tasmanian history came from outside the University and we can identify waves of interest: in the 1890s related perhaps to federation and the Boer War, in the 1920s in the wake of the First World War and in the 1930s after the depression when there developed a greater pride in Tasmania's heritage under the Ogilvie Government. In 1899, as federation approached, the Historical and Geographical section of the Royal Society of Tasmania was formed and encouraged research into local history until Tasmania's centenary celebrations in 1904 when it appears to have disbanded. The section was revived after the First World War in 1921 by J. Moore-Robinson, with the help among others of Dr. William Crowther and Clive Lord. It was a livelier entity than its predecessor, holding regular lectures, agitating for the preservation of monuments such as those to the convict ship George III and the politician William Race Allison and of the headstones in St. David's Park, advocating the identification and preservation of historical documents, and in 1925 celebrating the centenary of Tasmania's colonial independence from New South Wales. In its desire to mark the landing place of the Dutch explorer A. J. Tasman's discovery of Tasmania in 1642 and Lieutenant-Governor David Collins's first settlement at Sullivan's Cove in 1804, the section emphasised the tourist value of identifying and commemorating historical landmarks. The section folded soon after press criticism about the quality of some historical lectures in 1927.

Tasmania's first historical body, the Historical Society of Tasmania, was formed in Launceston in February 1934. Despite its name, that body concentrated on the history of northern Tasmania and had only a short public impact. On 13 March 1935 it unveiled a commemorative tablet on the pillar of the Cornwall Hotel to mark the spot where the settlement of the city of Melbourne was planned and on 28 December 1935 supported moves to commemorate and re-enact the first settlement in the north at George Town by William Paterson, but thereafter seems to have adopted a low key approach.
It was the emphasis on the tourist value of the preserved past that provides the context for the emergence of the most prominent historical body, the Tasmanian Society. In 1935, elected in 1934, Sir Ernest Clark, a history buff, became President. Wignall was also first chairman of the Southern Division and the Mayor of Launceston, F. Wardlaw, a farmer and member of the Legislative Council, was chairman of the Northern Division. Local historian Basil Rait was State and Southern Divisional Secretary. Wignall praised Rait for his historical work which was ‘well known throughout Australia, and said he was ‘perhaps our foremost authority’ on Tasmanian history. This exaggerated statement says less about Rait, who was only a young man of 23 in 1936, and more about the neglected state of Tasmanian history. But certainly Rait’s energy kept the Tasmanian Society in public view until around 1940. One of his key roles was to write lectures for the office bearers to read on commemorative occasions and to write press releases about the society’s activities. Although he had an infectious enthusiasm for history, which somehow communicated to others, Rait’s small corpus of historical work was unimpressive. His forte was newspaper articles but he had also written a short history of Hutchins School, St. John the Baptist Church and St. David's Cathedral and a short biography of Charles Leslie Dundas.

As well as the Governor, Mayors and politicians, the Tasmanian Society attracted support from Ministers of the Crown, leading public servants and even the Bishop of Tasmania Robert Snowdon Hay. The President of the Municipal Association, the Director of Education and the Council of Churches were represented. Also represented were the Institute of Architects, the Shiplayers' Society and the Royal Society. The Tasmanian Society claimed not to be a ‘political organisation’ or to be seeking ‘financial gain’. It intended to deal with ‘any matter affecting the interests of Tasmania past, present, and future’ and to make it ‘a State Society in every possible way’. They were of ‘one colour, of one people, serving the same King, children of one God’. They should unite under the motto ‘Tasmania and service’. In this spirit, the Tasmanian Society co-operated with the Pioneer Executive in planting trees in the southern part of the Pioneers’ Avenue and Rait represented the society on the St. Andrew’s Park Memorial Committee, the Australian Forestry League and the Franklin Centenary Committee. While the society could not contribute financially to every historical commemoration, it did, as was the case with the memorials to Scottish pioneers in St. Andrew’s Park, give ‘the greatest possible publicity’ to the project.

The Tasmanian Society was founded for a number of reasons. As they believed that Tasmania was ‘richer in historical tradition than any of the Mainland States and abounded with historical relics, they wanted to preserve the physical reminders of Tasmania’s past as a tourist asset. In preserving historical relics they were helping ‘to safeguard for future generations one of the State’s greatest industries’, tourism. The formation of branches in different parts of the State was expected to be of ‘immense value and assistance’ to the Government Tourist Bureau. More than a hint of self-interest on Rait’s part was the proposal to appoint a historical adviser to the Government and the Tourist Bureau to be called the Official Historian. The Official Historian would survey Tasmania’s historical relics, monuments, landmarks and buildings including the graves of the early pioneers, record relics and inscriptions for the use by the Tourist Bureau, copy historical documents scattered throughout the state with the aim of writing a complete history of Tasmania, compile historical guides to tourist routes, and prepare an index of events each year in the municipalities.

The society wanted to establish branches of Tasmanians living in other States, where sites with Tasmanian connections would be marked. More ambitiously, the society hoped that some historical anniversaries would be commemorated in other countries and thus provide international publicity for Tasmania. An example was the Dutch discovery of Tasmania; but the British connection was paramount. Rait wrote an article entitled ‘Tasmania’s Homage’ in the Imperial Review, published by the Imperial Trade Organisation, to underscore Tasmania’s British heritage. By ‘perpetuating the historical traditions’ of Tasmania and ‘marking historical sites’, the Tasmanian Society reinforced Tasmania’s link with ‘the Motherland of England’. 
To commemorate the coronation of King George VI in 1937 and to perpetuate the memory of Royal visits to Tasmania, Rait suggested to the City Council that a memorial obelisk be erected. This would symbolise "the loyalty and the devotion of the people of Tasmania to the throne" and commemorate "a number of outstanding events" in Tasmanian history.

