Innovation at Heritage Tourist Attractions

Thesis submitted by

Julia Margaret CROZIER, BA (Hons)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
University of Tasmania

March 2012
Declaration of Originality

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University or any other institution, except by way of background information and duly acknowledged in the thesis, and to the best of my knowledge and belief no material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgement is made in the text of the thesis, nor does the thesis contain any material that infringes copyright.

Julia Crozier: ...........................................

Dated: ..................................................
Authority of Access

This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968

Julia Crozier: .............................................

Dated: .....................................................
If heritage attractions are to be economically sustainable, they must be relevant to their potential and current audiences. If they are to be socially and environmentally sustainable, they must also ensure their heritage significance does not fade with the passing of time. Heritage attractions arguably exist within an environment shaped by disequilibrium where public perception shifts constantly as each generation imposes their own attitudes and values on the past and how it is represented. If heritage attractions are part of a global inheritance they must innovate to meet changing demands at the same time as supplying new, meaningful experiences for each generation. Significance values are reflected by the choice of built heritage, artefacts, relics, myth and narrative; how these become mutable resources for innovation at the same time as providing a competitive advantage is a focus of this study.

In order to navigate through the constantly shifting environment, iconic heritage tourist attractions typically follow a pattern of innovation waves fluctuating between periods of activity and periods of inertia as they seek to maintain their relevance to a contemporary audience. With each wave of innovation, operators of heritage attractions gauge their level of acceptable risk and shape the innovation accordingly. Innovation occurs within parameters dictated by contemporary forces prevalent within the environment. How heritage attractions achieve innovative outcomes is an issue for the operators of heritage attractions.

Innovation is frequently slow and incremental, meaning it is almost invisible in the short term; therefore, a historical case study at a single heritage attraction, separated into three comparable and adjacent periods was used to identify innovation and its effects. Several types of innovation were identified; specifically product, process, position and paradigm innovations. The forces that drove and determined innovation at different times were also identified and a model developed which may be applicable to other heritage attractions in the future.

This research makes several contributions to knowledge. First it is shown that the heritage product can be defined in terms of access. This may be physical, virtual, emotional and/or intellectual. Second, the research presents a new definition of the process that occurs during the co-production of the tourist experience product. Third, viewing the access product as a component of the tourist experience product provides a different lens for considering whether heritage attractions are innovative.
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Heritage tourist attractions\(^1\) are fundamental resources for tourism (Gunn 1997; Lew 1987). They attract visitors based on their connections to the past (Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Silberberg 1994). Many attractions that have iconic status have continued to attract tourists to visit for several centuries. How and why these places manage to remain significant over the long term, and relevant to constantly changing audiences in the short term, is the fundamental question addressed by this study.

Heritage and sustainability have increasingly been linked in the literature as they are both associated with inheritance (Garrod & Fyall 2000; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003). How attractions balance the requisites of tourism with the conservation of heritage so that it can be inherited by future generations becomes a complex notion when what it is that is being inherited is unclear. This is particularly pertinent within the realm of tourism that gives heritage a second life as an exhibit of itself but in the process produces something new (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995). Heritage attractions continue to evolve as new episodes are added to their history over time. The distance of time adds to disequilibrium as objects, myth and place alter, becoming more or less representative of the imagined past (Lowenthal 1998). Finally, society is subject to constant change and each new generation has their own perceptions and attitudes about the past and its meanings (Halewood & Hannam 2001; Lowenthal 1998; Schwartz 1982). Heritage attractions have to navigate through this constantly fluctuating environment, being continually vigilant in case they become out-dated and irrelevant (Hjalager 2001).

The basic definition of heritage attractions used in this study is “any property that attracts the public by virtue of its explicit connection with the past” (Garrod & Fyall 2000, p. 685), but recognises that heritage attractions also incorporate tacit connections which work towards the creation of the heritage tourist experience. Heritage attractions are a composite of intangible stories and myth overlaid onto

\(^1\) Heritage tourist attractions are called heritage attractions in this thesis, but it is acknowledged that not all heritage places are available for tourism.
tangible buildings, artefacts and relics. These seemingly static objects are the raw materials with which operators of attractions make sense (Ashworth 1994; Ashworth & Graham 2005). Raw materials may be considered static, bound by time and space, based on their perceived authenticity. If attractions are to innovate then the raw materials become mutable resources which reflect the changing story for contemporary audiences and help them to co-produce meaningful experiences. This is reflected in the general definition of innovation as new combinations of existing resources (Fagerberg 2003).

To date, research on innovation and tourism has largely concentrated on generic forms of tourism and hospitality; there has been little research into innovation in heritage tourism as a discrete sector. Research which links innovation and heritage tends to concentrate on heritage cities and regions or the benefits and disadvantages of conservation and innovation or conservation and tourism (Burns, P 2006; Hjalager 2001; Hospers 2002; Rayport & Sviokla 1994; Richards & Wilson 2006; Silberberg 1994; Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002; Wanhill 2003). This is a cross-disciplinary study which combines literature from innovation studies, heritage studies and tourism.

Much of the literature about tourist products broadly considers the tourist experience as the product (Halewood & Hannam 2001; Pikkemaat & Weiermair 2003; Richards & Wilson 2006; Shaw & Williams 2004; Vitterso et al. 2000). This study contributes an alternative view of the heritage attraction product, by taking into account the relationship between supply and demand. In particular, it separates the primary access product from the secondary experience product. The access product is produced through a managed process by which the site operator offers an identifiable packaged entity (the site). The secondary experience product is the outcome of a co-production process between the heritage site (access?) and each tourist, resulting in a heterogeneous, personal and unique tourist experience. (Nuryanti 1996; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004). The primary product is defined as access, and takes the form of physical, virtual, emotional and intellectual connection points, designed to educate, entertain and engage audiences. Access is within the control of the operator and is a component of the tourist experience. Management control means the level of acceptable risk associated with implementing innovation can be monitored (Abernathy
In order to address the question about why and how innovation occurs, several secondary questions were developed which provide the components of a comprehensive answer. The component questions ask: what form does innovation take when set within the heritage context; what are the forces that drive and determine the shape of innovation when it does occur; and what is the role of meaning in the process of innovation at heritage attractions?

An historic case study of a single attraction over three adjacent but comparable periods was undertaken to provide the long-term view of innovation, some of which is so subtle and incremental that it is almost impossible to identify over the short-term (Abernathy & Clark 1985). The long-term view identified an arbitrary pattern of waves which fluctuated between periods of inertia and periods of innovative activity, each of which complemented the other. The catalyst for innovation appeared to be events that occurred, mainly in the external environment, which changed social perceptions and attitudes. A model of the forces that drove and determined innovation has been produced, based on the case study results.

In chapter two the literature review starts by discussing the importance of attractions to tourism and then progresses to define the product and process in terms of this research. The heritage context provides several differentiating factors that are described and the heritage sector is identified as a discrete niche within the broader tourism industry. The raw materials for heritage are identified and their use in providing access is explained. The forces that drive and determine innovation at heritage attractions are suggested and provide framework for the case study that follows.

Chapter three describes the Method used in this study. As mentioned above, an historic study of a single iconic heritage attraction over three adjacent but comparable periods was conducted. The narrative combined several histories including explicit documented commentary; contemporary social commentary; image and text; as well as personal conversation with people involved in the development of the tourism product in the later years of the case study period. The case study chosen was Port Arthur Historic Site situated in Tasmania, Australia. Port Arthur was a colonial penal settlement and has
been available for tourism since 1877. It was chosen as the case study as it has iconic status, a well-documented history, and strong ties to the local and national identity.

While the importance of Aboriginal history in Tasmania is undoubtedly significant, it is not within the scope of this study to address it adequately. Rather, this study concentrates on the colonial history of a specific heritage tourist attraction within a set period. The effects of convictism on the Aboriginal population of Tasmania would be more appropriately researched as a separate study.

The next four chapters incorporate the findings; each considers an adjacent period to facilitate understanding and comparison. Chapter four provides background about when Port Arthur first became accessible for tourism. It includes narrative that explains public perception at the end of the convict era and incorporates contemporary voices to provide a picture of Port Arthur in the years immediately preceding the arrival of tourists. The information in this chapter sets the scene for the following three chapters.

Chapter five starts by describing the external environment and the events that shaped individuals’ perceptions at the end of the nineteenth century. The study shows how the events in the internal and external environments changed how Port Arthur was viewed and how it was used to represent the past and the way in which the raw materials changed from being considered everyday items into heritage artefacts. During this period Port Arthur began to develop as a tourist destination supported by a network of tourism suppliers. Chapter six includes the period during which the meanings associated with Port Arthur shifted again. Marketing and image formation became important elements. For most of this period interstate and international tourists used Port Arthur to satisfy their heritage interests whereas Tasmanians used it for recreational purposes. Chapter seven covers a period during which extensive management and organisational change took place as well as a shift in strategy from tourism to conservation. This was a period during which several types of innovation were evident, driven by a range of internal and external forces.

The Discussion and Conclusion are chapter eight which brings together the analysis of the data and identifies how and why innovation has occurred at Port Arthur as well as how these findings have applications which can be used in the broader tourism realm. The definition of the product as access and the co-production process which results in the tourist experience are reiterated. The wave pattern which marks the fluctuations
between periods of inertia and periods of activity is further explained, and a model is developed to explain how events are the catalysts for innovation which, when subject to a time-lag, can be seen through the benefit of hindsight and absorbed into the story of the heritage site, becoming resources for innovation.
PART ONE: ATTRACTIONS

THE IMPORTANCE OF ATTRACTIONS TO TOURISM

Tourist attractions are the focus of this study; they are succinctly described as fundamental elements of tourism:

“without tourist attractions there would be no tourism (Gunn 1997, p. 24).
Without tourism there would be no tourist attractions” (Lew 1987, p. 554).

There are many types, varieties and scales of attraction, each of which provide different activities or forms of engagement for tourists (Richardson & Fluker 2004). Attractions also form the core element in the development of destinations for tourism (Benckendorff & Pearce 2003).

Lew (1987) generalises about attractions by describing them as having “landscapes to observe, activities to participate in and experiences to remember” (Lew 1987, p. 554), suggesting that visits to an attraction require a combination of features intrinsic to the attraction with some level of participation by the tourist. Consequently, tourist attractions can be considered as experiential, and if they are to be successful, they must offer a combination of entertainment, education, aesthetics and escapism (Apostolakis 2003; Pine & Gilmore 1999b; Wanhil 2003) to engage tourists and ensure their experience is tailored to suit individual requirements (Peters & Weiermair 2000; Wanhil 2003). Due to the variety of different attractions within the tourism sector they have traditionally been segmented into typologies based on their primary features. This creates order for tourism researchers (Horner & Swarbrooke 2006; Lew 1987) and

---

2 Throughout this study the terms tourist and visitor are used interchangeably.
makes choosing which attraction to visit easier for tourists (Gunn 1997; Peters & Weiermair 2000; Wanhill 2003).

As businesses, attractions are valued for their uniqueness and act as a pull factor for other support industries, and in some cases, other attractions (Gartner 1996; Prideaux 2002; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996). From a tourism business perspective, Gartner (1996) suggests that successful attractions must provide value for money; be perceived as authentic, provide a sense of place through interpretation; be unique; have activities which prolong visitation; and have drawing power to interest prospective visitors in the first place. Attractions that display all of these qualities can maintain their competitive advantages as resources for ensuring sustainability.

In part one, this chapter considers heritage attractions which have iconic status, differentiating them from other types of tourism and encapsulating the competitive advantages of those attractions which are most sustainable. The process and product at heritage attractions are defined in terms of this study and provide the variables for identifying how innovation is used to renew or rejuvenate the heritage attraction. Part Two identifies different types of innovation and the forces that drive and determine how it is implemented. Finally, in part three, meaning and symbolism, place, identity, time and knowledge are identified as factors within the heritage context that provide the parameters of change at heritage attractions.

**HERITAGE ATTRACTIONS: A DISCRETE SEGMENT**

This study considers heritage attractions to be different from other types of attraction because they stimulate tourists to visit through associations with history and heritage (Jamal & Kim 2005; Silberberg 1994) distinguishing it as a discrete sector. Sectoral innovation theory provides the key variables of differentiation, which include: characteristics; sources; actors involved; boundaries of the process; and the organisation of innovation (Malerba 2005). Applying these variables to heritage attractions, the primary differentiating characteristic lies in the core heritage attribute
as an interpretation of the past for a contemporary\textsuperscript{3} audience (Ashworth 1994; Graham 2002; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Lowenthal 1998). The differentiating sources at heritage attractions are contingent on site specific ‘raw materials’ which become resources for innovation, including history and knowledge; as well as tangible relics, buildings and artefacts, and intangible myth, story, and atmosphere (Ashworth 1994; Richards & Wilson 2006). These raw materials are largely static and inflexible but become mutable and dynamic when they are used as meaningful triggers in interpretation (DeSilvey 2006; McIntosh 1999; Pocock 2008; Wouters 2009).

The actors involved at heritage attractions include a heterogeneous range of individuals and organisations from the tourism and heritage realms as well as those who specialise in conservation and preservation (Giaccardi & Palen 2008; Hjalager 2001; Maddern 2005; Pocock 2006a; Richards & Wilson 2006). The boundaries that limit change at heritage attractions are geographic and locational as well as temporal (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Prideaux 2002). Boundaries are also strategic when conservation and preservation requirements are incompatible with those of tourism (Pocock 2006a; Wanhill 2003). The organisation of innovation is the last key variable (Malerba 2005) and it directly addresses the core question asked in this study which concerns how and why innovation occurs at heritage attractions, the form of innovation and which forces determine its shape.

Within the heritage segment there are a wide variety of different types of attraction, some of which are more sustainable than others. This study concentrates on those which are considered to have most potential to innovate and change their core meaning and significance over time. These types of attraction are broadly referred to as iconic as they provide a pull factor for a region or destination, becoming symbols of place identity (Richards & Wilson 2006).

\textsuperscript{3} The term ‘contemporary’ is used in historic terms throughout this thesis, rather than describing today as contemporary. It refers to the contemporary social attitudes, perceptions or opinions of historic characters or the contemporary social meanings and values of past eras. The term ‘current’ is used to differentiate comments which refer to today. It is acknowledged that contemporary opinions, perceptions or opinions are inherently contestable.
THE ICONIC HERITAGE TOURIST ATTRACTION

Heritage attractions need to be sustainable in economic, environmental and social terms, but not all have the capacity to be so over a prolonged period (Hjalager 1997; Leask 2003). Iconic status refers to those built heritage attractions which have significance value, due to the events associated with them (Drummond, 2001). Iconic status stems from a higher level of awareness (Voase 2010). Although built heritage attractions with iconic status are more likely to be sustainable because they have high significance value and lack duplication, they still need to constantly renew their offering to ensure their relevance does not fade (Garrod & Fyall 2000). Iconic status cannot be achieved solely through supplying buildings or monuments and labelling them as such because their significance value lies in their meaningful associations (Gonzalez 2007; Hollinshead 2007; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Palmer 1998; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003). They are also distinct from those buildings which are purposely built for use as marketing symbols, but which currently lack the meanings supplied through heritage, even though they may acquire it over time (Richards & Wilson 2006). This study concentrates on an iconic heritage tourist attraction, but recognises that not all heritage attractions have iconic status.

Iconic attractions are sometimes described as ‘must-see’ attractions if their name or brand is so powerful that the destination image is juxtaposed with that of the site (Voase 2010). Heritage attractions with iconic status attract a wide range of visitors, including those with specific interests in history and heritage as well as those who have a less defined interest but may be motivated by associations with identity (Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Tranter & Donoghue 2007). Tourists may simply wish to experience the past on their own terms (Gyimothy & Johns 2001), or may be attracted by the must-see status. Consequently, not all visitors can be typified as heritage or cultural tourists (Gold & Gold 2007; Silberberg 1994). Operators of heritage attractions therefore need

---

4 Heritage tourism is defined as “a subgroup of tourism, in which the main motivation for visiting a site is based on the place’s heritage characteristics according to the tourists’ perception of their own heritage. … Historic and heritage tourism can occur in the same space as each other as well as with other types … while a heritage tourist is a historic one, the reverse is not always the case” (Poria, Butler & Airey 2001, p. 1047)
to use the full interpretative potential of their core assets to provide the breadth of connections which a diverse range of visitors demand (Poria, Butler & Airey 2003).

In recent years heritage attractions have had to market themselves more extensively than their immediate niche market to attract enough visitors to be economically sustainable (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006). Residents are an important potential market, but they may only be motivated to visit when a threat to destroy or alter historic or symbolic places evokes a strong reaction (Lowenthal 1975). Even those who have no intention to visit, may feel a sense of security and continuity rooted in the survival of the past and the perception that the present will be valued in the future (Lynch, K 1972). Those who manage heritage tourist attractions have to ensure they remain relevant within the boundaries presented by multiple stakeholder opinion and sensitivities, including (among others) visitors, potential visitors, local residents and those who have no intention of visiting but who consider the heritage story to be personally significant (Gold & Gold 2007; Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Maddern 2005; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003).

As mentioned above, iconic attractions are primary attractions which draw tourists into a region or larger destination area, providing the opportunity for smaller support services or secondary attractions to develop (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Leiper 2004b; Prideaux 2002). Heritage associations provide unique competitive advantages for heritage tourism, but when the novelty and nostalgia potential becomes exhausted, places tend to reduce their heritage element and inflate their more sensational features resulting in ‘spectaculars’ such as light shows, animation and virtual reality (Richards & Wilson 2006). These types of display are imagined experiences enhanced through the use of technology, where the technology may become the main focus of the attraction experience (Richards & Wilson 2006). Limitations can also occur when the built heritage infrastructure is locked into a temporal frame with no appreciation of other historic eras that may have altered the site, resulting in debate about its authenticity value (AlSayyad 2001; Pocock 2006a). If these places are to be sustainable in social, economic and environmental terms they need to renew or revitalise their offering through innovation when necessary and to protect their unique competitive advantages, supplied through history (Richards & Wilson 2006; Wanhill 2003).
Tourism provides a highly competitive marketplace in which an increasing number of attractions compete for an increasingly sophisticated tourist cohort (Leask & Yeoman 1999; McLean 1995; Robinson & Novelli 2005). Additionally, competition for tourist time and money stems from non-tourism related leisure pursuits and material goods (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002). If heritage attractions are to succeed in business terms, they need to develop a competitive strategy which differentiates them from their competition by offering something which is unique and which has value for consumers (Porter 1985). Two strategies for maximising competitive advantage involve using a unique attribute (such as a heritage resource) to attract customers or by differentiating from competitors by creating something (such as a new product or process) which is valued by buyers (Porter 1985).

The development of niche tourism segments5, situated in specialized environments means attractions are in direct competition with similar attractions, hence they must constantly manoeuvre to differentiate their offering and to maintain their competitive advantage (Gartner 1996; Robinson & Novelli 2005). Niche segmentation has also resulted in a key role for small and medium enterprises which supply increasingly specialised products to support specific interests and needs (Novelli, Schmitz & Spencer 2006). In some cases, suppliers outside the tourism sector meet niche demand, for example through the adoption of technologies from the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) sector (Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002). A core innovation process includes increased specialisation through value added services, including customised guiding services, new forms of interpretation and the tour operator’s services (Hjalager 1997).

Segmentation is a consequence of changes in consumption due to the sense of adventure and willingness of consumers to seek out new experiences (Burns, P 2006).

---

5 Segmentation occurs in demand and supply so to avoid confusion, the term ‘segmentation’ is used in this study to describe the situation when different types of tourist attractions are segmented into different niches; market segmentation is the term used to describe different types of tourists with different motivations and interests who are segmented accordingly.
Hence, the trend to segment the tourism offering into niches is forecast to grow, meaning that tourism experiences will become increasingly personalised (Burns, P 2006). This in turn leads to an increased demand for customised experiences by increasingly experienced tourists (Robinson & Novelli 2005). As mentioned above, market segmentation places different types of tourists into groups in an attempt to identify and meet their demands as well as to facilitate marketing strategies (Misiura 2006; Robinson & Novelli 2005). A risk associated with segmentation is that over-specialisation may lead to exclusivity, reducing the potential tourist market and causing the attraction to be economically and meaningfully unsustainable (McIntosh 1999; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004). Additionally, because segmentation leads to specialisation it promotes the notion that tourists visit places for a narrow range of reasons, which motivational research has shown to be untrue (Nuryanti 1996; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Wall & Mathieson 2006).

At heritage attractions competitive advantage is inherent in the unique stories and events that are resources for differentiation and therefore assets that can be used for innovation and renewal (Wouters 2009). A successful business strategy entails designing a system which allows heterogeneous market segments to select those elements which they find most appealing (Holbrook 1995). In aiming to be economically sustainable, heritage attractions provide multiple layers of interpretation, using a variety of signs and symbols in an attempt to attract a wide spectrum of visitors (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006; Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Peters & Weiermair 2000; Richards & Wilson 2006). Although this strategy should engage a broad audience, the plethora of choice should not result in dumbing-down the interpretation as visitors seek depth and insight as well as variety (Voase 2002). As operators seek to appeal to a broader customer base there has been a blurring of the lines between many typologies as similar techniques are imitated once they are perceived as successful (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006).

In summary, segmentation drives innovative activity in three areas; first as a consequence of the changing tastes of tourists, searching for something different or specialised; second, because the increased supply of tourist attractions leads to intensified competition; and, third, because the providers of tourism aim to target new markets through the renewal of their core product (Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002). To
date there have been very few studies which consider links between innovation and heritage. This study attempts to discover whether theories of innovation are applicable to heritage tourist attractions as places of exchange based on significance values and meaning. This theory is in line with the concept of co-production, which will be explained in the following section.

INTERACTION BETWEEN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PRODUCT IN THE CO-PRODUCTION PROCESS

Heritage attractions have been defined as “any property that attracts the public by virtue of its explicit connection with the past” (Garrod & Fyall 2000, p. 685). This definition provides a broad understanding of the heritage ‘product’ as the property with connections to the past, and the heritage ‘process’ as the attraction that it has for the public based on that connection to the past. Therefore, the product and process could be described as inseparable because the interaction between them occurs simultaneously. This study defines the primary product as access in various forms, described below, which is produced and controlled by the operator. When a consumer interacts with the access product a co-production process ensues, the outcome of which is a unique experience, defined as the secondary or experience product.

The primary access product and the secondary experience product are distinct because the source of control, and therefore ownership, of risk are different. The concept of innovation means that if a tourist attraction operator is to take the required level of risk associated with introducing change, they need to be in control of the product which they supply (Kline & Rosenberg 1986; Tether & Howells 2007; Wanhill 2003). In the case of heritage tourism, the operator controls access to the site through the primary access product which is a fundamental component of the co-production process. Even though they do not control the outcome of the co-production process, operators influence the secondary experience product through the packaging of the primary access product.

Other types of risk associated with heritage tourist attractions and of which operators need to be aware include the risk of changing meaning through bias or misplaced emphasis in the interpretation of the site; and through alienating the heritage site from its environment, which can be social, historic, geographic or temporal, among others.
The primary access product, defined in this study, takes physical, virtual, emotional and intellectual forms and will be described in more detail later in this chapter.

PRODUCTS AND SERVICES AT HERITAGE ATTRACTIONS

Products, in very broad terms, tend to be divided into two types; they can be tangible goods which are owned or intangible services which are used (Evans, Campbell & Stonehouse 2003). A basic classification, used to differentiate between services and manufactured goods, is that they are inseparable, perishable, heterogeneous and intangible (Kerin et al. 2003; Kotler 2003; Pride & Ferrell 2003; Solomon & Stuart 2003), although these factors are disputed (Lovelock & Gummesson 2004).

Intangibility can be contentious as even prospective consumers of tangible goods make purchasing decisions based on intangible promises (Levitt 1981). Seemingly intangible heritage experiences are produced using tangible elements as raw materials, such as relics, artefacts or built heritage to elicit a sensory response (Pocock 2008).

Inseparability describes the simultaneous production and consumption of the heritage experience, but the raw materials used to reflect heritage values are separable from the experience, as they exist regardless of the presence of tourists. The experience can be described as perishable because it takes place in the moment, as the co-production process requires a combination of personal input, external factors and the choice of interpretive triggers. The process of co-production also means that the individual heritage experience is heterogeneous as it is unique (Evans, Campbell & Stonehouse 2003). However, the interpretive triggers are generic as they are provided for all visitors and heterogeneity depends on individual choices and input.

Within the tourism literature there have been many attempts to define the tourism product, often in generic terms. For example, Smith (1994) developed a model incorporating five levels, where each successive level represented declining management control and decreasing levels of tangibility at the same time as increasing consumer involvement and choice, through a process of co-production. More recently Cooper & Hall (2008) suggest different forms of tourist product including: the trip product; destination product; business product; and service product, each of which involves the co-production of experiences between operator and consumer. Gunn
(1997) and Leiper (2004) proposed similar models to describe the functions of attractions starting with the core or nucleus and encompassing human and environmental or community interactions. Many attraction businesses believe that tourists buy experiences, and much of the tourism research into attractions appears to confirm this hypothesis (Andereck et al. 2006; Halewood & Hannam 2001; McIntosh 1999; Ryan 2000; Shaw & Williams 2004; Uriely 2005; Vitterso et al. 2000). In contrast, in heritage theory Ashworth (1994) defined the product as interpretation. As mentioned in the previous section, this study offers an alternative definition, which differentiates between two distinct but mutually dependent products, namely the primary access product, which refers to what the operator sells, and the secondary experience product, which refers to what the tourist buys and of which they are co-producers. The concept of the access product is critically analysed below.

One of the reasons why research focuses on what tourists buy is because many of the original models which define products stem from marketing, such as Levitt’s (1975) four level model of product or service including the core; expected; value added; and potential product/service levels, (McNeill & Crotts 2006). Kotler (1984) adapted this model for marketing and Middleton (1988) adapted it further for tourism marketing. The problem with using marketing theory to define a product is that the definition attempts to answer the question “what is the buyer really buying” (Kotler et al. 2009, p. 269), suggesting that the marketer is attempting to satisfy customer demand by providing transformational experiences (Kotler et al. 2009). This study prefers to ask the question “what is the seller really selling?” which, as mentioned above, is based on the precept that the operator has control of the content of the product, namely the signs and symbols presented to the consumer as triggers for meaning. The term operator does not only refer to those who manage the attraction, but to all of those operators who provide access to the attraction, broadening the scope for innovation and extending the forces which drive and determine the actions taken. Access occurs in physical, virtual, emotional and intellectual forms but when access is the core product, its temporality changes the way in which time is perceived, valued and consumed (Lovelock & Gummesson 2004).
To explain how the access and experience components interact at heritage attractions during the process of co-production, the model (Figure 1) above has been developed. The square boxes describe the components which interact to create the experience product. These incorporate the raw heritage materials as they become the heritage tourist experience influenced by a combination of interpretation and tourist attributes including prior knowledge, and personal interests. This process will be described in
more detail below. The dotted lines portray the access product which is a component of the co-production process, and which can affect the final experience outcome.

**DIFFERENT FORMS OF ACCESS AND THEIR EFFECTS**

The access product incorporates a range of triggers with which the tourist can choose to connect, or not, but which provide access in physical, emotional, intellectual or virtual forms. The connection points can be tangible or intangible, and they can be planned and designed, or organic, but they are managed. Physical access enables the spatial, aesthetic and built resources of the heritage place to be used as a medium for interpretation (AlSayyad 2001). The physical embodiment of the tourist within the heritage place provides a spatial understanding through sensory elements that link the past and the present (Crouch & Desforges 2003; Edensor 2001; Ryan, Chris 2002a).

Virtual access has several characteristics that work together to create the experience (Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002). As heritage sites become adept at providing interpretation using new forms of media, it enables the creation of novel explanations and new connections (Giaccardi & Palen 2008). Virtual access is an off-site marker that can be used to attract potential tourists as well as providing access for those who may have no other opportunity to visit (MacCannell 1976; Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002). Virtual access not only promotes and captures potential audiences; it can also create networks of visitors ensuring on-going levels of interest and a sense of place beyond the actual visit leading to post-visit experiences (Giaccardi & Palen 2008).

Emotional access is unique for each individual on each visit. Engagement results in personal meanings and sense of place (Chronis 2005; Nuryanti 1996; Richards & Wilson 2006) which can elicit feelings of nostalgia, fear, humour, excitement, sadness or shock, amongst other responses (Gonzalez 2007; Halewood & Hannam 2001; McIntosh 1999; Shaw & Williams 2004). When the visitor invests elements of themselves into the co-production process to gain emotional access they risk becoming vulnerable to unforeseen responses, but it is through this action that the experience can become transformational (Gold & Gold 2007; Pine & Gilmore 1999b; Weddington 2004).
Intellectual access occurs when visitors become complicit in the creation of their own experiences and engagement compels them to delve into their personal stock of prior knowledge, understanding and values (McIntosh 1999). They are confronted with new knowledge and forced to question their existing beliefs, becoming complicit in the creation of their experience (Weddington 2004). Knowledge is a fundamental ingredient for intellectual engagement, especially for those visitors who have an ability to immerse themselves in the experience through reflection (Voase 2002). Education is one of the basic realms of an experience, and when it actively engages the mind it provides intellectual access (Pine & Gilmore 1999b; Weddington 2004).

Interpretation is the essence of what is controlled by the operator, but how this is received is dependent on the individual, as previously mentioned. Interpretation delivers the unique qualities which encompass the competitive advantage of the place encapsulated by the raw materials used in the interpretation of the story (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007). Although some interpretation may be aimed at promoting specific messages, the co-produced nature of the product means that a message sent is not a guarantee that the same message has been received (Voase 2002). Conversely, other interpretive triggers are intrinsic to the place, including sensory elements such as ambience and atmosphere, which add value, and meaning to the experience should the visitor choose to engage with them (Bonn et al. 2007; Dann & Jacobsen 2003; Kotler 1973).

Personal input of individual tourists (McIntosh 1999; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Uriely 2005; Vitterso et al. 2000) occurs during the co-production process and depends on the level of engagement each tourist is willing to risk, based on their own prior experience, knowledge and personal interests (Addy 2009; Voase 2002). It is within the co-production process that innovation takes place when renewal or rejuvenation is required to ensure sustainability in economic, social or environmental terms.

THE PROCESS OF CO-PRODUCING THE HERITAGE EXPERIENCE

Raw heritage materials are historic resources which are capable of being transformed into heritage (Ashworth 1994). These resources are site specific and contextualised
through their heritage associations. In order to be valued the heritage resources need to be significant. Raw materials are described as:

- a varied mixture of historical events, personalities, folk memories, mythologies, literary associations and surviving physical relics, together with the places, whether sites or towns with which they are symbolically associated” (Ashworth 1994, p. 16).

Tourists gain physical access to the raw materials when they visit a heritage attraction where the physical access provides an embodied experience and tourists use their senses to engage with the place and its interpretation (Pocock 2008). Raw materials used in interpretation tend to conform to expectations to make them plausible and relevant to tourists, for example, if something is old, it should look old and artefacts should display signs of wear and tear (Lowenthal 1975). Intangible raw materials include the folk memories and mythologies, mentioned above, as well as atmosphere and ambience, which are accessed through the sensory and instinctive experience that is part of being in a heritage place (Lovelock, Patterson & Walker 1998). Buildings and artefacts that can be static and meaningless are transformed through interpretation that provides a contextual setting using a combination of symbols and signs to convey meanings making them dynamic and malleable (Wouters 2009). The role of interpretation is to present symbols and signs as triggers which engage the audience in the formation of a heritage experience (Diller, Shedroff & Rhea 2008; Tilden 1957). Engagement adds value, in the form of meaning, to the heritage experience (Chronis 2005; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Lowenthal 1998; Maddern 2005; McIntosh 1999; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Strange 2000; Voase 2002).

Freeman Tilden (1957) was the first to acknowledge that interpretation was a fundamental aspect of tourism. His principles of interpretation remain valid: the first principle is concerned with engagement, as anything which does not relate the object being described to the visitor is sterile; the second points out that information and interpretation are not the same; the third stresses that interpretation is an art where the presentation and choice of material is used to engage the audience; the fourth concerns the participatory nature of interpretation, and stresses that it should provoke not instruct; the fifth directs that interpretation needs to include the entire story rather than segments; and the sixth that it should be customised for its audience, for example
offering children a diluted version of the interpretation for adults is not satisfactory as their interests and needs are different (Tilden 1957).

As an interface between an historic event and the contemporary heritage attraction, interpretation can combine resources in new ways resulting in the development of new heritage products (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 1995). It is a fundamental competitive advantage as it renews the story keeping it fresh and relevant to succeeding generations of tourists (Peters & Weiermair, 2000). Interpretation is therefore a flexible resource with many benefits. Effective interpretation creates value and helps to maintain the contemporary relevance of the place; it protects the values associated with the place by a range of stakeholders; and it ensures constant updating and expansion of the story being told (Nuryanti 1996).

Although the operators of heritage tourist attractions make interpretive cues available, they have no control over the connections that each individual chooses to make, or what the outcome of the co-produced experience will be (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004). Insofar as the co-production process customizes the experience outcome, the collaboration between provider and customer is a form of open innovation (Austin & Devin 2003; Utterback et al. 2006). The level of control which operators have rests with decisions concerning which interpretive cues should be developed and which should be ignored (Ashworth 1994). When emphasis is placed on specific periods, events or viewpoints perspective and meaning can be altered (Chronis, 2005, McIntosh, 1999, Voase, 2002). In contrast, the story of place constantly evolves organically due to the dynamic nature of history (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995), and research and development provides new discoveries which can be incorporated into the interpretation (Uzzell & Ballantyne 1998).

A heritage story can be expressed in multiple ways, through a range of media to different audiences, and may trigger a diversity of emotional responses (Uzzell & Ballantyne 1998) through the choice of triggers designed by the operator and selected by the visitor (McIntosh 1999; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Voase 2002). The co-production process occurs because:
“whatever meanings visitors create in their minds are shaped by their own memories, interests and concerns as much as by their encounter with the attraction” (Voase 2002, p. 392).

Operators must understand the co-production process if they are to design experience triggers which match the needs of individual participants (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004). Engagement which is relevant to a broad range of tourists is the aim, now there is no longer a presumption by those managing heritage that only specific people have the prior knowledge, values or aesthetic appreciation to benefit from heritage attractions (Lash & Urry 1994). As co-producers, tourists contribute their prior knowledge, expectations, needs and wants to the process (McIntosh 1999; Pekarik 2010; Ryan, Christopher 2002), but they also bring their psychological state which can be affected by mood, company and external factors such as the weather (Uzzell & Ballantyne 1998). Tourists engage with the triggers provided to make individual connections with the heritage site meaning that the tourist experience is unique, personal and impossible to duplicate. This combination makes the experience simultaneous and perishable (Kotler et al. 2009). In contrast with the premise of this study, several authors consider the tourist experience to be a modern construct separated from the service sector and purposely managed to create a specific experience (McIntosh 1999; Pine & Gilmore 1999a; Richards & Wilson 2006).

**ENTERTAINMENT, EDUCATION, AESTHETICS AND ESCAPISM AT HERITAGE ATTRACTIONS**

Experience has been defined by Pine and Gilmore (1999), as combining entertainment, education, aesthetics and escapism, as illustrated in the model below (Figure 2). They stress that experiences are staged in order to engage the audience rather than simply designed to entertain them, making the experience participatory rather than purely observational (Pine & Gilmore 1999). This model will be considered in terms of heritage attractions.

This study proposes that the access product supplies the contact points through which the elements of the experience engage the tourist. Entertainment can require either passive or active participation depending on the personal input of tourists and the types
of experience triggers provided by the place in order to entertain (Ryan, Chris 2002b). At heritage attractions the heritage attributes should not be trivialized in the process of creating entertainment, as this could threaten their perceived authenticity and therefore their significance value (Richards & Wilson 2006).

**Figure 2: Experience Realms (Pine & Gilmore 1999b, p. 30)**

The second of Pine & Gilmore’s criteria, education is widely recognised as one of the main elements of a heritage experience (Garrod & Fyall 2000; Halewood & Hannam 2001; McIntosh 1999; Prentice 1993; Waitt 2000; Wanhill 2003). Education engages intellectually through increased knowledge, which enhances meaning (Moscardo 1999). Knowledge can be either tacit or explicit (Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000) and is provided using participatory or observational media, which can shift the perceptions of visitors (Uzzell & Ballantyne 1998; Voase 2002). Experiences, which are designed to do this, emphasise a particular aspect of the story in a carefully chosen location to elicit a specific emotional response making the educational experience memorable and
meaningful for those who engage with it (Crouch & Desforges 2003; Holbrook & Hirschman 1982; Richards & Wilson 2006; Ryan, Christopher 2002; Utterback et al. 2006).