Given the emphasis on tourism, it was no surprise that the Director of the Tourist Bureau, Evelyn Temple Emmett, was a leading member of the society. Equally important as this practical, economic link between tourism and history was a deep emotional attachment to the past. The founders wanted "the present generation and the generations to come" to understand "what they owe to the Pioneers of their country, what those splendid men and women did in the early development of Tasmania." This understanding "would help all in their duty of putting country first, the essential before the trivial, the permanent before the transitory". They wanted to foster "Love of country" and "Patriotism through the study of history". They believed that tradition was "the great factor in the building up and the maintenance and advancement of any country." Viewed in "the right light", history was "more fascinating and more romantic than any of the so-called novels of the day". The founder of the first settlement at Risdon, Lieutenant John Bowen, was one of many "romantic pioneers" who had given Tasmania "a most fascinating history". The Tasmanian Society was open to all "public spirited" citizens who wanted to make "the people more historically minded" and to "preserve and make known places of historical interest". Moreover, they wanted to preserve "existing beauty spots" and create "new beauty, the development of civic pride, and the development of the "More Beautiful Tasmania idea"", aims with obvious import for tourism.

The theme of learning from history was taken up by Governor Clark. The Tasmanian Society should "create a sense of history" which was "a great and vital necessity for a proper direction in life." The young would benefit from learning about "the pertinacity, the industry, and self-reliance" that enabled the pioneers to make "this prosperous State out of wild nature". The records of their endeavours were "everywhere around" and needed to be preserved before they were lost. Rait took issue with Tasmania's image of "the Convict Island", which was "a hideous stain upon the pages of our history". As descendants of the pioneers, they had a duty to remove the stain and restore "the memories of our ancestors"—those gallants [sic] souls who braved the perils of an unknown land to win that glorious heritage which is ours". This could be done by stressing that "Tasmania was a foundation centre of Australian education, culture and sport. Another influential supporter, the Treasurer Edmund Dwyer-Gray, was aware of the value of Tasmania's convict past to tourism but had broader horizons. He called Port Arthur "the Stone Henge of Australia" and "one of the greatest tourist assets which this state possesses". Visitors from all over the world arrived in Tasmania to see "the ruins of this celebrated penal station, a relic of a dark age". But Port Arthur represented but "one phase of the State's history" and many landmarks "if marked by suitable memorials" would attract visitors.

The founders were aware of the work done elsewhere. Historical events were commemorated in other Australian States. In England the National Trust, since its establishment in 1895, had saved from destruction, restored and preserved a number of historical buildings. It was also interested in the preservation of "the natural beauties of the countryside". The Ancient Monuments Board cared for historical monuments. The Tasmanian Society realised that it could not emulate the work of these bodies but it did have wide-ranging aims, wider perhaps than most historical societies. These were to mark historical sites; to preserve historical monuments, landmarks and relics; to create Pioneer Avenues; to create "a Tasmanian sentiment"; to organise "fitting" commemoration of the historical anniversaries by suitable celebrations; to publish a journal containing the historical records of Tasmania; to establish an archives of Tasmanian records; to record and preserve "the stories of the lives and works of the pioneers"; and to hold lectures, illustrated talks and screen films illustrating the general history and development of the State. This was an ambitious program for a society depending on members' subscriptions and a small government grant of £75.

Despite its limited funds, the Tasmanian Society attempted to put many of its aims into practice. To stimulate an interest in different aspects of history, lectures were held at regular meetings. Members reached out to a wider audience by arranging a series of talks for ABC Radio in 1937. Emmett spoke on "Picturesque Personalities" such as the Reverend Knopwood, Jorgen Jorgenson, and John Pascoe Fawkner and the turbulent life of convict Denis McCarthy. Fred Usher, managing editor of the Mercury, selected "The Growth of Tasmanian Literature" as his subject. Dwyer-Gray spoke about "Our Heritage", a talk written by Rait. Although there were "chapters in its history which are best forgotten", Dwyer-Gray believed there were many more that deserved wider knowledge and formed a "glorious heritage". Tasmania was the first colony to be granted responsible government, was a pioneer in the federation movement and, as the first centre for many denominations, had many of the oldest churches in Australia. The Tasmanian Society lacked the funds to publish a journal to record talks and broadcasts and few therefore have survived unless summarised in newspapers.

The Tasmanian Society also failed in its aim of creating an archive for "the preservation of the records of Tasmania, now scattered far and wide". The alternative to creating an archive was for the Government to appoint a records officer (as had existed in the early 1920s) and, as "valuable records of the early pioneers" had been acquired by mainland institutions, to take "definite steps" to keep existing records in the state. The other major concern was the unthinking destruction of original records. In 1938, the Northern Division asked the Minister for Lands and Works, Thomas Henry Davies, to preserve old records held in the Court House at Stanley.
directed the Scenery Preservation Board to circularise eight rural councils to care for 'any historical records or documents' relating to the early settlement and development of their municipalities. Other steps to form a collection of documents and photographs of historic importance by approaching various organisations but it is doubtful that he had much luck.58

The push for a state archives was given considerable impetus by a report in February 1940 from Max Crawford, Professor of History at the University of Melbourne. Crawford was shocked by the destruction and housing of records and urged the appointment of a trained archivist with a degree in history and library training. The Government decided to delay a decision about a state archives until after the war but, in September 1942, appointed a senior officer in the Chief Secretary's Office, J.C. Watt, as Archives Officer in addition to his other duties.59 This appointment was confirmed by the Public Records Act 1943, which was based on a 1939 South Australian Act. It contained safeguards against the destruction of public records without authorisation and the recovery of records 'improperly held'.60 But when introducing the Bill the Minister linked the need to preserve historical landmarks for the tourist industry with the need to stop the removal or destruction of public records. In line with government policy he was more tourist-conscious than history-conscious.