The aesthetic elements of an experience stem from the heritage infrastructure and location as well as intangible elements that include atmosphere and ambience (Bonn et al. 2007; Dann & Jacobsen 2003; Edensor 2001; Kotler 1973; Richards & Wilson 2006). It engages the imagination of visitors using sensory triggers (Crouch & Desforges 2003; Edensor 2001; Uzzell & Ballantyne 1998). The final realm is the escapist experience, which involves active engagement, as the visitor becomes a participant (Tilden, 1957; Uzzell and Ballantyne, 1998a) through activities that use the heritage resources (Edensor, 2001). Interpretation immerses the visitor into the experience, influencing their perspective through physical, mental and sensory triggers (Lowenthal 1975; Pine & Gilmore 1999b), meaning that absorbing escape experiences, which are specifically designed to impact on imagination and fantasy, can become a competitive advantage (Amin & Thrift 2002; Richards & Wilson 2006).

To summarise, the heritage tourist experience is the result of a process of co-production. Raw materials are converted into signs through interpretation and tourists use the signs to engage with the site on their own terms using their tacit knowledge and previous experience, to construct symbolic meanings that are personal and memorable. The engagement between heritage site and visitor produces the experience. The end-result of this interaction is the tourist experience and the access product is the component that provides innovation capability for management within the process. The requirements of innovation and their effects are considered in the next section.

**Part Two**

**INTRODUCTION**

Innovation at heritage sites is poorly understood; research into innovation and tourism is a relatively new field of study and the research which links heritage attractions and innovation is very limited. It tends to focus on the business or operational aspects of
heritage attractions, including the effects of adopted and adapted technologies, or on cultural heritage destinations and regional development (Burns, P 2006; Garrod & Fyall 2000; Hjalager 2001; Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Rayport & Sviokla 1994; Richards & Wilson 2006; Silberberg 1994; Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002; Wanhill 2003). This study contends that in order to be economically and socially sustainable innovation is a paramount function of heritage attractions if they are to be relevant to their present audience, attracting them to visit and significant to the wider community resulting in a desire to retain the site as representative of the historic past.

There are particular challenges with innovation at heritage attractions associated with the quality and conservation needs of the heritage resource. Together these provide a (sometimes) uneasy balance between the primacy of tourism and the primacy of conservation for the management of heritage attractions. Both tourism and conservation are the focus of innovation and may have contrasting aims as they drive innovation for different purposes, although both are necessary for sustainability at heritage attractions. The study considers how changes in management focus determine different types of innovation depending on the driving strategy of the organisation at any time.

**DIFFERENT TYPES OF INNOVATION FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF OUTCOME**

Despite an extensive literature, the majority of research within the innovation studies discipline relates to the manufacturing and technological sectors (Fagerberg 2003). Joseph Schumpeter (1939) suggested that the most common types of innovation were new products, new methods of production, new sources of supply, the exploitation of new markets and new ways to organise business (Fagerberg 2003). These types of innovation continue to form the core of most innovation studies, but are adjusted to suit the sector to which they are applied. It is only recently that innovation studies have included the services sector (Fagerberg 2003), which is where this study positions heritage tourist attractions.

Abernathy and Clark (1985) described four types of innovation that are defined by their functions. When applied to heritage attractions, architectural innovations encompass the introduction of tourism at a place which previously had another purpose (Ho &
McKercher 2004), creating support industries, changing the economic base and shifting social perceptions (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Richards & Wilson 2006). Niche innovation includes combinations of existing products to construct packages or to create alternative, sometimes temporary, attractions that appeal to specific audiences (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006; Richards & Wilson 2006). Regular innovations encompass new investment for building non-heritage infrastructure or new processes to minimise wear and tear (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006). Revolutionary innovation includes new modes of delivery such as electronic marketing where the market and suppliers remain the same (Rayport & Sviokla 1994), and through which new forms of virtual access can be provided.

**Figure 3: The Innovation Space Model (Bessant & Davies 2007, p. 67)**

The Innovation Space Model (Fig 3) was created for the service sector suggesting four specific types of innovation that are called product, process, position and paradigm (Bessant & Davies 2007). Product innovation changes the things (products or services) which are offered by an organisation; process innovation changes the way in which the product is created and delivered; position innovation changes the context in which the products or services are introduced; and paradigm innovation changes the underlying
mental modes which frame what the organisation does. Incremental innovation refers to “do-better” innovations including extensions to original concepts, whereas radical innovation describes “do-different” innovations that are completely new ways of doing things (Bessant & Davies 2007; Bessant & Tidd 2007). The types of innovation can either stand alone, or work in tandem with one another although sometimes the dividing line between types can be blurred (Bessant and Davies, 2007), particularly between product and process innovation (Voss & Zomerdijk 2007).

As previously mentioned, process innovations, in the heritage tourism context, involve the creation of meaningful experiences through the process of combining aesthetic and heritage resources, including artefacts, relics, myth and symbolic knowledge (Asheim & Hansen 2009) into meaningful triggers with which tourists engage based on their own personal attributes, resulting in the co-production of the tourist experience (Chronis 2005; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004; Richards & Wilson 2006). Product innovation occurs as new forms of access are provided which may be physical or virtual, and which, through engagement, may also be emotional and intellectual. Product innovation is manifest through new delivery methods and media which combine the content and context of the interpretation (Giaccardi & Palen 2008; Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002).

Position innovation occurs as the heritage context shifts through time, changing the significance of place and what it represents to different segments of the tourist market (McIntosh 1999; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Voase 2002). If heritage attractions are to continue being relevant and to engage new audiences they must change their interpretation techniques and content accordingly (Chronis 2005; Halewood & Hannam 2001; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Nuryanti 1996; Pocock 2006a; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003). Paradigm innovation involves changes within the structure and strategy of the organisation as it shifts between what is considered to be the predominant function; in heritage tourism this is most evident in the balance between the primacy of heritage or tourism (Pocock 2006a).

THEORIES WHICH LINK TOURISM, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION

A number of models have been developed to explain how heritage attractions develop over time. Both Darwinian and Lamarckian evolutionary theories have been used to
formulate models of tourism development (Ravenscroft & Hadjihambi 2006). The major difference is that Darwinian evolution follows stages of natural selection resulting in the survival of the fittest, and Lamarckian evolution suggests that survival depends on the ability to adapt to a constantly changing environment (Ravenscroft & Hadjihambi 2006; Tellis & Crawford 1981). Schumpeter (1942) called the effects of competition that drive development ‘creative destruction’, following Darwinian theory where the new replaced the old, making it obsolete. His model has five stages, and has been tested in relation to heritage villages and destinations (Fan, Wall & Mitchell 2007; Huang, Wall & Mitchell 2007; Mitchell, Atkinson & Clark 2001). In contrast to Schumpeter’s (1942) theory, Abernathy and Clark (1985) take a different view of creative destruction, suggesting that some innovations refine and improve rather than destroy and make obsolete, which provides some explanation of the way in which heritage attractions build upon new episodes in their history and new discoveries, without losing the core advantages of the site or making unsought changes to the significance values of the site.

There are several theories of staged development including MacCannell’s (1976) which includes the naming phase, framing and elevation phase, enshrinement phase, mechanical reproduction phase and social reproduction phase. Together they describe stepped development from first identification as an attraction, through tourism becoming its main focus before gaining iconic status. This leads to reproduction through souvenirs and then immortalisation as groups and cities name themselves after the attraction (MacCannell 1976). However, if the attraction is of a ‘dark’ nature or associated with negative emotional responses, the opposite may occur when groups, cities or regions rename themselves in order to create distance from the attraction (Muhlhausier 2002). The question arises as to whether tourists will allow locals to rebrand themselves, or whether the force of tourism will retain the old name as a heritage marker, emphasizing the significance of the site for tourists or those not directly associated with the story, because tourists have a different view of places than locals (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007).

---

6 Though this is not the case for all sites with negative associations as demonstrated by the growing thanotourism research and negating associations of many iconic heritage attractions such as the Tower of London or Alcatraz.
The next model was developed to illustrate how an attractor based system can be used to attract tourists to specific regions or destinations (Mattsson, Sundbo & Fussing-Jensen 2005). The core attractor is what differentiates a place from purpose built tourist attractions constructed specifically to generate tourism. The scene maker is an innovator who identifies the opportunity for tourism and contextualizes the attractor, turning it into a scene. The scene maker may not be involved in tourism and will not necessarily benefit from the scene (Mattsson, Sundbo & Fussing-Jensen 2005). If the attractor is to be sustainable, the scene must be maintained and marketed and this role is undertaken by the scene taker, which is most likely to be an organization or an individual with entrepreneurial characteristics (Mattsson, Sundbo & Fussing-Jensen 2005). In order to maintain and renew the scene, a collaborative network of tourism firms act together to renew and rejuvenate it (Mattsson, Sundbo & Fussing-Jensen 2005). Examples of the attractor-based system applied to heritage tourism include regions which attract tourists to visit a variety of linked attractions through a common theme, such as ‘Shakespeare Country’ in the UK.

Butler’s (1980) Tourist Area Life Cycle (TALC) followed the traditional product life cycle model adapted for tourist areas. He suggested that the early development of a tourist area starts with discovery by visitors who seek new places, as yet untouched by tourism. Places slowly build their tourist numbers as awareness increases, restricted by lack of access, facilities and local knowledge. Several stages reflect increasing levels of tourism related development, including discovery, exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, decline or possible recovery (Butler, RW 1980). Weaver (2000) applied the life cycle theory to destinations affected by war, suggesting that major unplanned events, occurring within the external environment, have an effect on the development process. He proposed that the distance of time changes perceptions of places and the events that took place as well as attracting different types of audience at each stage of development. War related attractions acquire a mythological status, and interest is sustained through episodic events which relate to commemoration and re-enactment (Weaver 2000). Baum (1998) suggested there should be a reinvention stage to Butler’s model whereas Hovinen (2001) questioned the classification for stages during the maturity phase and the clustering of different business types to create a tourism area when many of the businesses have their own
life-cycles that run through different stages at the same time. He concluded that heritage tourism entrepreneurs were the driving force for change (Hovinen 2001).

Rather than stepped models, cyclical models have also been used to describe innovation in economics. Kondratiev (1922) and Schumpeter (1963) observed that long waves existed in business cycles which were identifiable by the periods of active innovation and invention which took place during periods of economic recession (Haywood 1998, p. 44). Contemporary economists say that this cyclical pattern can only be sustained through the relentless search for value (Haywood 1998). The search for value in heritage tourism is socially constructed and changes over time. Although in most services perceptions are used to measure success (Bessant & Tidd 2007), in heritage tourism perceptions may be negative, but will not necessarily create a negative impression of the attraction in the minds of tourists, only of the events which it represents.

Although aspects of each model are applicable to heritage attractions, staged or stepped models only consider single generations where each development stage must be completed before the next begins (Tellis & Crawford 1981). Staged models have deficiencies, particularly in the establishment of thresholds between stages which, in reality, occur slowly and can be blurred, plus the assumption of unidirectionality (Fan, Wall & Mitchell 2007; Tellis & Crawford 1981). Lamarckian theory suggests that evolution occurs over several iterations each reflecting an improvement on the last (Ravenscroft & Hadjihambi 2006). This is in line with the distinction between ‘do better’ and ‘do different’ innovations, where change can be incremental or radical (Bessant & Davies 2007). Rather than being successive, as in staged models, development is cumulative, where elements from the previous stage are improved upon or changed rather than discarded (Tellis & Crawford 1981). This is found in the stories of heritage places, where the emphasis may change but the history, authenticated through explicit knowledge sources, remains as the foundation for interpretation. Kline and Rosenberg (1986) also questioned the perception that innovation occurs in stages as a linear model, where the first stage is research and innovation is applied science; instead, they suggest that it stems from demand coupled with a commercial need for change. They propose that two sets of forces need to be present if innovation is to succeed, both of which are dependent on the internal and external environments in which the
innovating organisation exists. Those forces are market forces and the forces of progress (Kline & Rosenberg 1986). Different types of innovation occur at different times in the development of a heritage tourist attraction, depending on the external factors presented by the environment in which the heritage attraction exists. In order to identify innovation over time, it is necessary to consider what drives and determines the type of innovation that may occur.

FORCES WHICH DRIVE AND DETERMINE INNOVATION AT HERITAGE ATTRACTIONS

Systems theory (Edquist 2005) brings together the diverse segments within heritage tourism and shows how internal and external environments influence the way in which innovation occurs at these sites (Edquist 2005; Hjalager 2001; Richards & Wilson 2006; Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). Environments comprise forces that influence decisions, actions and goals, and drive innovation at heritage attractions (Richards & Wilson 2006). These decisions include place-making that incorporates the messages and meanings emphasised in interpretation and the dissemination of knowledge about a heritage attraction (Hollinshead 2007).

The internal and external environments are shaped by disequilibrium (Barras 1986; Schumpeter, J 1939) as conditions derived from current social attitudes, expectations and values constantly fluctuate (Misiura 2006). The dynamic nature of history provides a catalyst for disequilibrium as current events change the relationship between the perceived past, the present and the imagined future making it difficult to forecast what will have meaning for successive generations (Lynch, K 1972). The constantly shifting environment offers opportunities for innovation, through new interpretation in terms of content, presentation and delivery, transforming the tourist experience and creating different meanings through changed perceptions of the past (Chronis 2005; Voase 2002; Waitt 2000). Additionally, interpretation which is effective and meaningful, makes tourists mindful (Moscardo 1996) as it can force social change by shifting perceptions of the past through increased knowledge and understanding which can influence future behaviour (Moscardo 1996, 1999). Heritage attractions which combine their power to control knowledge with their power to disseminate it are able to drive
change which maintains relevance and protects the inherent competitive advantage (Apostolakis 2003).

Sundbo and Gallouj (2000) developed a model (Figure 4) to show the driving forces behind service innovation. This model, which is described below, was used in this study as the foundation for identifying the drivers and determinants of innovation at heritage attractions. An adapted model (Figure 6) was developed from the case study to show the forces that drive and determine innovation at heritage tourist attractions. This alternative model will be explained in detail in chapter eight. The innovation process in service firms is mainly driven by internal forces, of which there are three, these will be described in the next section.

THE INTERNAL FORCES

The internal forces at heritage attractions include the management team who strategize to facilitate the shifting focus of the business as it oscillates between prioritizing either conservation or tourism aims (Nuryanti 1996; Wanhill 2003). Management and strategy can be a driver for innovation, particularly in the areas of marketing when new markets emerge and heritage attractions are forced to reposition by becoming more customer focused and responsive to visitor needs and expectations (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Nuryanti 1996). The management and strategy of the firm, emanates from any level of management and from any department (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). The internal effects of general management incorporate the business activities of the site and include heritage, conservation and tourism concerns, for example, strategizing to adhere to the guidelines for acceptance as a world heritage site. Additional management concerns at heritage attractions are affected by the unique nature of the resource itself and the budgetary demands associated with conservation and protection. The day to day running of the site and ability to maximise on efficiencies and effectiveness is a priority for the internal management of the heritage site. Strategic change may result in more experiential products designed to engage visitors with the aim of encouraging a longer stay, repeat visitation and word of mouth recommendation (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002).

Formalised research and development departments rarely exist in service firms (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). However, research and development in heritage tourism is multi-
focussed, and carried out by a range of professionals including historians, architects and archaeologists, who may be required for their research capability or for their engineering and design skills as well as within the realm of conservation. The definition for research and development used in this study is

“research and experimental development (R&D) comprise creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man [sic], culture and society and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications” (OECD. 1993 paragraph 57)

Figure 4: Driving forces behind service innovation (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000, p. 21)

When the above definition is used in the context of heritage attractions it suggests that R&D can lead to increased knowledge about the cultural and social history associated with the site as well as better understanding about tangible artefacts, relics and buildings which can be used as resources for heritage interpretation (Wouters 2009). Research and development also takes place within the conservation realm, where new
discoveries in the form of archaeology or architecture come under the auspices of historic research (Garrod & Fyall 2000).

Employees, including managers and others, become a force for innovation when they act as corporate entrepreneurs (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). Although some service organisations may have a separate innovation department this is rare, and normally provides a communication function where employees are encouraged to develop innovative ideas that are then harvested by the organisation (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000).

THE EXTERNAL FORCES

The external driving forces are divided into trajectories and actors. The trajectories are ideas and logic diffused through the social system (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). Trajectories include the service professionals’ ethics; general management ideas or ideas for new organizational forms; technology trajectories, which include new ways of using technology in service organisations; the institutional trajectory describes the evolution of regulations; and the social trajectory is concerned with the evolution of social rules and conventions (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). The actors are the people, firms or organisations that affect innovation in either a positive or negative way. The actors define the market possibilities and include customers who co-produce the service product; competitors who may imitate a product; suppliers including consultants and other knowledge providers; and the public sector which may supply research and education necessary for innovation, but which is less likely to play an active role and may, in some cases, limit the ability for services to innovate (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000). The trajectories and actors will be described in more detail below.

Institutional Regulations

In terms of heritage attractions, the external trajectories include the institutional regulations which deal with tourism and those which are concerned with conservation and preservation although to reiterate, decisions regarding actions based on the regulations rest with the managerial function mentioned in the internal sphere (Figure 4). Those which are tourism focused tend to be on local, national and supranational scales and range from health and safety regulations to regulations dealing with pricing and market share (Evans, Campbell & Stonehouse 2003). Those which are concerned with conservation and preservation are dictated by heritage institutions such as the
Australian Heritage Council and regulations provided through the Burra Charter (Appendix 5) which gives guidelines for managing heritage resources (ICOMOS 1999).

**Technology**

The second trajectory is technology which both directly and indirectly affects heritage attractions through the provision of physical, intellectual and virtual access (Giaccardi & Palen 2008). Technology can provide innovation capability by solving problems associated with the geographical boundedness of some heritage sites; such as when physical access is a fundamental requirement (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006). When places are remote from large urban areas, physical access is via transport links and the risks associated with investment means that the outcome has to be considered worthwhile (Gunn 1997; Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Wanhill 2003). Once the means of access has been provided, other support services take the opportunity for entrepreneurial innovation by creating new products or alliances (Hjalager 2001) resulting in the formation of a network of suppliers. Transport makes remote places more accessible, allowing people from further afield to visit in a shorter period of time (Lash & Urry 1994; Lury 1997), although conversely the role of the entrepreneurial service suppliers, mentioned below, is often to encourage longer stays and increased spending.