Historical buildings

With a small and slowly growing population and limited pressures for redevelopment, many of Tasmania's historic buildings remained intact by the 1930s. The Scenery Preservation Board, composed of representatives of government departments and individuals nominated by the Government, had 'full powers' under the Scenery Preservation Act to buy land upon which 'an historic structure' had been built.61 Since 1916 it had controlled 'several outstanding historical buildings and areas', the major being Port Arthur, but it had no direct powers over historical buildings and limited finances.62 In 1934 the Tasmanian Institute of Architects formed a vigilance committee to advise local councils on the preservation of 'Historical Architectural Buildings' and their records, plans and photographs.

Little was done before the establishment of the Tasmanian Society which asked the architects to join its Historical Buildings and Monuments Committee. In June 1936, Wignall and Rait initiated an appeal to raise £400 to buy and repair the old Shot Tower on Brown's River Road. The appeal succeeded, the tower would become 'the property of the people' and be 'administered in trust for them'. Although a valuable and popular tourist attraction, the private owner was no longer prepared to maintain the tower for tourist purposes and threatened to demolish it. Wignall and Rait acted to save 'the only tower of its kind in Australia'. It had been built in 1870 by the engineer and architect Joseph Moir. The first shot had been dropped on 8 September 1870 but shot making did not last long. Although the appeal was abandoned for lack of public response, the owner fortunately did not proceed with demolition.

Prompted by Emmett, the Tasmanian Society moved to save the Lady Franklin Museum which was used as an apple store. Rait's suggested ways of renovating and beautifying the museum at little cost were taken seriously by the Christ College trustees and the City Council, which was willing to take over the museum. Renovations included building new timber doors, placing panels throughout the museum for former Governors, Premiers, Mayors and Pioneers of the Franklin period. Church denominations were asked to donate a glass showcase in memory of their pioneer minister in Van Diemen's Land. Prints and photographs of early Tasmania were collected. Rait suggested opening the museum on one afternoon each weekend from 3 pm to 5 pm and at other times depending on visits of tourist ships. On 6 January 1937 the museum was transferred to the City Council and was renovated and repaired. It later became an art gallery.

Northern members were especially interested saving historic buildings. The Northern division heard that the old Oatlands Gaol, built in 1834, would be pulled down and asked the Council Clerk to halt proceedings. Architect, Frank Heyward, garnered support from the Royal Society and Oatlands' publicans because it would be a 'foolish blunder to destroy this rather remarkable piece of masonry, one of the most outstanding in the State' and of immense interest to tourists. Wardlaw counselled against upsetting the Government which had been 'wonderfully helpful to us'. Rait outlined the need to preserve historical landmarks for the tourist industry with the need to stop the removal or destruction of public records. In line with government policy he was more tourist-conscious than history-conscious.
In July 1936 Wignall unveiled a tablet on the Huon Bridge to mark the 60th anniversary of the first bridge over the Huon River, south of Hobart, which assisted the transport of produce to markets. The Tasmanian Society was interested in 'perpetuating military traditions'. In July 1937, the Hobart City Council allowed the society to commemorate the establishment of Mulgrave Battery and the old Signal Station in Prince's Park. A tablet was erected at the entrance to Mulgrave Battery, Tasmania's first military battery, and another tablet on a stone base was placed on the lawn in front of the Signal Station, 'the last link in a chain of semaphore telegraph stations', which began sending messages in 1818. The early governors also received some recognition, in particular the society's spiritual patron, Sir John Franklin. In January 1937 a granite obelisk was unveiled to commemorate the centenary of Franklin's visit to Tasmania and a church service was held at St. David's Cathedral.

Early explorers were honoured. The Tasmanian Society combined with the Bruny Municipal Council to mark the 150th anniversary of William Bligh's ship the Bounty anchoring in Adventure Bay in August 1788. Perhaps more surprising was the interest shown in the early French explorers, an example of where tourism and historical significance merged. French explorers had undoubtedly played a major role in the discovery of the River Derwent. In August 1937 the Tasmanian Society proposed memorials to other French explorers. These included Captain Marion Du Fresne who discovered Marion Bay in 1772 and who had the earliest recorded encounter with Aborigines. Another significant figure was Commodore Nicholas Baudin who chartered the East Coast from Freycinet's Peninsula to the Tasman and Forestier's Peninsula in 1802. Supported by the Glamorgan Municipal Council, the State Government and private individuals, the Tasmanian Society selected a site south of Swansea overlooking the coast to erect a red granite memorial. Further discussions with Swansea residents resulted in the proposal to establish a tree-lined avenue from...
the East Coast Road to Kelvedon Point where the memorial would stand. Called the Explorer’s Avenue, the memorial would overlook Oyster Bay. The Premier A.G. Ogilvie, ‘an ardent supporter’, died in June 1939 before the opening ceremony and the society proposed to place a memorial to him at the entrance to the avenue. On 22 July 1939 a number of trees were planted to commemorate Dutch, French and English explorers.

Other memorials involved the financial community and illustrated Rait’s power of persuasion. In Hobart, Rait approached the manager of the AMP Society about commemorating the diamond jubilee of the first branch in Tasmania in 1884. Rait pointed out that the first office was opened in the Stone Buildings at the corner of Macquarie and Murray Streets, but the AMP preferred to place the brass tablet on its new building at the corner of Elizabeth and Collins Streets. At the unveiling ceremony in July 1937, Rait thanked the AMP for supporting the Tasmanian Society and wryly commented that the AMP building was one of the first skyscrapers in Hobart. In June 1937, Rait approached the manager of the Union Bank in Launceston about marking its centenary. Rait described the bank as ‘one of Australia’s leading banking institutions’ which had played ‘an outstanding part’ in the development of Launceston’s commercial life. The bank agreed and the Launceston firm Jackson made the brass tablet which was eighteen inches high by eleven inches with one inch high lettering. The ceremony on 29 September marked the centenary of the bank’s establishment. On 24 October 1938 the Tasmanian Society unveiled a tablet to commemorate the centenary of the Derwent and Tamar Assurance Group, the oldest institution of its type in Australia, an event that was reported in the London Times.

The Tasmanian Society also supported commemorations of the place of Aborigines in Tasmanian history. In 1936 plans were formulated to unveil a memorial plaque to Trucannini who, Rait wrote, was the last Tasmanian Aborigine. He suggested that a statue to Trucannini be erected on the summit of Trucannini’s Lookout at Bruny Island, which overlooked the waters which she so loved. Rait admitted that her mistreatment was ‘a damning indictment of white people, and a shameful passage in our history’. The story of the decline of the aborigines of Tasmania, he wrote, apparently not aware of the pun, was ‘one of the blackest passages in the history of our state’. This was tokenism. The Tasmanian Society overwhelmingly perpetuated a view of the past that was acceptable to the business and civic leaders whose support was cultivated.

Another kind of memorial to attract the attention of the Tasmanian Society was gravestones. In 1938 northern member, Frank Heyward, enthused that old graveyards were ‘rich in illustration of the earliest colonial period’. He collected epitaphs from cemeteries in Hobart, Launceston and smaller towns as well as ‘isolated graves’. They revealed ‘queer comments on the life of the time’ and revived memories of ‘almost forgotten worthies’. The common thread that ran through all the epitaphs was of ‘hopeful humanity with its common end of frustration and its hopes eventually covered with dust’. In 1937, the Tasmanian Society urged the City Council to care for the gravestones of St David’s Park, which perpetuated the memory of the early pioneers and were of ‘great interest to tourists’. The council agreed to cut back creepers but not to repaint faded inscriptions of headstones placed against the walls.

In 1940, William Nevin Hurst, the Secretary for Lands and enthusiastic local historian, suggested that the stones which commemorated men who arrived with Collins should be grouped around his ‘magnificent monument’ and be protected from vandals by an iron fence. The stones of St David’s ‘preserved’ stories of early Tasmania, of men killed by bushrangers or while whaling, memories of an Aboriginal boy or the first white child born. They should be restored because more tourists visited St David’s and read the inscriptions than any other tourist ‘retreat’. Hurst also pointed out that St John’s Park cemetery at New Town, controlled by the Government, contained ‘valuable’ monuments in need of care. If the monuments to Tasmania’s pioneers were cared for, the Tasmanian Society would rise in ‘public estimation’. The Treasurer Dwyer-Gray, a member of the society, agreed that the Government should act ‘to preserve Tasmania’s historic monuments’ but the war diverted attention from such matters.

Anniversaries

Linked with the unveiling of memorials was the commemoration of historical anniversaries which the Tasmanian Society thought would give ‘the people generally...a better knowledge of the State’s history’. On 11 October 1936, the society organised a memorial service in St David’s Cathedral to mark the anniversary of the birth of Arthur Phillip, founder of ‘the first white settlement’ in Australia. The society thought it fitting to ‘co-operate in this empire movement to honour the man who ranks as Australia’s first pioneer’. Celebrating anniversaries also would ensure that Tasmania’s contribution to ‘the development of Church life’ in Australia was remembered. Not only did a number of churches, such as the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, start in Van Diemen’s Land, but ministers from these and other religions laid the foundations for their churches in Victoria. Leading members of the society such as Wignall and Wardlaw spoke at the centenary meetings of rural and other churches and at fairs to praise the pioneers of ‘spiritual and religious work’ and the education of the young. In 1937, Rait initiated a move to celebrate the tercentenary of Tasmania’s discovery of Van Diemen’s Land and attract publicity for the event in Australia and overseas. Premier Robert Cosgrove warmly supported the idea. He praised the Tasmanian Society and Rait in particular for stimulating an interest in the rich historical background of Tasmania. It had publicly highlighted significant past events and would ‘co-operate with the Government to commemorate the 300th anniversary of Tasman’s arrival. Other anniversaries
to be celebrated in 1942 included the centenary of the Diocese of Tasmania, the consecration of the first Bishop, and Tasmania's first museum, the Lady Franklin Museum. The Government agreed with Rail's suggestion that, as a goodwill gesture, the Tasmanian Government should present a 'Tercentenary Memorial to Tasman to the people of Holland'.