**Service Professionals**

The emergence of new technologies has increased the reach of heritage places to diverse audiences through marketing and other media (Stamboulis & Skayannis 2002). The service professional trajectory refers to those with specialist knowledge and expertise in heritage, conservation and tourism who supply the methods, general knowledge and behavioural rules from their various professions.

**Management**

A concern for management in general is economic sustainability. Economic cycles alternate between periods of boom and bust and have a psychological effect (Schumpeter, J 1939), which may change the perception of places of heritage interest and alter their interpretation. Management is also concerned with making decisions concerning overall organisational strategy which can be affected by events in the
external environment causing choices to be made between heritage, conservation and tourism values.

Social

The social trajectory is a primary driver of innovation at heritage attractions as social attitudes and perceptions are catalysts for change in the meanings and values inherent in the heritage story (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007; Garrod & Fyall 2000). Socially constructed values shift with each generation, depending on their symbolic value to a contemporary audience (Giaccardi & Palen 2008; Richards & Wilson 2006; Urry 1990). Society needs constant monitoring so that when ideas, emphasis and constructed messages no longer engage the audience they can be changed to meet customer demand.

Competition

The actors who drive innovation at heritage tourist attractions also change over time. As noted, competition is for time, money and interest and heritage attractions must provide satisfaction on all levels if they are to succeed (Richards & Wilson 2006). Competition for the tourist dollar not only comes from other heritage attractions, but also from a range of leisure activities aimed at locals and tourists (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006; Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002; Misiura 2006; Richards & Wilson 2006; Wanhill 2003). As mentioned earlier, heritage attractions have unique competitive advantages based on valuable, rare resources which are impossible to imitate or duplicate (Sillince 2006).

Customers

Customers are the second group of actors. They co-produce their heritage experience to satisfy their personal demands and needs. Experiences depend on personal expectation, prior knowledge, recollections and personal interests (Voase 2002), as well as personal attributes, temperament and tastes (Holbrook & Hirschman 1982). They use their intellect and imagination to receive and communicate messages, and in the process they construct their individual sense of meaning and self discovery (Nuryanti 1996).
The public sector

The fragile built infrastructure of many iconic heritage places can result in heavy financial outgoings and they may not attract a large enough audience to be self-sustaining. Hence the economic requirements of these places may be dependent on grants and other types of government provision from the public sector (Wanhill 2003). Nevertheless, there is an on-going expectation that such sites continue to generate some form of income and hence innovation continues to be important. The public sector also drives innovation at heritage attractions because the strong link between politics and heritage ties them into a concept of national identity (AlSayyad 2001; Craik 2001; Palmer 1998). The support provided by government changes over time and the contemporary political landscape affects how an attraction is used to reflect a constructed national identity and to promote the current political elite changing the tourist experience (Edensor 2001; Halewood & Hannam 2001; Hollinshead 2002; Lowenthal 1975; McIntosh 1999). This can be complicated if the heritage attraction reflects a negative period in a nation’s history (Sharpley & Stone 2009) where less savoury elements are edited or treated sensitively. The influence of the public sector on heritage attractions is also recognized in international terms through incorporation on UNESCO’s World Heritage List. Sites which are listed become politically sensitive as part of an international tourism system (Maddern 2005). Heritage attractions that are relevant to an international audience need to resonate on a different scale and provide alternative levels of engagement at the same time as ensuring that local affiliations are not diminished (Maddern 2005).

Suppliers

Suppliers are actors who drive innovation on a variety of levels; they form a network of operators who complement one another, benefitting the organisation in terms of information, status and resource advantages (Powell, WW & Grodal 2005). Other suppliers include those with whom the heritage attraction partners or with whom they are mutually compatible (Wanhill 2003). For example, transport and accommodation suppliers depend on heritage attractions to pull visitors into their area, but the heritage attraction depends on the transport and accommodation suppliers to provide their service for the convenience of the visitor (Misiura 2006). Partnerships between competitors is an innovative process through which several seemingly competitive
attractions are cooperatively packaged and marketed to visitors (Craik 1997; Misiura 2006; Powell, WW & Grodal 2005). The networks of service professionals combine to create a form of open innovation which describes a trend towards networks of suppliers, independent specialists and customers who interact with one another to co-create products and services (Bughin, Chui & Johnson 2008; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004).

**Other Stakeholders**

Although the category entitled other stakeholders has not been included in the model being discussed in this chapter, it is a factor which has been added to the adapted model illustrated in chapter eight. This category incorporates many types of stakeholders including pressure groups, such as local communities, and tourists themselves (Leask & Yeoman 1999) as forces which drive and determine innovation. Local communities may be the focus of interpretation at heritage attractions, which means they pressure management towards emphasising particular viewpoints (Dewhurst & Dewhurst 2006; Gold & Gold 2007; Leask & Yeoman 1999; Maddern 2005; Strange 2000). If the interpretation is contentious, pressure groups may attempt to construct specific meanings in line with their own interests (Strange 2000). Local stakeholders may also attribute value and meaning to less tangible and more abstract elements of heritage places, such as atmosphere and ambience as well as local knowledge developed through non-tourist embodied experiences of space. These values may not be understood by those more focused on conservation of tangible resources or those focused on tourist outcomes (Pocock 2006a). When stakeholder’s views are marginalised it may lead to antagonism between stakeholder groups and/or management (Fallon & Kriwoken 2003).

**Summarising the model for heritage attractions**

Combinations of actors and trajectories within the external environment and the objectives of management within the internal environment at heritage attractions change constantly. Subsequently they dictate the type of innovative activity that is possible although not necessarily what will be done to maintain the competitive advantages of the site. At heritage attractions the environment is set within the heritage context that creates different parameters than those that non-heritage
attractions need to consider. Some of these considerations have been mentioned above. The following section will consider the effects of the heritage context on the innovative capability of a heritage attraction.

Part Three

THE HERITAGE CONTEXT

Places of historic interest have attracted visitors for centuries, but since the nineteenth century historic places have also been used to signify political and cultural differences (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Lowenthal 1998; Smith, A 1991; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996). As noted above, the heritage context differentiates heritage tourism from other types of tourism. The heritage industry largely developed as a recognisable entity in nineteenth century Europe and is seen as a construct of modernism (AlSayyad 2001; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Lowenthal 1998; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996; Walsh 1992). National identity became one of the main drivers for a constructed heritage story, particularly in Western Europe during the nineteenth and early twentieth century when a period of nation building was taking place (AlSayyad 2001; Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Tilly 1992). A national history or myth was a unifying factor which promoted the powerful and confirmed the presumed rights of leadership (Cosgrove 1984). It was a period of uncertainty when populations moved from rural areas to urban industrialised towns, leaving behind them the markers of their identity (White 1981). The emergence of ‘heritage’, in the construction of a national identity provided a national, unifying story with a positive bias (Seal 2007).

In Australia, at the start of the nineteenth century, there was a sharp distinction between Europeans, who were considered progressive and non-Europeans who were not (Crang 2006). Over time the demographic mix changed and Australia shifted towards a multicultural identity as it assimilated a variety of migrant populations (Jupp 1997). When other nationalities arrived the notion of what it was to be an Australian changed (Tranter & Donoghue 2007; White 1981). The ex-colonial links and the
predominance of British settlers until the early twentieth century told a story which emphasised the closeness of the relationship between Australia and Britain (Reynolds 2006). As national identity developed along with the changing demographics, heritage tourist attractions had to reassess their significance value if they were to be considered relevant to the new audience. In more recent times, heritage has additionally been used to satisfy the economic aims of tourism, resulting in the development of a constructed heritage aimed at consumption by tourists (AlSayyad 2001; Graham 2002).

The heritage context provides opportunities and limitations for innovation. Opportunities are found in the essence of heritage as a contemporary rewriting of the past. This suggests that revitalisation is a constant state and, as a resource, heritage is both flexible and renewable (Ashworth & Graham 2005; Edensor 2001; Garrod & Fyall 2000; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Halewood & Hannam 2001; Lowenthal 1975; McIntosh 1999; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996). As the past is not reproduced, only imagined, it provides a wide scope of possibilities for creating meaning (Appadurai 1990; Goldman 1995), although there is a danger if reinvention goes too far, that the core heritage meanings associated with the attraction will be lost. Heritage resources expand due to the dynamic nature of history, when events occur which provide new episodes for interpretation (Lowenthal 1998). The process of constructing heritage reflects contemporary moral and ethical values meaning that events which are deemed unacceptable may be consigned to oblivion (Lowenthal 1998) or conversely, may be interpreted specifically to shock and confront their audience (Lennon & Foley 2004).

Limitations to innovation inherent in constructing heritage tourist attractions include a risk that preservation may encapsulate the past, locking it into a specific temporal or spatial frame. Risks in limitation occur if the flow of history is ignored, endangering sustainability by making places irrelevant and meaningless (Lynch, K 1972). Measures need to ensure that attractions remain relevant and sustainable and that potential innovation is not stifled (Chronis 2005; Edensor 2001; Gold & Gold 2007; Halewood & Hannam 2001; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Voase 2002). On the other hand, benefits may eventuate if confinement provides a competitive advantage through making a site unique or by creating opportunities for new linkages or associations, leading to new interpreted experiences (Wanhill 2003). The conundrum that faces managers of
heritage attractions is how to balance conservation and tourism interests without damaging the ability of attractions to maintain their unique competitive advantage at the same time as preserving the heritage resource for future generations.

**BALANCING THE AIMS OF CONSERVATION AND TOURISM**

There needs to be a balance between the primacy of conservation and that of tourism if heritage attractions are to be sustainable in economic and social terms. Conservation and preservation became a primary concern of heritage sites following the inception of the Venice Charter of 1964 and, in Australia, the Burra Charter in 1979 (and revisions) (Appendix 5). This Charter laid out the ethics of conserving places of heritage significance, including links to national identity. Competing interests at heritage attractions resulted in a divide between those professionals who specialised in conservation and preservation and those whose interests lay in tourism (Pocock 2006b). This shift in perspective affected the management of heritage attractions and created some conflict of interest about their purpose. Two approaches to conservation are taken at heritage sites by managers; first, aesthetic conservation applies to those places which accord with concepts of beauty and the picturesque, appealing to the romantic imagination. Second, scientific conservation refers to those places which are conserved based on research, knowledge and understanding where gaps exist, meaning that only the places, stories and items most valued by contemporary generations are conserved (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Lash & Urry 1994). Decisions about significance and conservation therefore are subjective, and those tangible and intangible resources, which attract the interest of conservators and curators, are designated as ‘special’, frequently because of their rarity value (Lowenthal 1998; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996).

An additional concern can arise if conservation is given precedence over tourism because it can lead to a reduction in the funding needed for maintenance of buildings and other tangible resources (Garrod & Fyall 2000). This particularly occurs if tourism is restricted to prevent the impact of visitor numbers because of the fragile nature of heritage sites, consequently reducing the income from tourism through non-use (Pocock 2006a). Not all heritage places are destined to become tourist attractions, but heritage attractions do tend to be heritage sites. The exception is some cultural centres
and living heritage museums, which may combine purpose-built infrastructure with the
display of historic artefacts. This can lead to commodification when history is packaged,
presented and delivered for consumption by tourists (Chang 1997) perceptibly turning
heritage resources into commodities.

COMMODIFICATION AND EXCHANGE IN THE HERITAGE CONTEXT

Commodities have two values: first as use and second as exchange (Fleissner 2003).
When heritage assets are commodified, they encompass the collection, consumption
and comparison of the signs and symbols of the past, making them increasingly
marketable and giving them a functional value in economic terms (Ionnides & Debbage
1998). When interpretation is used to engage tourists, through the use of signs and
symbols, an exchange occurs between the encoding/creation and
decoding/consumption stages (Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton 1981). To explain,
attraction exchanges access to heritage resources using interpretation as a coded
medium. The consumer exchanges their tacit knowledge and personal interests when
they decode the interpretive access triggers during the co-production of their individual
heritage experience. These meanings are grounded in a social context, representing
more than a simple economic exchange (Elliott 1997 ) because the visitor adds value to
heritage experiences through their personal understanding and imagination (Crouch &
Desforges 2003). The exchange occurs because neither the site nor the visitor can
create the experience without the other, but the exchange means that heritage sites
are consumable objects in both symbolic and concrete terms (Urry 1990). Therefore
heritage sites incorporate the metaphorical and imaginary components which result
from the commodification of the heritage product (Meethan 2001). Without
interpretation a question arises concerning the level of understanding or interest
individual tourists would have if presented with seemingly unconnected historic
remains.
PARAMETERS OF INNOVATION IN THE HERITAGE CONTEXT

Those factors that differentiate heritage tourism from other types of tourism have already, to some extent, been discussed. However, there are five elements inherent in the heritage context which this research suggests affect innovation capability at heritage attractions and which create additional opportunities and limitations in the development of heritage sites for tourism purposes, supplementing those already mentioned. The five additional elements are meaning and symbolism; place; identity; time and knowledge, these will be considered below.

MEANING AND SYMBOLISM

As mentioned previously, heritage is an adaptation of history to make it relevant for the present generation (Lowenthal 1998), but as meanings are socially constructed, different cultures and each generation changes how they classify and assign meaning to the world (Hall, S 1997). Conversely, as social perceptions change, a cumulative process of cultural transmission occurs, which involves passing on knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values so each generation can build on the achievements of their predecessors and the culture evolves (Smith, K et al. 2008). Meaning is mutable and creates value through constant reconstruction (Lowenthal 1998; Meethan 2001), hence, as relevant interpretation redirects and reorganises the heritage content it becomes a dialogue between the past and the present (Meethan 2001).

Although meaning is a raw material at heritage attractions, when people access the interpretive triggers for a meaningful engagement, the ways in which they make their own connections ensure that their constructed meanings are personal. Selwyn (1996) defines tourists as those who chase myths, and within heritage studies the past is acknowledged as an imagined place (Chronis 2005; Lowenthal 1998; Selwyn 1996). Myth and imagination are personal constructs that suggest that the individual input of tourists into the process of making meaning at heritage attractions is a fundamental part of the heritage tourist experience.

Heritage attractions are symbols which represent a historic event or place and as such, they carry meanings related directly to their physical location and those associated with the history of the place, which is its competitive advantage (Elliott 1997). Managers of
heritage attractions work towards constructing meaning through the subjective choice of artefacts and knowledge identified as being most valued by the current generation who are their potential audience (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007). The artefacts and knowledge selected for tourism may differ from those selected to be conserved or preserved for historic research as its aim and purpose are different. Interpretation is used to construct meanings and provide access at heritage tourist attractions through the choice of artefacts, the knowledge used to explain them and how it is presented, and contextualised (Hirschman 1982; Lovelock, Patterson & Walker 1998; Strange 2000; Wanhill 2003). Heritage generates perspective and meaning to visitors’ lives (McIntosh 1999) making it personal, subjective and often symbolic; particularly when the meanings are associated with identity or psychological and social needs (Nuryanti 1996).

Signs and symbols are used to trigger meaningful connections that form the heart of a heritage experience and create a sense of place (Giaccardi & Palen 2008). Signs are the first markers to represent an attraction to a tourist, frequently in the form of information or marketing material (MacCannell 1976). The marker, or sign, is therefore the first trigger for meaning which can either be personal or cultural (Hall, S 1997). Over time, everyday tools and implements become imbued with age and are re-classified as artefacts (Kjeldbaek 2009; Lowenthal 1998; Wouters 2009), often becoming signs. The contextual and temporal settings of signs help tourists to make sense of them and what they symbolise (Wouters, 2009). Symbols include located stories, histories and traditions which reflect the relationship between people and place (Cosgrove 1993; Stephenson 2006), providing multiple values including cultural significance, aesthetic appreciation and a functional value as a personal storehouse of collective memories (Stephenson 2006). Those attributes that imbue symbolic meaning can be used as resources for innovation (Hirschman 1982) and for identity formation as personal and national associations are reflected in the content and context of heritage places and how they are interpreted.

**PLACE**

This study takes a broad view of place, using the term to refer to sites that are given meaning by the people who use them, in this case, tourists. Place describes the spatial context in which the triggers mentioned in the previous section, are located. Places do
not exist in isolation; they are dynamic and change over time becoming potentially infinite through their temporal and spatial contexts and their shared associations with other places and landscapes (Lynch, K 1972; Walsh 1992). Place can be described as “space imbued with meaning” (Vanclay 2008, p. 3), when associated with tradition, myth, memories and narratives, (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007; Crang 1999) making it unique and providing a geographic location; a material form; and meaning and value (Gieryn 2000; Relph 1976). Place is always in the process of evolving, as new elements are added and old elements disappear, meaning that they are dynamic and have a distinct link with history (Relph 1976; Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996). They contain the signs and symbols that society uses to represent the past and the meanings associated with it (Knudsen et al. 2008). Hence, place is a raw material in heritage tourism as it is constituted through various forms of knowledge which saturate it with significance and meaning (Knudsen et al. 2008; Tuan 1977). The complexity of history imbuéd in place demands multiple layers of interpretation if it is to connect with a diverse audience and is compounded by the simultaneous viewing of the same site through a variety of lenses (Ashworth, Graham & Tunbridge 2007).

IDENTITY

Meanings associated with nationhood and personal identities can be influenced through interpretation at heritage attractions and the symbolic artefacts used to represent the past, as mentioned previously (Frable 1997; Knudsen et al. 2008; Pritchard 2007). Individuals possess several identities at the same time and heritage places need to provide meaningful connections on multiple levels if they are to engage tourists through links with identity (Ballengee-Morris & Stuhr 2001; Pritchard 2007). This study concentrates primarily on national and personal identities as these were recognised during the period covered, whereas other types of identity were not.

Two ways in which innovation can be used to change a national identity include the use of historic events and monuments to construct significant places which inspire myths and legends (Smith, A 1991). Alternatively, through the use of history to recreate a glorious past, redolent of heroism or liberation resulting in national pride and dignity (Smith, A 1991, 1996). In both cases interpretation becomes the vehicle for innovative activity that aims to engage the audience and provide meaningful triggers through which people will understand their national story as well as create their own personal
connections with the constructed heritage on display. As people change their interests and perceptions, constant vigilance followed by innovative action is necessary if heritage attractions are to maintain their relevance to their audience and significance to the broader community.