The onset of war forced the abandonment of a celebration on 'a fitting scale'. In 1942 the Government felt that modest Tercentenary celebrations should be held and appointed the Minister for Lands and Works, John Lewis Madden, to organise the event in twelve weeks. Madden sought advice from the most reliable authorities in Australia and New Zealand so that the celebrations would be based on 'historically sound foundations'. A forty-three page booklet entitled *The discovery of Tasmania* based on J.E. Heeres' 1898 translation of Tasman's journal was edited by local historian John Reynolds and served as 'a permanent record of an important milestone in Tasmanian history'. Some 1250 copies were distributed to schools and an abbreviated version prepared by Miss M.L.Reid-McIlreary was produced for public speakers and municipal councils. A number of official guests representing the Netherlands, Britain, America and the Commonwealth Government attended the major ceremonies at Dunalley and Launceston where suitably inscribed tablets were unveiled. At Hobart Technical College, the A.I. Tasman wing was opened.

Seeing the commemoration as valuable from an educational and civic viewpoint the Government encouraged local communities to act voluntarily and unaided. Tree-planting ceremonies were held at twenty-four centres, some schools re-enacted aspects of Tasman's discovery, and a number of societies held special meetings. Outside Tasmania, ceremonies were held in Sydney, Melbourne and London. Special broadcasts about the celebrations were heard on the BBC, America's Columbia Broadcasting System and Moscow Radio. Newspapers in Tasmania, Victoria and New South Wales published historical articles related to the discovery. Madden felt that the Tercentenary celebration achieved its aims and the 'historical significance' of the discovery was 'made known to a wide public'. It attracted 'international interest' despite the distraction of war. Some fifty-three functions were organised compared with two in 1904, when Tasmanians celebrated their centenary of settlement.

The Tercentenary celebrations demonstrated a growing interest in Tasmania's past but the Tasmanian Society seems to have played no formal part in them. In part its support waned after war broke out and, as key members were involved in war work, the society suspended its activities. The death of one of the society's stalwarts, Alan Wardlaw, in December 1938 lessened its influence in the north. But we have evidence to suggest that influential supporters felt the society was losing its sense of purpose. In March 1940, just before it suspended activities, Dwyer-Gray told Rail that the society was wrong to require evening dress for the annual general meeting. This tended

'to turn the whole affair into a society affair, instead of a people's affair'. This begs the question of whether the society had ever been a people's society. It was not in its membership, which was overwhelmingly composed of educated, middle class professionals. The society could be interpreted to be a vehicle for Rail's ambitions. There was more than an element of this certainly, but the Tasmanian Society's wide-ranging activities undoubtedly 'generally created interest in Tasmanian history', even if it had not necessarily 'definitely changed public opinion in historical matters'.

3. 1945–60

The Tasmanian Society had always intended to regroup after the war, but it was provoked into early action in 1945 when Dr William Crowther, an early member of the society, suggested that a new historical body be established under the auspices of the Royal Society to preserve historical buildings. This idea was deplored by the Tasmanian Society. The Royal Society was an exclusive body and more interested in scientific than historical matters. The Tasmanian Society claimed to represent all sections of the community and dealt with all kinds of historical issues, as its activities before the war had demonstrated. A meeting to reconstitute the society was attended by four authors of books on Tasmanian history—Emmett, Hurst, Rail and Monsignor J.H. Cullen. Other men equally committed to the objects of the society had announced their intention to rejoin. The society had much less ambitious aims than in 1935. It was now devoted to what it was good at: marking historical sites; preserving historical monuments, landmarks and relics; and organising commemorations of historical anniversaries. To establish its bona fides as the chief historical body, the society changed its name to the Historical Society of Tasmania on 5 May 1947. But it was much less active than in the pre-war period partly because there were fewer anniversaries to commemorate. The main focus of official and public attention after the
war was on historical buildings, and the central role of the Tasmanian Society was challenged by other bodies.

Moves to preserve buildings of architectural or historic value were revived before the end of World War II by the Tasmanian chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. Prompted by the Government's moves to save the Theatre Royal, in October 1944 the architects pointed out that Tasmanian towns and country districts contained buildings of ‘definite architectural merit’. Tourists regularly commented that Tasmania had ‘a richer heritage’ in such buildings than other states and the architects felt more should be made of these assets. One obstacle to preservation was that the buildings were often privately owned and their value was not recognised by the owners. This created difficulties in framing regulations to ‘ensure their preservation’ or ‘protect them from being spoiled by incongruous [sic] additions’. The architects proposed the appointment of a committee of representative bodies to advise government on the preservation of worthy buildings based not just on age but ‘architectural value’.

Premier Robert Cosgrove pointed out that the Tasmanian Society had shown an interest in historic buildings before the war, and he valued its advice. He recognised the value of historical buildings to the tourist trade but felt that government sponsorship of an expert committee was not yet justified. In any case, he thought the government already had a suitable body in the Scenery Preservation Board. The Tasmanian Society supported extending the Board’s jurisdiction to historical buildings. One of the members of the Board, Director of the Tourist Department, L.F. Smeeton, recommended that the Government be asked to sanction a policy of acquiring ‘historic structures’ that the Board considered should belong to the State and to make funds available. Funds would also be required to restore and maintain the buildings. Smeeton suggested that the still vulnerable Shot Tower be the first building acquired.

Meanwhile, a public meeting on historic buildings was followed by a deputation to the Minister of Lands and Works on 19 September 1945. One of the members of the Scenery Preservation Board, W.E. Maclean, persuaded the Board to confer with the Tasmanian Society of which he was a prominent member, and develop a policy of acquisition and preservation. Representatives of the society met with the Board and agreed to co-operate. The Board asked the society to report on the Shot Tower and Bowen’s Government House and to list other buildings in ‘priority order’, as well as to suggest ways of raising revenue. Although Premier Cosgrove continued to support the Tasmanian Society and praise its ‘good service’ to government under ministerial direction the Board decided to seek the views of interested parties to list historical buildings and ‘scenic spots’.

On 19 November 1945, Minister for Lands and Works, Edward Brooker, held a meeting on the preservation of historical buildings and landmarks with representative bodies, including the Royal Society, the Tasmanian Society, the

Scenery Preservation Board, the City Council, the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, the Town and Country Planning Commissioner, the Municipal Association and the Tourist Department. All agreed to support the Board in preserving historical buildings and monuments. Brooker supported the appointment of a representative committee to advise the Board and list ‘all buildings and landmarks throughout the State, which, in its opinion, should be preserved’. The Board should then report to the Government with recommendations and costings.

The Board asked the Royal Society and the Tasmanian Society to submit separate lists. Seeking to neutralise the Tasmanian Society’s influence, the Royal Society pressed for a more representative committee, but Cosgrove stood in its way. The Tasmanian Society announced publicly that it was contacting municipalities and compiling a state-wide register of all historical landmarks and buildings. The criteria would be ‘historic value’, ‘architectural construction’ and age. But the society acknowledged that just because a building was old did not justify preservation unless it represented a period in development or architectural construction and had ‘historic associations with the days of the pioneers’.

The Royal Society submitted its list on 14 February, and the Tasmanian Society on 6 March. The Royal Society sub-committee consisted of Dr William Crowther, Dr Joseph Pearson and A.L. Meston. The sub-committee recommended that Secheron in Battery Point, Runnymede in New Town and Fawkner’s Cottage in Claremont be acquired. Secheron was ‘probably the best specimen of early Colonial architecture’ in Hobart and should be converted into a museum to illustrate a type of early Colonial home with period furniture. The sub-committee recommended that another fifty-seven properties be preserved but not acquired. The Board should co-operate with the owners to preserve the properties ‘as near as possible in their original condition and also to maintain them in good order’. A third proposal was to preserve and maintain ‘the original character of certain townsships, suggesting first Hamilton as representative of early Tasmanian settlement’. Finally, the sub-committee discussed scenic areas. Mt Wellington, which had suffered from bush fires, should be ‘cleared of dead and burnt trees and replanted with the original types of trees’. Later, the Northern Branch of the Royal Society emphasised the preservation of convict-built bridges and waterways.

The Tasmanian Society’s major recommendations were different and broader. It recommended the immediate acquisition and preservation of: Batman’s Cottage at Ben Lomond; the Old Mill at Oatlands; the site of First Settlement at Risdon; the cottage of the Irish exile, Thomas Francis Meagher, at Ross; the Signal Station in Prince’s Park, Hobart; and Clyde, the home of the author D’Ken John Peel, all of which appeared on the Royal Society’s longer list. The Tasmanian Society further suggested co-operation with the owners to preserve another forty-seven buildings, and here we find substantial overlap with the Royal Society.
After studying the lists, the Board's sub-committee on historical matters recommended that the Government acquire one property near Hobart and one near Launceston which embodied 'the best features of early colonial architecture', furnish it in 'period style' and charge for public admission. The Risdon site should be acquired including the old house at the back of the monument which should be 'partially restored' and furnished as a museum and tearoom. The Oatlands windmill should be acquired and 'completely restored'. The Board should inspect the old penal buildings at Rocky Hills and Fawknere's Cottage before deciding to restore. The owners of private buildings would be asked to take 'all possible' care of them. The Board welcomed further advice from bodies interested in 'historic matters'. The Board estimated the cost of buying the five properties to be £30 000 and made the Oatlands windmill first priority at £2500. The Board ruled out legislation requiring owners to maintain their properties under its guidance because the expense would be 'unacceptable' to owners and to Parliament.

The Government was responsive. It placed £30 000 in the Public Works Execution Bill 1947 to acquire and preserve historic buildings and monuments. But Cabinet wanted more details about the houses to be purchased in Hobart and Launceston and the penal buildings at Rocky Hills. As for Fawknere's Cottage, the owners intended to keep and repair it. During debate on the Bill, the Assembly agreed to vote £20 000. Reg Wright dissented, suggesting tourists would benefit more if money was spent on beaches and other resorts. On 14 April 1947, a Royal Society deputation to Minister Brooker urged him to support its recommendations. While noting that the Government could not buy all old properties, Brooker wanted to create a public appreciation of historic buildings. Since 1939, he had supported the concept of a self-supporting 'national house' furnished in 'the style of the old days' with wax figures 'to give a complete picture'. He also favoured asking private owners to maintain their historic buildings and placing plaques on the most worthy.

Launceston's Examiner lauded the Government's initiatives and stressed that mobilising public opinion was a pre-requisite for 'political action'. Culturally, it was desirable that Tasmanians 'young and old and of all sections' should gain 'a much better understanding' of 'the value' of historic structures. The Examiner urged immediate action to preserve 'the original character' of old towns because buildings were deteriorating and 'incongruous' changes destroyed 'the character not only of the buildings directly affected but of villages as a whole'.