**TIME**

“The past is a place which is separate from the present, and which one travels to and visits via a combination of recreation and authentic elements” (Lennon & Foley 2004 p.11).

Although heritage is present-centred and represents the values of a contemporary audience (Ashworth and Graham 2005), the aspects of the story that will become symbolic of the past need time to pass into history before they can be converted into heritage (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Lowenthal 1985; Smaldone, Harris & Sanyal 2008). The distance of time offers the benefit of hindsight (Halbwachs 1992), (Smaldone, Harris & Sanyal 2008), meaning that events or occurrences can become part of the heritage story after an acceptable time. As such, heritage is a dynamic concept which is continually evolving (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000). As the views and values of society fluctuate, change occurs in small increments and is difficult to identify in the short term. It is only when change is considered over the longer term that shifts in attitude are noticeable. The term ‘generation’ has been suggested as a symbolic unit of time, used as a device for representing change in society (Nora 1996). Byrne (2001) suggests that generations overlap one another and that as many as four generations may be alive at the same time with those in the youngest inheriting the knowledge of their grandparents, and those in the middle being sandwiched between gaining knowledge from their predecessors at the same time as they pass knowledge to their children (Byrne, Brayshaw & Ireland 2001).

Disequilibrium in society ensures that history remains fluid and that social values vary (Carr 1987). Places which reflect negative occurrences can elicit emotions such as shock, grief or compassion in the recent aftermath, this is followed by a period when commemoration is considered exploitative, before being memorialised and turned into a place of pilgrimage once enough time has passed (Lennon & Foley 2004). Differentiating between ‘then’ and ‘now’ in the interpretation can change the meanings
associated with negative events, creating a temporal barrier which distances past
generations from the current one (Fowler 1992; Hall, S 1997; Lowenthal 1998),
(Lowenthal 1998). The remote past is described as ‘historic’ but the present generation
deciphers it on their own terms (Assmann & Czaplicka 1995; Lynch, K 1972). It also
means that not every ‘event’ or occurrence is available for use as heritage until a
generation has passed, allowing time for myth making and imagination to take over
from memories and reality (Assmann & Czaplicka 1995; Smaldone, Harris & Sanyal
2008).

Ruins as a marker of time

A tangible and romanticised reminder of the past are ruined buildings, where their
ruined state frequently encourages curiosity (Macaulay 1953). There are three
interlinking aesthetic approaches to the depiction of ruins, which offer a form of artistic
interpretation (Zucker 1961). First they are a vehicle to create a romanticized mood as
they are used as props to create a particular emotional response within their story;
second, they are a factual architectural document of the past; and third, they are a
revival of the original concept of space and proportion (Zucker 1961). Although it is
impossible to know how a ruined building would have previously fitted into its
contemporary landscape, the architectural values inherent in the proportional and
spatial qualities of the original structure survive as a metamorphosis of the original
architecture (Zucker 1961). They allow the embodied tourist to experience the spatial
qualities of the place despite the ruined state of the architecture. In this way, built
heritage, romanticised by destruction, becomes part of heritage reflecting meaning in
current terms rather than those of the past (Macaulay 1953). Ruins are also seen as
symbolic of the triumph of nature over society “no circumstance so forcibly marks the
desolation of a spot once inhabited, as the prevalence of Nature over it” (Macaulay
1953 p.xvi). Other commentators suggest that ruined structures may be seen as a scar
on the landscape and evidence of perceived tragedy, giving them an emotional depth
(Lynch, K 1972). The story of destruction may elicit several responses, including a
pleasurable melancholy, satisfaction at having survived, a feeling of righteous triumph,
aesthetic delight or intellectual enjoyment (Lynch, K 1972): “but at base the emotional
pleasure is a heightened sense of the flow of time” (Lynch, K 1972 p.44). Thus, time is
an element in innovation as it provides a time-lag, allowing current events which can
only be seen through the micro-view of the present to be reconstructed after a passage of time through the macro-view provided by hindsight.

**Knowledge**

This study considers historic knowledge as a raw material for heritage tourism. The fundamental premise concerning what knowledge is and why it is important is that it is about creating competitive advantage (Cooper 2005). Knowledge is historically and culturally specific and can only be understood meaningfully when contextualized by its own historic discourse (Hall, S 1997). If organisations are to be sustainable; they need to create knowledge through action and interaction with their environment (Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000) and this also applies to heritage attractions.

As has already been noted, different types of knowledge are implemented during the co-production of the heritage tourist experience including tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000). Explicit knowledge is codified and tangible in the form of authorised books, manuscripts, monographs, images and other types of authenticated media which can be processed, stored, archived and used by individuals relatively easily (Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000). Explicit knowledge describes the way in which historic records and archives are used to authorise and document an official history based on the subjective choice of those professionals whose role it is to preserve the present for the future. The on-going development of knowledge depends on externally acquired information and learning, especially the collection, discovery and development of explicit knowledge.

Tacit knowledge is the personal, sometimes unconscious knowledge, which exists in the body and mind and is rooted in action, but difficult to communicate with others (Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000). Research into the relationship between tacit knowledge and geography suggests that tacit knowledge is centred on knowing ‘self’, influenced by cognitive, social, cultural and economic circumstances which are guided by the environment (Howells 2002). The heritage tourist experience depends on the tacit knowledge of each visitor, which is unique and based on emotional responses, intuition, and individual values (Howells 2002; Nonaka, Toyama & Konno 2000). During the process of co-production all information is filtered and interpreted by individuals using tacit know-how which is based on past experience (Howells 2002). The co-
production process enables individuals to make their own personal sense of place depending on their level of engagement and choice of connections with the interpretive triggers supplied by operators and based on explicit knowledge sources. The tourist may have only a shallow knowledge of the heritage attributes of an attraction, but this may satisfy their needs.

Narratives or stories can draw out tacit knowledge and ameliorate understanding (Connell, Klein & Meyer 2004) by encouraging tourists to dig deeply into their consciousness to create connections with heritage interpretation resulting in a meaningful engagement (Giaccardi & Palen 2008; Holbrook & Hirschman 1982; Voase 2002). Most customers’ (or tourists’ in this case) needs are tacit, which means they cannot explain what they want in explicit terms (Nonaka & Takeuchi 1995). Tacit knowledge can also be gained through sensory engagement when a tourist is embodied within a heritage place (Edensor 2001; Pocock 2006a). If managers of heritage tourist attractions are to maximise their heritage assets they need to provide opportunities for knowledge creation (Giaccardi & Palen 2008; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995). The type of knowledge exchanged in the co-production of the tourist experience differentiates heritage attractions from other types of tourist experience.

CONCLUSION

The broad aims of this study are to identify how and why heritage attractions innovate. Why innovation occurs may be associated with sustainability if heritage attractions are to remain relevant to their audience and significant to the broader community. In terms of this research, the explanation of how innovation occurs required a new definition of the product, which incorporates both an access product and an experience product and the interaction between them in the co-production process. Recognition that the product is a component of the tourist experience rather than the end result stems from the fact that operators require control of their products if they are to accept the risks associated with innovation. Therefore, they provide a product based on the elements that they control, which in terms of this research has been defined as access. The types of innovation that were possible at heritage attractions were reviewed and the reason that the literature pertaining to services was most appropriate for this study was
explained. The drivers of innovation, within the internal and external environments, create opportunities that may be proactive or reactive. Events, which are outside the control of the site, change visitor perception and must be absorbed into the story.

Meaning, in the process of innovation at heritage attractions, has a functional role and is manifest in the development of the access product. To reiterate, the product was identified as access in the form of

- physical access to the site, including its stories and the natural and built infrastructure which frame the attraction and embody the visitor;
- virtual access through images and words, which lead to understanding what the place represents and in marketing why a potential visit may be attractive;
- emotional access through the personal connection points which are stimulated by the interpretive triggers in the form of signs and symbols which can either be organic or organised for specific effects; and
- intellectual access which is gained through engaging with the interpretation in order to increase knowledge and understanding.

Each point of access provides meaning for visitors, which, through the process of co-production, is personally relevant and forms the ‘take-home’ element of the heritage experience. The role of meaning at heritage attractions is therefore twofold, first it is at the core of the access product as operators seek to highlight or manipulate the meanings represented at the site through the use of signs and symbols within the interpretation; secondly, as mentioned above, meaning also provides the unique experience outcome which visitors take home at the end of their day.

The contribution made by this literature review is a new way of thinking about the heritage product. It is acknowledged that not only is innovation present at heritage attractions, it is also fundamental if they are to be sustainable. How the study will be undertaken will be considered in the next chapter which describes the method used to conduct the research in order to discover how, when and whether innovation occurred; and which forces shaped the type of innovation implemented at different periods over time.
CHAPTER THREE:
METHOD

INTRODUCTION

The project seeks to understand how innovation occurs at heritage tourist attractions and to do this a new definition of the heritage attraction product and the process of co-production was discussed in the previous chapter. The study will use these definitions to identify where innovation has occurred and what has driven and determined its shape over time in relation to the shifting environments in which the heritage attraction exists. The prolonged period under study means it is possible to understand how innovation is a continuous process through time as it fluctuates through waves of activity and inertia.

The study discerns which raw materials are mutable and can be used to innovate. This happens in two ways; when the passage of time renews their meanings they become tools for rejuvenation, or alternatively different meanings are ascribed to them during the innovation process and the raw material is rejuvenated to represent a new range of meanings. Raw materials are therefore not static and their innovative application works towards ensuring the economic sustainability of heritage tourist attractions by providing a wealth of resources for revitalising the product. Further investigation will identify other aspects of the heritage resource that may have been ignored or under-utilised in innovation.

THE INITIAL APPROACH

In the initial stages of the research in early 2007 a brief exploration of heritage attractions in Tasmania was conducted. This identified how many sites might be considered sustainable heritage attractions over a long period. As a starting point the list of major attractions proposed in the Advancing the Attractions Sector (Reed, Hepper & Tilley 1999) report for Tourism Tasmania, published in 2001 was used. The report identified Tasmanian attractions by significance based on: size, potential, location, fit,
strengths and services and concluded that there were 81 major attractions in Tasmania, out of which 24 were classified as historic rather than culture, nature or other (Appendix 1). The 24 historic attractions formed the initial base of the enquiry. At first, the proposed research plan was to include several contemporary case studies that would be compared. However, a pilot study that included several interviews and site visits showed that this would only identify innovation based on current conditions and would not give enough explanation concerning the long-term view of the forces that drove or determined innovation. The interviews did confirm however that interpretation was considered to be the area in which most innovative activity had occurred, followed by organisational change, at each of the heritage attractions included in this phase of the research.

The necessity of seeing the long-term view was paramount if small and incremental innovations were to be identified and the pilot study informed the choice of a new research plan based on a single case study over a prolonged period. The criteria for the choice of case study were identified following analysis of the data collected in the pilot study. It should:

- cover a long period in order to see the effects of the external environment on decisions to innovate and to understand their drivers and determinants;
- be an attraction with a well documented history where it was possible to find voices other than those provided through explicit, authenticated sources in order to gain as full a contemporary view of the place as possible;
- have iconic status, where the core heritage attribute motivated people to visit rather than a purpose-built attraction, or an attraction which had heritage merit but not enough curiosity value to be viable as a business;
- have shown its ability to be sustainable over several generations;

Port Arthur historic site was identified as possessing all of the above qualities and was chosen as the case study. It has a long and continuous history of heritage tourism from the time it was first available to visitors until the present time. The history of Port Arthur traces periods of economic success and failure and it is possible to identify the events that caused these fluctuations and the innovative activity that was catalysed by them or undertaken in order to precipitate them. It is also a significant heritage site,
which has recently been placed on the World Heritage List; the values associated with the listing are included as Appendix 2. The history of tourism at Port Arthur has been well documented and widely discussed by a range of different voices, aided by the controversial nature of the site which has elicited some emotional and heated opinions, amongst others, providing a wealth of information about social attitudes, perceptions and values at different times.

The focus of interpretation at Port Arthur has shifted over time as it represents different versions of the past to meet the expectations of new generations of audiences and engage them on their own terms. To accomplish this, different methods of interpretation have been used including those that are constant, such as guided tours, and others that are novel such as enactments and artworks as well as the traditional use of museums and interpretation centres. How access has changed over time along with the shifting demographic profile of the audience and the type of competition that exists can be traced over the prolonged period of the case study.

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE

Port Arthur is a historic site, situated on the remote Tasman Peninsula in southern Tasmania, the island state of Australia. It is surrounded on three sides by the Southern Ocean and linked to the mainland by two narrow isthmuses. Between 1830 and 1877 it was used as a British colonial penal settlement, where nature rather than walls marked its perimeter. Today, Port Arthur is an iconic attraction with strong ties to the local identity as well as to the wider colonial history of Australia (Richards & Wilson, 2006).

Until 1853 Tasmania, then called Van Diemen’s Land, was in entirety a penal colony to which convicts were transported from the British Empire. On arrival they became part of the Assignment System that provided convict labour to free settlers who supplied their food and clothing in return. The majority of convicts who were transported, until the system ended in 1839, worked on the land or on Government projects (Tuffin 2005a). Port Arthur was a place of secondary punishment for those who committed crimes after arriving in the colony. This changed with the introduction of the Probation System which worked on the principle that both reform and punishment could be achieved by a regime of hard labour, religious instruction, education and separate
confinement, meaning that all convicts transported to Van Diemen’s Land after 1839 served the first part of their sentence at Port Arthur (Sprod 2005). The penal settlement reached its zenith in 1846 with 1200 convicts imprisoned (Tuffin 2005b), and in 1850 the Separate (or Model) Prison was built. Following the cessation of convict transportation in 1853 the Probation System ceased and the number of convicts at Port Arthur began to decline until, by 1870, they numbered only 500 increasingly frail and aged men. The abandonment of Port Arthur as a penal settlement was advocated and by September 1877 the prison finally closed. In 1996 Port Arthur experienced a traumatic event, when 35 people were murdered at, or near, the site by a lone gunman.

As a historic site with a contentious history, Port Arthur’s heritage values have constantly been an issue of debate. The values associated with Port Arthur have changed along with contemporary attitudes to punishment and reform; conservation and preservation; and whether the site represents a discrete historic period or covers its entire history including the pre and post convict eras. These tensions encapsulate the issues identified in the literature review and traced through the study that follows. In Australia, Port Arthur is considered as a premier heritage site (sometimes as ‘the’ premier heritage site), on state, national, and now with World Heritage Listing, international scales.

IDENTIFYING INNOVATION AT HERITAGE ATTRACTIONS

To identify how the site had been interpreted through time a number of historic sources were used. These included official government documents and reports that provided information about research and strategy formation at Port Arthur. Newspapers provided a social commentary by stakeholders who remarked on events and their effects, especially in the letters pages, making this a primary rather than secondary source of data for this study. Text and visual images provided information about the use of the site and points of interest over time as well as providing documentary evidence of changes wrought by events which occurred in the physical geographic location. As the case study period ends only 16 years ago, it was also possible to gain information through personal communications with people involved at the site during the later years covered by the study.
SOURCES

The sources used primarily came from three collections, the archives of the State Library of Tasmania, the archive at Port Arthur Historic Site, and the Rare Books collection at the University of Tasmania Library. The contents of these collections are explained in more detail below:

THE TASMANIAN ARCHIVE AND HERITAGE OFFICE (TAHO)

TAHO contains both the Archives Office of Tasmania and the Heritage Collections of the State Library of Tasmania. The archives comprise information about policy, regulations and recordkeeping for State and local government. The pertinent records for this study comprised primary source materials including the original working documents and correspondence of those organisations that were, at different times, tasked with managing the Port Arthur Historic Site until 1987. After 1987, the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority (PAHSMA) was formed, and they archived the majority of their own records, as explained below. The files of the National Parks and Wildlife Service during the 1970s and 1980s, during the development of the Port Arthur draft management plans and the tenure of the Port Arthur Conservation Project were of particular interest. The files contained correspondence between individuals and government departments and agencies as well as inter and intra-departmental memoranda, notes and letters which worked together to provide a comprehensive view of the issues under discussion during this period. Other archival materials included applications by individuals wishing to provide amenities and activities at Port Arthur and the responses that they received. Some of the information in these files was in the form of notes, hand written onto the original letters as comments or memoranda of action taken.

The other materials held by TAHO included correspondence files for the Scenery Preservation Board, the Port Arthur and Eaglehawk Neck Board and the Tasman Peninsula Board providing evidence of the major concerns at different periods. Other records and types of correspondence were found in several files entitled Miscellaneous Scrapbooks and included suggestions from private individuals as to how the site could be better managed; marketing materials which included printed brochures and pamphlets as well as newspaper cuttings; and the records acquired by William Radcliffe.
for his museum at Port Arthur in 1938, including the *Notes for a guide at Port Arthur by W. Radcliffe* (Radcliffe 1938b), written to Emmett who was head of the Tasmanian Government Tourist Bureau at the time.

Several series of scrapbooks containing newspaper cuttings and publications relating to Tasmanian Tourist Attractions compiled from daily Tasmanian newspapers between 1903 and 1964 were also of use. They not only show how Port Arthur was promoted as part of a Tasmanian tourism product, but also provided background information about the type of competition which was prevalent; the types of tourists who were visiting Port Arthur; and how Port Arthur was regarded as a tourist attraction including whether it was promoted as a heritage site or a place of scenic beauty for recreational activities.

Newspapers on microfiche were another source of data held by TAHO, these were supplemented by the Trove website from late 2009, which was used in parallel as it provided access to electronic versions of several Tasmanian newspapers and was a useful search engine. As mentioned briefly above, in this study newspapers were a primary source. They were referenced for the social commentary, reported mainly via the letters pages, or as accounts by columnists who wrote about events that held importance for contemporary society. The social commentary emitted from the letters pages was vocal and often emotional as heated discussion took place on several occasions about the state of Port Arthur, the events that occurred there, or about what would happen to the place. Photographs and images were also available in the TAHO collection. Images included photographs taken by tourists of friends and family experiencing Port Arthur, as well as professionally produced images used for marketing, including lantern slides used for promotional tours.

**PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE RESOURCE LIBRARY**

The Port Arthur Historic Site Resource Library houses a collection of current and archival records. It was initially started during the Port Arthur Conservation Project (1979 – 1986) when information generated included photographs, slides, plans and other data related to the conservation ethos of the Project. For this study the resource

---

7 Trove is the digitised collection of newspapers and other text resources held by the National Library of Australia and available on-line since late 2009.
centre provided a combination of primary and secondary sources such as recent historic records, many of which related to marketing since 1987. Records included brochures and information pamphlets produced by Port Arthur since 1987, plus other marketing material and media releases. Other materials included marketing plans, conservation plans and interpretation plans in draft form and market research information dating from the 1980s and 1990s. Some primary sources included historic records dating to the early 20th century such as letters from people who had stayed at Port Arthur on holiday and postcards that had been sent from Port Arthur.

Other resources included a collection of video footage (not yet catalogued). The earliest dated from 1932 when the film maker responsible for making the 1926 version of For the Term of His Natural Life, returned to Port Arthur to make a promotional film called The Ghosts of Port Arthur. Other promotional films dating mainly to the 1950s were useful in identifying the type of tourist and the type of experience they expected on a visit to Port Arthur. The Resource Centre at Port Arthur also provided access to the collections of artefacts, including plans and souvenirs such as decorative plates and cups, bookmarks, brochures and other items for sale to tourists as a tangible reminder of their tourist experience at different times.

UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA LIBRARY RARE BOOKS COLLECTION

The rare books collection provided a collection of early guidebooks, including those of Thomas Henry that gave an impression of Port Arthur as the first visitors would have found it. Early editions of the books written by David Burns (1842) and Anthony Trollope (1871) were also available in the Library.

OTHER SOURCES OF DATA COLLECTION

As the case study includes relatively recent periods, until the early 1990s it was possible to talk to people who had been involved in the design, interpretation, marketing and management of Port Arthur in recent years, as well as those who were involved in crisis management following the massacre in 1996. There were several accounts of the massacre and its aftermath including journal articles, newspaper commentary and television documentaries. It was possible to discern the underlying attitudes about Port
Arthur and what it would now represent, as well as the growing disparity between stakeholders and management of the site.

ANALYSIS

The initial research plan, as mentioned earlier, was to compare several contemporary case studies, but this changed reasonably early into the research once it became evident that in order to identify patterns of innovation and its drivers, it would be more effective to conduct a historic review of a single site.

A timeline was created through a process of historic research that drew data from a range of sources. The timeline was a useful analytic tool that drew disjointed data together to enable a broad view of different events on global, national, state and local scales and suggested possible cause and effect of changes at Port Arthur. The timeline was used to create the list of interpretive triggers (Appendix 3), which again provided a tool for identifying which innovative activity might have been stimulated by events which led to changes in demand.

As data were collected it was stored using NVivo 8 software. NVivo 8 was used to manage the data and to separate it by theme. This produced a chronological record which made it possible to identify patterns of change in each theme area over time and meant the broad narrative could was broken into its component parts. The themes included concepts; consumption; heritage resources; history; innovation; change management; determinants of innovation; meaning; tourism operations; and the business of tourism, the extended version of this list, including the sub-themes under each heading is found in Appendix 4.

CONCLUSION

Separating the case study into three adjacent phases facilitated data collection and analysis over the prolonged period. It also provided an understanding about how events and decisions taken in one phase might affect conditions during the next phase (Langley 1999). Each of the phases corresponded with changes in social attitude due to external events that had a profound effect on contemporary perceptions of the past and its
representation in the present, which suggested that external events became catalysts for innovation at heritage attractions. The types of innovation that were implemented and the forces that drove and determined their shape is described in the following chapters.
CHAPTER FOUR: 
TOURISM ORIGINS AT PORT ARTHUR

THE PRE-DEVELOPMENT PHASE

This chapter begins by providing a brief contextual history of the economic conditions that prevailed in Tasmania during the late 1860s and 1870s to provide some background to the circumstances in which tourism began to develop at Port Arthur. Context is also presented through those narratives which were available in the public domain prior to the closure of the penal settlement; providing a picture of attitudes and sentiments associated with Port Arthur in the years just before the penal settlement closed. Many of the narratives were instrumental in encouraging tourism, which occurred as soon as the opportunity was available, when Hobart-based entrepreneurs, recognising the potential of the place, began to organize day trips. A section follows this on the first seven years of development, prior to the destruction of the buildings at Port Arthur. A level of uncertainty prevailed during these years as to what would happen to the site, as it appeared most likely that the ex-prison buildings would be auctioned as building materials meaning that the tangible infrastructure would no longer exist. The aim of this chapter is help the reader to understand the social attitudes which were prevalent during the years immediately before and after the closure of the penal settlement, as well as to give insight into the sources of information to which ordinary people had access.

CONTEXTUAL HISTORY

Between 1869 and 1879, attitudes towards Port Arthur shifted, partly in response to the burden of debt that was associated with maintaining it during a time of economic depression in Tasmania (Felmingham 2006). During the 1850s Tasmania had prospered due to its exports of wool and wheat and through the loosening of Britain’s financial controls following self-government in 1855. During the 1860s, the situation changed as inflation rose due to lack of demand for Tasmanian products from both the export and
local markets. Financial hardships in Britain and war in America reduced demand from international markets and the local market was affected by the population exodus to the gold fields of California and Victoria (Maddock & McLean 1984). The result was that wages in Tasmania fell faster than overseas investment to the state (Felmingham 2006; Felton 2006).

Recovery during the 1870s was largely due to the mining and mineral export industry following the discovery of tin, silver-lead ore, copper, coal and gold (Felmingham 2006; Felton 2006; Maddock & McLean 1984). The Tasmanian Government procured loans to invest in infrastructure, including road, rail and telecommunications, as well as supporting mining and mineral exploration and development leading to boom conditions (Felton 2006). During the next ten years the population of Tasmania increased which resulted in more people moving into rural areas to pursue jobs in timber and mining (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2002). The convict era was drawing to a close as their numbers decreased in relation to the expansion of new settlers and the number of free settlers overtook the number of those who had arrived in Tasmania as convicts (Robson 1983).

The buildings that had formed the penal settlement, which closed in 1877, had simply been abandoned. Until 1884, when the first of the bushfires which were to cause ruination occurred, the built infrastructure of Port Arthur was complete except for the few buildings which had been sold as building materials and removed. Apart from the effects of nature, the damage that was inflicted on the place during this time was due to neglect and lack of maintenance or purposeful destruction by those who wished to obliterate the tangible memories of the past. The complete buildings had none of the romanticism of the ruins they were to become. Instead they were a stark reminder of a system and a history that many wished to forget.

The first visitors were not heritage tourists, they were contemporary visitors, cognisant of the convict era and familiar with the social mores of their time which precluded those with convict antecedents from being accepted in society (Young 1996b). The earliest settlers in Port Arthur, which was called Carnarvon after 1877 (Weidenhofer 1990; Young 1996a), were engaged primarily in farming and fishing. By 1880 there were approximately 80 residents living in what had been the penal settlement (Weidenhofer 1990), albeit in the houses and other residential buildings originally built for the officers
and non-military personnel who had been employed at the site, rather than in any of the prison buildings.

THE PRE-TOURISM IMAGE MAKERS

Two accounts, which have been valued for their contemporary knowledge, are those by David Burns (1842) and Anthony Trollope (1875), both of whom gave first-hand narratives about their visits, at different periods during the history of the penal settlement. Both of their books provide an indication of contemporary attitudes evident in their use of language and points of emphasis. The images of Port Arthur that were drawn from these accounts provoked the public imagination and provided easily accessible information about the penal settlement and what occurred there. The two accounts provide a distinction between a British and a Tasmanian/Australian history which emerged from the 1860s, becoming part of the external structuring of the heritage story of Port Arthur.

TROLLOPE, BURNS AND OTHERS

David Burns was a colonist who arrived in Tasmania at the age of 27 and bought land that he farmed at New Norfolk. During his youth, Burns associated with various playwrights and gained some acclaim as an actor and writer. While in England he published a series called ‘Sketches of Van Diemen’s Land’ in the Colonial Magazine. He also published a narrative about the trip to the West Coast of Tasmania undertaken by the Governor, Sir John Franklin and his wife, on which Burns accompanied them (Alexander 2005). Burns visited Port Arthur in 1842. His descriptive and florid writing style and his enthusiasm for the system resulted in an engaging and reader-friendly account that described how life appeared to an observer during the days of the convict settlement. The report was first published as a journal article (Burns, D 1842) and reprinted as a monograph in 1892 (Burns, D 1892). His work has been quoted frequently by other writers, particularly Beattie, a photographer and early collector who owned the original Port Arthur Museum in Hobart (Rimon 2005). He used most of Burns account verbatim in his book Port Arthur, the British settlement in Tasmania: glimpses
of its stirring history compiled from authentic sources by J.W. Beattie (Beattie 1913). When David Burns wrote his account, Tasmania was known as Van Diemen’s Land, it was a British colony, supported by the British Government as the place to which convicts were transported. It enjoyed a level of prosperity as well as being home to a military regiment.

Anthony Trollope, the British novelist, visited 29 years after Burns, in 1871, during the last six years of Port Arthur’s tenure as a penal settlement. His travelling companions were the Premier and the Attorney General (Trollope 1875). Whereas David Burn was a colonist who had been involved in colonial politics, Trollope was an outsider (Knudsen et al. 2008) with no personal connection to the place. He was visiting a colony that had undergone two decades of self-government. When Trollope wrote his account, Tasmania was no longer as prosperous as it had been following the cessation of transportation and was emerging from the economic depression mentioned above (Felmingham 2006). It’s name had been changed from Van Diemen’s Land to Tasmania in 1856 (Newman 2005) as an attempt to distance it from its past history.

The periods in which the men wrote coloured their accounts and experiences. Burns was writing during a time when Port Arthur was still being developed. The innovative Commandant, Captain O’Hara Booth had recently implemented both the railway system and the semaphore system and was in the process of reclaiming land to provide more productive space. Burns would have seen building work being carried out, including the granary, which was later to become the Penitentiary, and the stone hospital buildings which replaced the original wooden ones. The Model Prison would not be built for another five years and the New Barracks seven years after that. At the time of Burns’ visit the settlement had not reached full capacity, although Point Puer, the boys’ prison, reached its peak of 800 boys that year. The penal settlement must have appeared to him as a successful venture contributing economically and socially (due to the presence of an English regiment) to the prosperity of the Colony.

By 1871 when Trollope was writing, the closure of Port Arthur was assured as no convicts had been sent directly from Britain for nearly 20 years, following the cessation of transportation in 1853. Those who were incarcerated at Port Arthur were secondary offenders (Alexander 2005; Beattie 1913; Brand 1990; Young 1996b). With the expansion of gaols elsewhere in Australia it was no longer necessary to send convicts all
the way to Port Arthur incurring additional transport expense. Port Arthur was therefore subject to general attrition, as convicts either served their time and gained freedom, or died while incarcerated. By the 1870s the convict population was increasingly aged and infirm, with very few able bodied men to supply the labour which kept the place reasonably self sufficient (Young 1996b).

In 1842 Burns had recognised that Port Arthur was already an enigma and the focus of much curiosity, immediately separating those who had visited it as being ‘special’ or privileged, when he said:

“much as the colony itself is the wonder of strangers, as much is Port Arthur the source of wonder to the comparatively few colonists who have visited its shores” (Burns, D 1892 p.34).

His enthusiastic first sighting of Port Arthur reflects one of the most striking and commented on contradictions between the place of natural beauty and purpose for which it was used:

“What! this the pandemonium - this the repository of the worst of guilt!’ was the natural exclamation bursting from our lips. Whatever the core, the outside is a goodly and enchanting one” (Burns, D 1892 p.6).

The punishment of men in a place that was aesthetically attractive was a contrast that was constantly commented upon, questioning whether the punishment was exaggerated by being in a place of beauty. Both authors described images of the built infrastructure of Port Arthur. Their readers included many who were migrants from England, and the description of a ‘village’ would be reminiscent of ‘home’, potentially providing an emotional tug to visit and a nostalgic attachment between the ‘old’ and ‘new’ worlds (Lowenthal 1975; Smith, A 1991). Burns notes that he was impressed and surprised by:

“substantial stone buildings, tasteful cottages, extensive factories, luxuriant gardens - all the means and appliances of civilised and social life” (Burns, D 1892 p.35).

Trollope describes Port Arthur as
“having the appearance of a large, well-built, clean village, with various factories, breweries, and the like. There is a church, as I have said, and there are houses enough, both gentle and simple, to take away the appearance of a prison….. There is a long street, with various little nooks and corners, as are to be found in all villages.” (Trollope 1875 p.152).

Burns visited Port Arthur three years after the Probation system had been implemented, which meant all convicts had to undergo periods of separate confinement and hard labour (Sprod 2005). He considered reform and the wonders of religion to be paramount, which he described as

“a place of wonders. Where naught but sin and crime are assumed to exist the seeds of religion and virtue have been carefully planted, and the blossoms of goodliness are seen to germinate. Even the yellow jacket may cover many a repentant and returning heart” (Burns, D 1892 p.24).

His conclusion was that the punishment befitted the crime and was justified:

“the main purposes of its creation were wrought out with consummate skill and great humanity. The discipline is, of necessity, rigidly severe; not a fault - no, not the most trivial - is overlooked; the most anxious, the most searching enquiry ever precedes punishment, and the offender is made to feel that its infliction proceeds from no arbitrary capricious tyranny, but is the inevitable and well-known reward of his own malpractices” (Burns, D 1892 p.31).

The Probation system ceased in 1853 with the end of transportation (Sprod 2005), as mentioned in the previous chapter, and Trollope was more interested in the operational cost of the penal settlement at a time when it was considered a substantial expense, commenting that

“if it were to be continued, I should be tempted to speak loudly in praise of the management of the establishment. But it is doomed to go, and as such is the case, one is disposed to doubt the use of increased expenditure” (Trollope 1875 p.153).

Descriptions of the convicts, whom both men visited and talked to during their visits, were included in their accounts. Images of desperate men ignited the imagination as
escapees were reported in the newspapers and the fear of living amongst ex-convicts was constantly part of Hobart society (Hughes 1986). Burns appeared to be highly suspicious and untrusting of the convicts saying

“... scarcely one open set of features was to be found. To read their eyes, it seemed as though they were speculating the chance of gain or advantage to be hoped from us. Crime and its consequences were fearfully depicted in their visages; and we turned from the disagreeable caricature of humanity with as much disgust as pity and regret.” (Burns, D 1892 p.15).

Trollope held a more cynical view of the conversations he had with the convicts, when they proclaimed their innocence and told him how they yearned for their liberty;

“.. in the evening and far on into the night the premier was engaged in listening to the complaints of convicts. Any man who had anything to say was allowed to say it into the ears of the first minister of the Crown, - but all of course said uselessly” (Trollope 1875 p.152).

The two contemporary social concerns during Trollope’s visit were a fear of the system due to the tyrannical nature of the gaolers, and secondly, a fear of the convicts, should they escape and become bushrangers (Trollope 1875). The fears of living in proximity to the penal settlement excited the local population and the stories and myths were exaggerated. Trollope (1875) forecast that the notion of ‘horror’ would always be associated with Port Arthur, by those who enjoyed the sensation of terror. He suggested that

“... no tidings that are told through the world exaggerate themselves with so much ease as the tidings of horrors. Those who are most shocked at them, women who grow pale at the hearing and almost shriek as the stories are told them, delight to have the stories so told that they may be justified in shrieking.” (Trollope 1875 p.134).

Bushrangers during the nineteenth century were considered by many to symbolise a national sentiment, as anti-heroes, during a time when Australia lacked the military heroes or grand political figures which other countries used to symbolise national characteristics (Ward 1958). In 1870, a notorious but reformed bushranger, Martin
Cash, had published his memoirs (Cash, 1870). Thirty years previously, he had been imprisoned at Port Arthur but had escaped twice and became a bushranger before being recaptured and reformed. Cash was the first bushranger to give an autobiographical account of his escapades. His story, *Martin Cash, The Bushranger of Van Diemen’s Land*, which added to the myth and fantasy associated with bushrangers and with Port Arthur. His book gave graphic detail, including violent acts that he had perpetrated and others he had witnessed. Unsurprisingly, this book was one of the first to criticise the British Commandants who were in charge of the system. By the time he wrote his book, Cash was a retired farmer living on the outskirts of Hobart, highlighting the fact that there was no segregation between those who had been convicts and those who had arrived as settlers (Hughes 1986). To some extent all Tasmanians were treated with a degree of suspicion for years after the end of transportation, as to whether they or their relations had arrived as convicts (Hughes 1986).

Visitors to Tasmania were also aware that care had to be taken when referring to Tasmanian history:

"I got a warning from a friend who met me in Hobart that it was not 'good form' while in Tasmania to say anything about transportation, as one never knew whose feelings he might be wounding by alluding to the subject, so I took great care to be always on my guard" (Nisbet 1891).

There was some prejudice from those on the mainland against visiting Tasmania. As noted in the *Excursionists Handbook: Guide to Tasmania 1879*

“...A very short visit amongst Tasmanians will do much to disabuse the mind from the absurd prejudices which exist with many, who cannot forget - or disremember, as an Irishman would say - the antecedents of the colony. The people are proverbially hospitable, and there is an entire absence of anything likely to recall the fearful ordeal through which the colony has passed" (Thomas 1879 p.8).

Convicts had not only arrived in Tasmania, but had also been incarcerated on the mainland, particularly in Sydney. Trollope attempted to explain why, because Tasmania is an island, attitudes towards convicts were different from those of other places. Convicts in New South Wales, he explained, were not hemmed in by the sea and had
‘wandered away wither they would’ (Trollope 1875 p.143), presumably mixing with settlers who were the majority. Whereas, in Tasmania, “the records are recent, fresh and ever present” (Trollope 1875 p.143).

“It is not only that men and women in Tasmania do not choose to herd with convicts, but that they are on their guard lest it might be supposed that their own existence in the island might be traced back to the career of some criminal relative” (Trollope 1875, p. 144).