The Board examined a number of candidates as possible national houses. The Chairman of the Board, C. M. Pitt, favoured a national house in its 'natural setting in the country' and suggested the twenty-one room Entally House at Hadspeen. Further investigation strengthened the claims of Entally, the Royal Society supported it, and, in April 1949, Parliament approved £10 000 for developing and equipping it. Covering ninety-three acres, Entally had a drive which resembled 'a Sussex country lane' winding between 'fine English trees'. Thomas Reibey built Entally in 1820 with bricks made on the property by convict labour and lived there 'in the traditional style of an English squire'. Local historian, Dr Clifford Craig, and Director of the Queen Victoria Museum, N. J. B. Plomley, advised on the art and furniture to be placed in Entally, another local historian, Karl von Stiegalitz, advised on Tasmanian history, and landscape gardener, R. D. Dowse, advised on the layout of the gardens. Entally was opened in December 1950 and, within five months, 11 000 visitors had paid £560 to see it.

The Secretary of the Scenery Preservation Board, Michael Sharland, pointed out the growing list of buildings that deserved restoration and preservation because of their 'distinctive architectural charm or historic interest', but they were 'deteriorating' through their owners' lack of interest or inability to fund the work. The Board was justified in maintaining historic buildings just as much as natural scenery because both were assets to tourism. Tasmania's landscape resembled England's with its 'many lovely stone buildings, and large areas planted with English trees and hedges', which should be retained 'not only for the enjoyment of its own people, but also for the benefit of visitors. The Board was committed to saving buildings where possible but some were beyond redemption. For example, Fawknere's Cottage at Claremont required re-building, but, as this would destroy its historical significance, it was decided to let it fall down and place a monument on the site. Others were too expensive. Prospect House at Richmond would cost £20 000 but had no great historical or architectural interest.

Michael Sharland made a major contribution to awakening the public conscience by publishing a profusely illustrated book called Stones of a Century, which described many of the 'most interesting' old country houses, churches and bridges. He believed that 'our old Georgian homes, the gracious barns and stables, the lovely bridges, and old buildings associated with ancient rural crafts, all have a great appeal and form so rich a component of the scenery of the State'. Sharland's book stimulated interested individuals to express their views to the Board. In July 1953, D. S. Smith protested that the old Hobart Railway Station would be demolished or given 'a veneer facade'. Many tourists prized such buildings for their 'dignity and permanence' and for 'not having a garish exterior of the type used for chain stores and milk bars'. Smith was troubled by the disappearance of 'our architectural gems' and noted how two buildings had been 'recently ruined by the madman with his paint pot, others defaced by advertising material' and even the doorway on the front cover of Sharland's book had 'fallen victim to commercial enterprise'. Sharland agreed that Hobart was being 'spoil'd by lack of thought and appreciation for many buildings'.

Some buildings were saved from destruction or criminal conversion. In 1954, the Government intended to sell Narryna for use as a factory and workshop. The Board resolved to take 'whatever action was necessary to save'
been achieved in ‘the preservation of outstanding buildings by Government expenditure and much appropriate propaganda and public relations’. The Board supported UNESCO’s efforts to stimulate ‘national consciousness of cultural property’ and to develop a ‘national policy’. According to the Chairman of the Board, F Miles, the Board was restricted to rationing its limited funds between national parks and reserves with historic buildings, but its work in preserving buildings had set ‘a commendable example’ which private owners followed. The Board received ‘many requests from the community’ to extend its work to buildings of special merit and was willing to do so if it had more funds.

The demands on the Board were too many, its duties too onerous and its powers too limited to give historic buildings the attention they deserved. This resulted in the formation of the National Trust of Tasmania in Hobart in December 1954, but its ‘non-activity’ worried one member, Jack Thwaites, who represented the Hobart Walking Club on the Scenery Preservation Board. Thwaites suggested merging with the Narryna Committee and using the building as the Trust’s headquarters. This would create ‘the appropriate atmosphere and so become an example of what a National Trust can mean and do’. One of the members of the Trust, Dr William Crowther, later became chairman of the trustees of Narryna which indicated close ties between the two bodies. The effectiveness of the Hobart-based Trust can be doubted, and, in 1960, another body registered itself as the National Trust of Australia (Tas) Ltd in Narryna. The Government agreed to hand the building over to the Health Department as an administrative block for a chest clinic. The Board asked the Health Department not to make structural alterations that would ‘spoil the present character of the house’. After representations from the Battery Point Progress Association and other interested parties, the Government agreed to turn Narryna into a folk museum and hand over control to a trust. The folk museum illustrated ‘home life in Van Diemen’s Land in the middle 1800s with antique displays, and an old coach house displayed dying crafts such as the process of cooperage and the wheelwright’s trade.

In 1956, the Board declared twenty-five acres on the Lake Highway a reserve to preserve the cabins and cottage known as the ‘The Steppes’ which was ‘an interesting link with pioneering days’. In the same year, the Shot Tower was acquired by the Government for $10 500 and placed under Board control as a tourist centre. The Board advised owners of how to preserve early colonial buildings, such as the stone house at St Peter’s Pass on the Midland Highway, Runnymede at New Town, the Hobart Criminal Court, site of the first Trinity Church in Hobart and Angelsea Barracks. The expertise of the Board was recognised in 1956 when a committee planning to form a National Trust in Victoria sought information about its work.