Metaphorical olfactory descriptions were a literary fashion at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, attributed to the division between social classes. It was expected that convicts, like prostitutes, Jews, servants, homosexuals, sailors, hospital patients, vagabonds and tramps, would be separated from the ‘respectable’ middle classes (Dann & Jacobsen 2003) and Trollope used this tactic to segregate them. The terminology used by Trollope suggests that convictism is so entrenched that it can be sensed through smell and taste, the most intimate of senses, and cannot be covered up or eradicated. He affirms that “though a new name sweet as a rose has been invented, the odour and flavour have not as yet quite passed away” (Trollope 1875 p.144). Despite attempts to hide history through changing the name of the State, as previously mentioned, so that the ‘convict flavour and the convict odour attached to the old sound might be banished’ (Trollope 1875 p.143), this had not happened. Port Arthur was symbolic of Van Diemen’s Land and its purpose as a place for incarcerating and punishing convicts. For as long as Port Arthur was active as a penal settlement, the history of the colony could not be reconstructed in order to obliterate the past.

Burns and Trollope differed in their predictions about the future of Port Arthur. Perhaps because they visited at different times their forecasts were based on alternate criteria. Burns forecast that:

“here at some future (perchance not very distant) day, when penitentiary and penal settlements have ceased to exist, here in one of the most beautiful bays, with a shore of the purest sand, and waters of pellucid hue, here the Tasmanian steamers will flock with their joyous freightage of water-place visitors, whilst the present settlement, an easy distance off, will eventually resolve itself into
one of the finest and most important naval arsenals - a Plymouth of the South” (Burns, D 1842, p. 14).

Trollope does not foresee a future once Port Arthur is abandoned:

“.. there can hardly, I think, be any other fate for the buildings than that they shall stand till they fall. They will fall into the dust, and men will make unfrequent excursions to visit the strange ruins.” (Trollope 1875 p.153).

As Tasmania sought a new identity following self-government in 1853, a dichotomy arose because the role of heritage in identity is to unify people through images which reveal a past people recognise as their own (Palmer 1998). Tasmanians did not wish to recognise their past or to own it.

The descriptions contained in these narratives are subjective and emotive, they are part of the cultural landscape incorporating the recognisable signs and symbols which different generations have used as a bridge to the past (Whelan 2005). The creation and construction of different signs by succeeding generations illustrates how values and perceptions change over time. Other narratives that described the convict experience, some of which were written before the closure of the settlement, said as much by their silence as in their commentary. Some of these narratives are also explored in the following section, including guidebooks and other publications for tourists.

GUIDEBOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS FOR TOURISTS

Towards the end of the 19th century, Port Arthur was largely omitted from guidebooks, or the subject of convicts was skirted around while the books waxed lyrical about the natural beauty of Tasmania. Some of these books were written before Port Arthur was accessible to tourists, hence those that did mention the Tasman Peninsula did so briefly and others did not mention it at all. Guidebooks were not only sources of information, but were used for marketing with advertisements for hotels and other services. Private individuals or companies, rather than the Government who would later be tasked with promoting Tasmania, produced them. Others were written for emigrants and consequently emphasise the benefits of moving to Van Diemen’s Land permanently. As long ago as 1823 Godwin’s Emigrant’s Guide to Van Diemen’s Land, more properly
called Tasmania, described what potential emigrants would need in Van Diemen’s Land.

It is also notable that already at this time Tasmania had become a colloquial name for the place. The book described the climate, soil and productions, and included an application form for free grants of land (Godwin 1823). Information contained the cost of employing convicts, their weekly allowance of food and their annual cost of clothing (Godwin 1823) as the ability to employ inexpensive convict servants or labourers, through the Assignment System was a bonus for those planning to settle in Van Diemen’s Land.

In contrast, the main characters mentioned in the guidebooks of the late 19th century are not the convicts, but those who were in charge of the system. The Commandants and Officers, who worked at Port Arthur, were seen as protagonists of the story. Convicts were not seen as individuals, reinforcing the accounts of Burns and Trollope. An example is Walch’s Tasmanian guide book: a handbook of information for all parts of the colony, published in 1871, before Port Arthur ceased to be used as a penal settlement. It said very little about convicts, only mentioning the cessation of transportation had been celebrated with enthusiastic rejoicings throughout the colony (Walch, 1871). This book put the blame for transportation firmly onto the shoulders of Governor Denison in 1847, and gave an inkling as to the public sentiment, when it says that

“he brought to the support of the obnoxious transportation system an unusual amount of determination and fixity of purpose, and resolutely resisted the efforts of the colony to shake off the detested burden” (Walch 1871 p.20).

Henry Thomas (1879) was more forthcoming in the first of his series of guidebooks to Tasmania, called Guide to Excursionists: between Australia and Tasmania. David Young (1996) suggests that this was because he was not a Tasmanian (Young 1996b) and therefore gave an outsider’s viewpoint without the burden of shame which Tasmanians’ felt about their convict population. This guidebook was published only two years after the closure of Port Arthur and not enough time had passed for Tasmanians to feel comfortable in telling the story that was very much within living memory. Thomas (1879) described the places that convicts had been involved in building, which did not only include the prison at Port Arthur, but other places scattered about the island:
“The whole of the road along which we have come was made by convicts: relics still remaining at several spots where the old prisoners' camp stood. Ruined walls of stone or of sods; some with the roof still remaining, and showing traces of courtyards, cells, &c., but all abandoned.” (Thomas 1879 p.38).

The Thomas guides were amended and republished frequently until 1885. In his 1879 edition, Thomas includes a small section about the Tasman Peninsula in which,

“Besides the connection which this portion of the island has with the history of the early days of the colony through the presence of the great gaols and model prison at Port Arthur, the peninsula affords much enjoyment to the tourist” (Thomas 1879, p. 113).

In 1879, shortly after the closure of the penal settlement at Port Arthur, Thomas Just (1879) compiled a book about Tasmania especially for the Sydney International Exhibition. He sums up Tasmania’s history succinctly, describing it as ’maximus in minimus‘ (the greatest in the least) (Just 1879). He is dismissive about Tasmanian history when he says “nothing of unusual import has marked the fluctuations incident to a new colony so far from the parent country as this little portion of Australia.” (Just 1879).

During the late nineteenth century not enough time had passed for Tasmanians to feel comfortable in their history. Their stories had not yet become mythologised but were still very real. As will be seen in later sections, Tasmanians were reluctant to manage their image for tourists; they were too busy being shameful about the past to consider the opportunities which tourism could offer for the future at this stage. A time lag was needed before they could stand at a temporal distance and view the past with the benefit of hindsight.

AN UNOFFICIAL HISTORY OF PORT ARTHUR

In the late 19th century gothic-romanticism was a popular literary genre which aimed to create a feeling of foreboding and suspense by provoking the imagination and conveying the atmosphere of evil and brooding terror (Hume 1969), which resulted in arousing fantasy (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982, Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). This type
of novel was in line with Trollope’s previously mentioned observations about the appeal of terror and fear as a response to stories about convicts. A fictional account of convict experiences, which was popular at the time, was a novel by Marcus Clarke entitled *For the Term of His Natural Life*. This story triggered the imaginations of prospective visitors to Port Arthur for many years, first as a book, and later as a stage play and film. Until the late 1920s the story appeared to be the unofficial ‘history’ of Port Arthur.

Originally called *For His Natural Life*, the book was serialised in the *Australian Journal* (1870-1872) before being published in 1874 as a novel. It tells the fictional tale of a tragic hero called Rufus Dawes and links a doomed romance with the horror of violent and shocking events, many of which were based on real occurrences or people. For example, Alexander Pearce, an escaped convict who turned to cannibalism, is personified as a character called Gabbett. The book has a sad and melancholy ending invoking an emotional and psychological response in the reader. At the time the book was published Port Arthur was still in use as a gaol, and although transportation had ceased two decades previously, it was still within living memory.

**NEWSPAPERS AND SOCIAL COMMENTARY**

During the latter half of the 19th century, newspapers were the forum for discussion between members of the general public about the problem of what would become of Port Arthur when it ceased to be a penal settlement, and the new government of Tasmania became responsible for both maintenance and economic upkeep:

“... once the completeness of the whole settlement came to be more and more comprehended the question naturally arose, what is to be done with Port Arthur? Now that the Imperial provision for its maintenance is to be withdrawn, the establishment cannot be abandoned. It must be turned to some useful account.” (Mercury 1869, p. 5: 7 October).

Cessation of transportation and the reduction in the numbers of convicts (Weidenhofer 1990; Young 1996b) was exacerbated by the withdrawal of funding once Tasmania had achieved a level of self government in 1855 (Petrow 2005). Many of those convicts remaining were too old for productive work, becoming a cost burden rather than an
asset to the system. Debate arose between those concerned about moving them to Hobart gaol because it was less secure, although cheaper to maintain; and those who pointed out that the convicts still incarcerated at Port Arthur were broken-spirited and pathetic, and therefore no longer a threat. The economic argument prevailed and eventually plans were made to move the remaining convicts to Hobart.

Newspaper discussions about Port Arthur during the late 1860s and 1870s continued to augment the story with snippets of information and innuendo as different commentators added their ideas, knowledge and opinions. An air of mystery and foreboding was encouraged by the tone of those who gained access and reported their experience in the newspapers,

“Sad indeed are the records of Tasman’s Peninsula, and perhaps the saddest have never been told; it is a fine field for a gloomy imagination to nurture itself upon” (Mercury 1877i, p. 2: 24 February).

The fact that the buildings were falling down (Mercury 1876: 25 July), linked to the threat of demolition when the site was sold for building materials, increased the perceived urgency for potential visitors to seek access to see the place (Mercury 1877k: 27 February). Consequently, whenever the opportunity was available to visit Port Arthur those with the financial means to do so, became tourists, even taking advantage of travelling with the ‘lunatics and paupers’ who were barracked at Port Arthur for lack of anywhere else to put them in 1876 (Mercury 1876: 25 July).

Several suggestions were made for the future use of Port Arthur, including as a central depository for the incarceration of convicts, the support of the destitute, and for the hospitalisation of invalids. An alternative suggestion was as a naval depot for “the rendezvous and refitting of Her Majesty’s ships of war, cruising in the Australian and Indian seas’ (Mercury 1869, p. 2: 19 October). The rationale was that as a naval depot for the British navy, it would be economic and convenient should the defence of Australia (as a British colony) be necessary.

A third suggestion was that Port Arthur should be used as a health resort, aimed at attracting those whose health had been adversely affected by living in tropical climates elsewhere in the British Empire. The Mercury reported that:
“as a sanitarium, no site more eligible could be selected. The freshness and purity of the air; the beautiful scenery which is one of the main features of the district; well adapt it to the uses of those who seek renewed health under any circumstances of exhaustion or sickness” (Mercury 1869, p. 2: 19 October).

A more prescient suggestion came in a lecture entitled “Tasmania, Past and Present”, by Sir Charles du Cane, a former Governor of Tasmania, who predicted that:

"If it were but in England, I could fancy an enterprising hotel Company at once pouncing upon the settlement and converting the huge Penitentiary into a vast hotel, with all modern appliances and comforts. I could fancy railway trains and daily steamers bringing crowds of excursionists. I could fancy the shores of the harbour covered with lodging-houses and bathing machines and the Harbour itself dotted with yachts and pleasure boats.” (du Cane 1877).

The debate about what to do with Port Arthur was particularly active in the late 1860s and 1870s as the Tasmanian Government was largely responsible for funding the gaol and its upkeep. The choice the Government faced was between using the substantial buildings for another purpose or selling them to the highest buyer with the proviso that they be removed from the site, effectively demolishing the remains of a system which Tasmanians felt was not a part of their history, but that of Britain’s. The outcome was that very few people had the means of purchasing and removing the stone buildings from Port Arthur and consequently the question again centred on how they could best be used if they were to remain. At this point, tourism was on the brink of becoming the primary industry for Port Arthur as will be considered below.

THE END OF AN ERA AT PORT ARTHUR

By 1876 Tasmania was again prosperous with a healthy export trade, growing population and the beginnings of an interest in Federation with the other Australian states (Felmingham 2006). Port Arthur was less relevant to those who were either new settlers or who had been children when transportation had ceased twenty years before. There were calls for breaking it up and erasing “it’s sad history from our memories, and to remove the plague spot that disfigures fair Tasmania” (Mercury 1876, p. 2: 25 July).
In early 1877 the penal settlement at Port Arthur was no longer self-sufficient as it had been during the time of full occupation. It was increasingly in disrepair because, according to the station officer: “We have had neither a bricklayer nor a carpenter here for the last eighteen months, and we are powerless to arrest the dilapidation that is constantly going on” (Mercury 1877j, p. 2: 25 February). By then there were only a few prisoners left and the warders and overseers vastly outnumbered the convicts. A journalist who visited the almost deserted site in February 1877 commented that the place “speaks of nothing but departed greatness” (Mercury 1877j, p. 2: 25 February). He predicts that within a few years Port Arthur will have crumbled away and the great settlement will be nothing but a memory (Mercury 1877j: 25 February).

In April 1877 the majority of those incarcerated or living as prisoners, paupers or lunatics were moved from Port Arthur to Hobart; 23 paupers were sent to the Cascades Invalid Depot and 47 prisoners to Hobart gaol (Examiner 1877: 19 April; Mercury 1877d; Weidenhofer 1990: 18 April). Their arrival in Hobart aroused public curiosity and a large crowd assembled ‘to witness the landing of the steamer’s living freight” (Weidenhofer 1990, p. 2: 18 April). A posse of the city police kept onlookers away from the wharf (Mercury 1877f: 20 April; Weidenhofer 1990: 18 April). Only the Commandant, a few officers and eight or nine short sentence convicts remained at the site to close it down and remove Government property (Weidenhofer 1990: 18 April).

By September 1877, the buildings were completely deserted. They were looked after by the caretaker, a Mr Evendon, until they could be auctioned in December 1877.

“With the total abandonment of the Penal Settlement at Port Arthur, which has now been accomplished, has passed away the last stain which remained upon Tasmania from the days when she was too well-known among most classes in England as Van Diemen’s Land” (The Tasmanian Mail 1877, p. 2: 22 September).

Port Arthur’s raison d’etre as a penal settlement was over and it’s perceived value to the Tasmanian population negligible. It appeared that the decision to sell the buildings was in the interests of saving money as the Government did not wish to have to maintain or conserve them for no apparent purpose (Mercury 1877b: 28 December). The economic value of the bricks and mortar was considered to be higher than any historic or sentimental value. It was not a history which the people of Tasmania wished
to promote or even remember and consequently many of the lots to be auctioned stipulated that the materials had to be removed from the site (Mercury 1877b: 28 December). In the late 1870s Tasmania was enjoying an economic boom and looked forward to a prosperous future, rather than looking back to the past. As Thomas Just predicted “In the future lies the history of Tasmania” (Just 1879, p. 14).

PORT ARTHUR – THE TOURIST ATTRACTION

EXCURSIONS

The first tourist excursions by boat were offered in December 1877, three months after Port Arthur was closed as a penal settlement. Port Arthur was a popular destination either due to its notorious history or because of its novelty value as somewhere new. Competition was from several other excursions which were traditionally organised on public holidays to places such as the New Norfolk Regatta, the Brighton Races and the North-South Cricket match on the Domain (Mercury 1877c: 27 December).

As has already been mentioned, contemporary public knowledge about Port Arthur comprised popular opinion, gleaned from newspaper commentaries, novels, guidebooks, first-hand accounts and rumour. Together these encouraged tourists motivated by curiosity and speculation to visit and for days before the first departure the excursion became the “all absorbing topic” (Mercury 1877e, p. 3: 27 December).

The Port Arthur excursion was very popular, which was affirmed by the crowds of people who wished to join the few that were arranged (Mercury 1877e: 27 December). The first groups of tourists to visit Port Arthur is likely to have comprised a mix of older generation visitors who remembered the penal colony and the arrival of convicts prior to 1853, as well as a younger cohort who had no direct memory of convicts arriving. All would have had direct knowledge of ex-convicts who had gained freedom and settled in Tasmania, and who comprised a large proportion of the general population.

There was no tourism infrastructure at Port Arthur at this time and services were provided on board the boat. The overall experience was from Hobart back to Hobart, including the boat trip, and seasickness, as well as exploring the destination (Mercury 1877e: 27 December). On some trips the problem of landing such great numbers of
visitors convinced many to stay on board, hence suggesting that the experience of the excursion as a whole, rather than the visit to Port Arthur, in particular, was the attraction:

“The majority of the passengers preferred remaining on board the steamer rather than risk their limbs for the doubtful advantage of getting ashore”
(Mercury 1884b, p. 3: 27 December)

The visitor experience was tinged with urgency once the Government advertised the sale of some buildings on the historic site, to be dismantled and removed as building materials (Mercury 1877b: 28 December). Those who wished to see the place in entirety had only a short window of opportunity to do so. The only way to access the site was by boat and the frequency of boats chartered for pleasure trips was a limiting factor. The potential popularity of the trips was evident in the numbers who attempted to purchase tickets, including their willingness to pay a premium on the original purchase price (Mercury 1884b: 27 December).

The first organised trip was arranged to take potential buyers to view the properties (or building materials) prior to the auction. On Monday 17 December 1877 a two day excursion to Port Arthur at a cost of 15 shillings a head was organised (Mercury 1877g: 10 December). This was advertised as offering time for would be purchasers to ‘make a thorough exploration of the place, admiring its beauties, and inspecting those portions which are shortly to be offered for sale” (Mercury 1877g, p. 2: 10 December). The following day the newspaper commented that a large number of readers had already taken the opportunity of buying tickets and many had organised independent picnic parties (Mercury 1877h: 11 December) giving the impression that the outing would probably be more social than business oriented. About 30 passengers took part in this trip, leaving on the Monday and returning to Hobart two days later. On landing at Port Arthur the excursionists:

“...began to seek out the various sources of amusement which the place afforded. The greater portion of the party were courteously shown over the settlement by Mr Evendon, and had ample opportunities for inspecting the now deserted church, prisons and other buildings on the peninsula. Dead Island,
where the cemetery is situated, was also visited” (Mercury 1877l, p. 2: 20 December).

A second excursion to Port Arthur, was advertised for the following week, on Boxing Day, 26 December 1877, returning the same day (Mercury 1877a: 15 December). The second trip cost 5 shillings a head and was organised by the Widows and Orphans Fund (Mercury 1877a: 15 December). The shorter and less expensive trip attracted a much larger number of people. On 27 December 1877, The Mercury reported that

“The Oddfellows’ trip to Port Arthur in the Southern Cross was the great attraction. Excursions to the now-deserted penal settlement have been very few of late years, and consequently many were desirous of taking this opportunity of seeing the place. As far as numbers were concerned the outing was a success .... there was scarcely room enough on board to turn round. Numbers of people were forced to remain behind” (Mercury 1877c, p. 2: 27 December).