In 1958, Sharland told a UNESCO committee that the Board had by ‘ownership and example’ made ‘a substantial contribution to the preservation’ of buildings and bridges of ‘cultural value’. Despite limited funds, much had
As Tim Jetson has shown, the establishment of this body marks the beginning of effective work by the National Trust in Tasmania.\(^{165}\)

The emergence of a State-wide National Trust was one of a number of crushing blows to the future of the Tasmanian Society. In addition to the Scenery Preservation Board and the National Trust, the Tasmanian Historical Research Association had become an important vehicle for Tasmanian history since its establishment in 1951.\(^{166}\) Its first chairman was C. S. King, Professor of History at the University of Tasmania, its principal office bearers were members of the newly-formed archives and its appeal was to a diverse membership, all of which signified a new partnership between academic, administrative and public enthusiasts of history.\(^{166}\) It was more highly credentialled than the Tasmanian Society and distinguished itself from that body by encouraging wide-ranging research into the ‘virgin ground’ of primary sources on Tasmanian history and publishing Tasmanian history in its Papers and Proceedings.\(^{168}\) In 1957 a Historical Advisory Board was established to appoint study groups on particular projects such as recommencing the printing of Historical Records of Australia.\(^{168}\) In Launceston the northern branch of the Royal Society agreed to act as the northern branch of the Association in March 1952.\(^{170}\) The northern branch emulated its southern counterpart in holding lectures and arranging excursions to historical sites. By 1961, the Association had become firmly established and boasted 313 members.\(^{171}\)

The Tasmanian State Archives was established within the State Library of Tasmania in 1949, and, with the appointment of a trained archivist R. C. Sharman, Tasmania’s valuable public historical records were placed under expert control for the first time.\(^{172}\) Records in private hands also received attention. The northern branch of the Royal Society had recorded the existence of such records since the 1940s.\(^{173}\) In 1957, mainly on the initiative of Justice Peter Crisp and the support of John McManners, Professor of History at the University of Tasmania, the Historical Records Society of Tasmania was established to identify historical records held in private hands by families, companies and voluntary associations, to advise owners on their importance, proper care and preservation and to suggest transfer to the Tasmanian State Archives.\(^{174}\) McManners appointed a graduate Research Assistant to compile a catalogue of records retained in private hands and to obtain manual or microfilm copies. The more important records were later recorded in the History Department’s Reports on the Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania.\(^{175}\) The Battery Point Progress Association showed ‘commendable interest in preserving the many historic features of this old part of Hobart’ and under the guidance of the author Amy Rowntree arranged tours of the suburb for tourists.\(^{175}\) Even the Tasmanian Parliament honoured history by creating a museum of its ‘historical relics’ and publishing a book on one hundred years of responsible government.\(^{177}\)

Despite a brief flourish, the Historical Society of Tasmania folded in the mid-1950s, was revived again in 1959 and then soon after seems to have finally folded.\(^{178}\) It made little contribution to the preservation of historical buildings and concentrated on the work of commemoration. For example, plaques commemorated the first Australian wireless station at Devonport, the discovery of North-West Bay by Nicholas Baudin at Snug and the author Roy Bridges.\(^{179}\) These were worthy achievements and really demonstrated the society’s main contribution to the public awareness of history since 1935.

In the remaining decades of his life, Basil Rait became a lonely, dishevelled figure, but, for his early efforts to raise historical consciousness he really deserves sympathy rather than the ridicule he received. His hopes of becoming Tasmania’s official historian or state archivist were never realised and his aspiration to write an enduring book on Tasmanian history was beyond his talents and was never achieved.\(^{180}\) Although he initiated the proposal to celebrate Tasmania's sesqui-centenary in 1953-54, conceived it as helping the tourist industry and, with the backing of Premier Robert Cosgrove, was appointed secretary to the first organising committee, he later lost that position to W. L. Loney who had a higher political profile.\(^{181}\) In compensation, the Crown offered him £150 and he accepted minor positions in the Department of Education in 1952 and then the Tourist Board as a tourist promotion officer.
officer in 1960. In 1952 he had overcome his detestation of the convict system and helped his wife to run the Richmond Gaol, while continuing to write newspaper articles on Tasmanian history. A belated and deserved recognition of his services to history was the award of an MBE, an honour which he probably felt vindicated his life's work.

Conclusion

Between 1935 and 1960, a small group of enthusiastic amateurs raised the profile of local history in Tasmania. They gave institutional voice to their enthusiasm by forming the Tasmanian Society, which attracted the support of political, community and business leaders. This support was crucial in achieving the aim of commemorating the deeds of the 'great men' of Tasmanian history—explorers, governors and pioneers—and institutions like the military, banks and insurance companies. The erection of monuments and laying of plaques to these men and institutions received publicity in the newspapers and at times overseas. Publicity was also given to the celebration of historical anniversaries. Commemorations and celebrations heightened the public awareness of Tasmania's past showing that many aspects deserved to be noted. The Tasmanian Society succeeded because it did not take an adversarial stand. It persuaded government and civic leaders that the past was worth remembering because it was their past and a past of achievement. To use modern terms, it was a feel good past, not a 'sad struggle' by ordinary colonists and of 'the simple dignity of past lives'.

Ultimately, though, we must conclude on a harsh note. Constrained by the government's desire to attract tourists rather than explore Tasmania's past for its own sake, the Tasmanian Society, the Scenery Preservation Board and later the National Trust stressed the need to visualise the past and offered an essentially 'artefactual' history in which a whole variety of local experiences are ignored or trivialised. They assumed that tourists would not be attracted if they received a less antiquarian and more critical 'sense of past struggles' by ordinary colonists and of the simple dignity of past lives.

The Tasmanian experience showed that tourism could be the saviour as well as the enemy of history.
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