A second report of the trip appeared in The Mercury on the same day that voiced the popularity of the trip and how it had been speculated on and looked forward to:

“For some days previous to the 26th instant, the excursion to Port Arthur had been the all-absorbing topic, and consequently it was predicted that Port Arthur would be the rendezvous of a large number of persons on pleasure bent. The anticipations of the public generally were fully realised, and yesterday morning the Cross was thronged with excursionists, it being estimated that there were not less than 900 passengers .... The steamer left the Franklin Wharf shortly after 8 o’clock a.m., and the passengers enjoyed themselves in speculating upon the probable appearances and associations connected with the now-abandoned convict settlement, and in converse upon the picturesque views afforded by the mountainous skirtings of the River Derwent. ... Here the excursionists occupied the four hours’ stay in various ways” (Mercury 1877e, p. 2: 27 December).

The two trips attracted different types of tourist. The first trip included a tour of the buildings by the caretaker and a visit to Dead Island, the cemetery, at a cost of 15 shillings. These people were interested in the buildings and materials as potential investments, and may be supposed to be wealthier and likely more educated than many on the second trip. The second trip was a one day experience, at a cost of 5
shillings. It attracted a much larger group of people who visited the buildings without a guide and arranged their own activities including picnics and fishing parties.

During the first years that Port Arthur was developing as a tourist destination several trips were organised. Many of the larger excursions took place on public holidays and appear to have been the focus of sensationalism and titillation “curiosity had to be indulged by a peep at the various deserted buildings of the erstwhile convict establishment” (The Tasmanian Mail 1880b, p. 2: 3 January). Tourists expected to be frightened and excited; they were attracted by the anticipation of a thrilling experience:

“the model prison being the centre of attraction, in which place some amusement was caused by two young ladies going into the cells, and the doors being closed, they were made prisoners until some kind friend went in search of Mr Evenden, who had the keys, and thus released them.” (The Tasmanian Mail 1880a, p. 2: 13 November).

Port Arthur’s popularity remained high for visits on public holidays. On Boxing Day, December 1884 several people were disappointed at not being able to purchase tickets for the trip despite offering to pay a premium:

“The limit, so termed, comprised just as many persons as the decks of the vessel would hold, packed sardine fashion, and the comfort afforded existed only in the vivid imaginations of the committee of management. At 9 o’clock the SS Flora left the wharf densely crowded, her departure being witnessed by almost as large a crowd on the wharf, the majority of whom had been disappointed in not obtaining tickets ... were worth a considerable premium on the original price” (Mercury 1884b, p. 2: 27 December).

Pleasure certainly seems to have been the main motivator for visitors taking these excursions, which seem to follow a fairly standard routine,

“Those who did land made straight for the prison buildings which had been opened for the occasion, and very speedily the gloomy chambers were thronged by merry crowds, who peered into dungeons, danced in the mess rooms, shut themselves up in the horrible pens in the convict chapel, stole bibles as relics,
and generally made the most of an unwonted occasion” (Mercury 1884b, p. 2: 27 December).

Throughout the early years of tourism there seems to have been an atmosphere of celebration attached to the ending of the penal settlement that elicited mixed values. The fact that the Government was actively attempting to sell the site and dismantle the built evidence of the past encouraged tourists to help themselves to personal mementoes that were likely to be destroyed in the near future. The State attached an economic value to the site as building materials, but did not, at this stage, seek to preserve or conserve any of the buildings or objects associated with the penal settlement, as they did not value its history.

Not only were the movable objects purloined as mementoes, but those objects which were not specific to the prison buildings, such as gardens and their surrounds were also not appreciated by some people and a telling episode was the level of vandalism which occurred;

“There is one thing, however, that cannot be too strongly reprobated, and that is the wantonness with which the fruit trees and flower shrubs were destroyed, as well as two beautiful oak trees. The recklessness of the culprits should be punished, and it is much to be regretted,” (Mercury 1877e, p. 2: 27 December).

David Young (1996) suggests that those who wished to wipe out the convict stain had inflicted the damage, or perhaps, those who had unhappy memories of being incarcerated at Port Arthur themselves. The fact that any vandalism took place at this time suggests that tourists had no sentiment or nostalgia about the penal era and many in the community wished to eradicate what Port Arthur symbolised from the history of Tasmania. It must be remembered that these were not heritage tourists, but contemporary ones and their destruction was not of history but of their own living memory.

ACCOMMODATION

While there was uncertainty about the future of Port Arthur, it seems that the Government was unwilling to encourage tourism. Doubt concerning the permanence of the buildings and whether they would continue to attract tourists prevented local
investment in Port Arthur. In the early 1880s Mr Whitehouse repeatedly sought permission for a licensed hotel at Norfolk Bay to enhance the scheduled boat service from Hobart which he was supplying at the time. The local council initially refused the license, despite public support:

“At the quarterly licensing meeting at Sorell, the Bench refused Mr Whitehouse’s application for the license for an hotel at Norfolk Bay. Eight tenths of the population of the Peninsula were in favour of a licensed house at that place. Last winter passengers from Carnarvon for Hobart by the steamer Pinafore were obliged, owing to the bad state of the roads, to leave Carnarvon on Monday evening for Norfolk Bay in order to be in time for the steamer leaving there at 8am on the following morning; and, for want of hotel accommodation, several were obliged to sleep in an old dormitory, other buildings there being fully occupied. Norfolk Bay is, moreover, centrally situated for all persons going or coming overland to or from any part of Tasman’s Peninsula.” (The Tasmanian Mail 1883a, p. 2: 24 February).

In late 1883 Mr Whitehouse did eventually manage to gain a licence and the following year, the destruction of the Church at Port Arthur, which will be discussed in the following chapter, provided the permanent attraction needed to encourage investment. Tourism began in earnest and as a tourist destination, Port Arthur moved towards the next stage of development.

**REINVENTING PORT ARTHUR**

Ever since the name of the colony had been changed from Van Diemen’s Land to Tasmania in 1856, those in Government had sought to write a new history for Tasmania. Their aim was to separate the British colony that had been founded for the purpose of transportation from the self-governing colony which incorporated the last of the convicts and which was focussed on becoming a settler colony.

“The coal mines and old Government buildings on Tasman’s Peninsula are the first relics seen of an unhappy period, forever sunk in the limb of the past, a
period which though attached to our history, has no connection with the Tasmania of today” (The Tasmanian Mail 1884b, p. 2: 28 June).

By 1877, when the penal settlement closed, the population felt that the ‘stain’ of convictism could at last be removed from the place.

"With the total abandonment of the Penal Settlement at Port Arthur, which has now been accomplished, has passed away the last stain which remained upon Tasmania from the days when she was too well-known among most classes in England as Van Diemen’s Land” (The Tasmanian Mail 1877: 22 September).

Changing the name of Port Arthur to Carnarvon in 1877 had been an attempt to distance the farming community that was slowly growing, from the penal settlement that it had once been. However, all of the advertisements for excursions referred to Port Arthur rather than Carnarvon, suggesting that the drawing power of the place for tourists rested with its historic past and the identity of the place that was the penal settlement (Weidenhofer 1990).

Despite the interest that Port Arthur held for tourists in the late 1870s and early 1880s the site itself was neglected. The tourists who visited did so by boat, and the destination at Port Arthur was only one part of the overall excursion experience. Although the Government owned many of the buildings, and employed a caretaker to oversee them, there was no maintenance, and slowly the dilapidated buildings began to fall apart. Comments were made about the state of the church, where the ivy was loosen the keystones and the roof needed reshistling (The Tasmanian Mail 1883a: 24 February). The hope expressed was that the buildings might be turned into a resort for visitors from Melbourne “where they would find plenty of game, such as kangaroo, wallaby, duck, and deer on Tasman’s Peninsula, besides a fine harbour for boating and fishing” (The Tasmanian Mail 1883a, p. 2: 20 January), but nothing about convicts.

CONCLUSION

The first tourists to visit Port Arthur were not ‘heritage’ tourists but contemporary ones, with a range of motivations that sought to satisfy their curiosity at the same time as engaging in an exciting and sensational experience. In the early days of tourism the
experience started and ended in Hobart with the visit to Port Arthur being only one aspect of a whole day’s excursion. The tourist experience was participatory as the tourist was physically emplaced and able to use all of their senses to explore their surroundings. The sensory experience was exaggerated by the overwhelming sensation of seasickness and real fear at being shut into the punishment cell and left behind in such an isolated place. The discovery of somewhere new, which was tinged with fantasy having been a place of exclusion for so many years, added to the excitement of the experience. The over subscription of every excursion offered until the mid 1880s, suggests there may also have been an element of status attached to having been to and seen Port Arthur, when others may not have succeeded in buying a ticket.

Prior to the closure of the penal settlement at Port Arthur the discussion in the press about what would happen to the site kept it within the public sphere. Viewpoints ranged between those whose preference was for it to be dismantled to those who recognised the historic values that the place might hold for future generations. For the majority, information about the site was gleaned from comments in newspapers, scant descriptions in guidebooks, eye witness accounts which had been written by social commentators following visits to the penal settlement, and gossip and rumour to fuel expectations. The narratives created visual, textual and imaginative images, exciting rather than confronting the imagination of potential visitors (AlSayyad 2001), but they also had a tendency towards righteousness, explaining why the actions of the colonial power had not only been acceptable but were laudable and justified.

This chapter has considered the years during which the settlement at Port Arthur was dilapidated but the buildings were not yet in ruins. The experience of being amongst the prison buildings might have been confrontational for some and the atmosphere of foreboding emitted by the strength of such solid structures could remind tourists that the prison days were recent rather than ancient history. The time lag which allows the unacceptable present to become the accepted past was still underway.

Access to Port Arthur offered business opportunities for those in Hobart who could provide boats for charter and later offered scheduled services. Although there was a small number of people who had houses in Port Arthur by 1880 the majority were involved in smallholdings rather than tourism. The uncertainty surrounding the prison buildings and whether they would be sold and dismantled did not encourage
investment in tourism infrastructure in Port Arthur in the early days. Although the natural beauty of Port Arthur would later be promoted as the main attraction, there were many other equally as attractive and more accessible places which were being developed at the time suggesting that interest in the buildings at Port Arthur provided a competitive advantage and point of difference for tourists. The next chapter will consider how Port Arthur developed once tourism had become its primary industry.
BACKGROUND

The first phase of tourism innovations at Port Arthur began with the closure of the penal settlement in 1877, as considered in the previous chapter, and continued through the 1880s and 1890s, as entrepreneurial activity drove the growth of a tourism system. This system was dependent on the enterprising spirit of a few creative individuals who developed new services and products, forming a network of tourism operators. The development at this stage was organic rather than planned, as each individual took advantage of the opportunities they identified to create their own business. Innovation during this period was largely due to private operators, many of whom were based in Hobart. These individuals worked together to form a network of tourism suppliers in the production of innovative new products to meet demand from tourism.

THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

Political, cultural, social and technological developments became the drivers of new ideas, products and processes during the late 19th and early 20th centuries; which was a turbulent period including global wars, economic depression and technological advances leading to massive social change. The needs and wants of people created a new market for tourism products that acted as a catalyst for innovation (Bessant & Tidd 2007). Australians began to construct a national identity which encompassed unique Australian attributes and characteristics distinguishing them from their colonial past rather than following the European idea of nationhood (Johnson 1999; Powell, JM 2000). Places of heritage significance had to innovatively interpret their history to meet demand for this new audience.

The late 19th century was a period of social and cultural change as the demographic profile of Australia shifted. By the First World War most Australians were ‘native born’ rather than migrants from Britain. This meant that, increasingly, the majority of the
population knew no other climate, country or customs (Ward 1958) and the traditions which were constructed symbolised ‘Australian-ness’. Following the First World War the population of Australia expanded, from 3.7 million in 1901 to 5.5 million in 1921 (Australian War Memorial 2010). This was mainly due to the arrival of non-British migrants, including men from southern Europe, the Adriatic and the Mediterranean, (Australian Government 2010). The shift from predominantly British migrants to a combination of British and increasingly European migrants had a major effect on how Australians saw themselves which was reflected in the adoption of European traditions (Ang & Stratton 2006). The values attached to Australian history changed as memories of the colonial era faded and places, which reflected that period, lost some of their significance for a contemporary audience that included the newly arrived migrants. Those attractions which symbolised the past had to renew their story to make it relevant for a new audience, many of whom had no direct connection with the history reflected by those historic sites.

By the 1920s tourism was becoming part of the everyday (Franklin 2001). As people had more leisure time and were able to travel further as they took holidays, effectively separating work and home (Hall, CM & Page 1999). The nexus between time and space was altered following the implementation of the telegraph and the telephone, as well as expansion of the road and railway systems. These forms of communication opened Australia up to its expanding population. As homes and living conditions were modernized, Australians began to look forward, shifting away from nostalgic imaginings about the past with its colonial influences to hope for the future and a national awareness.

Another innovative technology which was to change society during the early twentieth century included new forms of media, such as the movie industry and the making of motion pictures (Hall, CM & Page 1999). This technology allowed stories to be told to a global audience. One of the earliest full length, narrative motion pictures to be made was For the Term of His Natural Life, in 1908. This version of the film was produced in Australia and was the dramatization of the book by Marcus Clarke, of the same name. The audience for the story no longer needed to be literate as it was not necessary to read the book to follow the plot. The use of powerful visual images plus the over dramatisation by the silent movie actors was a completely new medium which
appealed to a wide public who may not have previously known about convict Tasmania. As the significance of the actual events at Port Arthur faded, over time, the relevance of the place as the setting for the fictional story and location of the movie grew.

**MATESHIP, DIGGERS, LARRIKINS - CONSTRUCTING NATIONAL IDENTITY**

The renewal of the historic story in the development of heritage leads to a paradigm between the imagined past and the construction of a national narrative which changes the values associated with heritage places. In Australia artists, movie makers, journalists, photographers, academics and historians, as well as those who wielded economic and political power at different points in history (White 1981), changed the national identity by their contemporary portrayal of what it means to be an Australian (Kapferer 1996). Their contemporary images and narratives became the signs and symbols of their generation and the markers of change.

During the period 1877-1920 the perception of convicts shifted from the notion of ‘villain justly punished’ to ‘anti-hero and larrikin’, turning them into the victim of a brutal, bullying system rather than the wrongful perpetrator of misdemeanours. A tradition of mateship spread, though it was prone to political connivance at different times (McLeay 1997; Phillips & Smith 2000; Ward 1958). The characteristics personified by mateship include independence, egalitarianism and confidence (White 1981) underpinned by a commitment to hard work (Harris & Williams 2003). Mateship had also been evident when convicts, working in road gangs, provided support for one another as well as between free settlers who were faced with the harsh environment and depended on each other for help and companionship (Ward 1958).

During the First World War soldiers, colloquially known as ‘diggers’, formed part of the Australian mythscape (Bell 2003). They epitomized the transformation of the Australian bushman into the pioneer soldier and became the focus of heroic tales of bravery; imbuing Australia with self-confidence to imagine a great national future (Tranter & Donoghue 2007). The Australian identity emphasised the importance of physical skills rather than intellectual attainments mixed with egalitarianism and mateship (Tranter & Donoghue 2007). The larrikin was a maverick that rebelled against rules, becoming a popular stereotype for an Australian. In 1885 a newspaper correspondent with the pseudonym of ‘The Waif’ wrote about an evening spent with a group of ‘old hands’ (aka
ex-convicts) who were working as Bushmen, and who might be described as larrikins. He recounted the stories of:

“...floggings and hangings, 14lb leg irons, bullock chains, solitary immuring, marvellous escapades, and diabolical goading’s to mutiny, the triangles, the scaffold, and the cell gave subject and harrowing interest, interlarded as they were with copiously-adjectived [sic] mention of the iron hearted martinets who held autocratic sway and directed the licensed brutality of subordinates”

“...somehow it invariably fell out that the offences for which they were exiled were such as in our later times would hardly merit a magisterial month” (Waif 1885, p. 1s).

A TASMANIAN IDENTITY – BUILDING IMAGES

Tasmanians identified themselves as different from mainland Australians, which Reynolds (2006) argues is manifest in their island status. During the movement towards Federation in the 1890s the nationalist slogan, ‘Australia for the Australians’ was adapted to become ‘Tasmania for the Tasmanians’ (Reynolds 2006), and the support given to the referendum on Federation in 1898 was stimulated by perceived benefits for Tasmania, rather than Australia (Reynolds 2006). The image of Tasmania as part of the national identity was contentious, because the name change had not obliterated the reputation of Van Diemen’s Land. One way in which Tasmanians sought to maintain control of their story was to distance themselves from the events which made Van Diemen’s Land notorious, by pointing out that the current generation was not responsible for the actions of a past generation:

“... it is quite time that the colony was freed from the last vestiges of a system which was got rid of with some trouble, but with the hearty assent of all right thinking persons. Port Arthur, and what happened there, will live long enough in the pages of history, too long, indeed, to be pleasant to ourselves, although the present generation can hardly be held responsible for the deeds of a past one” (Mercury 1889b, p. 2: 11 March)

Twenty-five years later, the temporal divide between colonial Van Diemen’s Land and the Federated Australian nation was still being promulgated. The History of Tasmania,
written in Melbourne in 1915 promised to “...tell in a plain way the true story of the bad old days in Van Diemen’s Land” (Anon 1915a, p. 180).

The penal settlement at Port Arthur had become synonymous with Van Diemen’s Land; hence its notoriety encompassed some events that had occurred in other places. This was particularly so following the filming of *For the Term of His Natural Life* on location at Port Arthur in 1908 (and later in 1926 which will be considered further in the next chapter). This meant the visual images associated with the convict era were those of Port Arthur and the meanings promoted by heritage story were of something that was ‘done’ to, and in, the place by a foreign nation (albeit for much of the time the ‘mother country’ of the colony). Interpretation in guidebooks and newspapers separated the events that occurred in the past from the present. The story was told so that the horrors belonged to Britain, but the physical landscape belonged to Tasmania through its scenic and aesthetic resources.

### FOR THE TERM OF HIS NATURAL LIFE – AN IMAGE CREATED

As discussed in the previous chapter, *For the Term of His Natural Life* was broadly accepted as an unofficial history of Port Arthur confusing reality and fiction to produce the myth. From 1886 the story was dramatized as a play and performed around Australia as well as elsewhere, taking the story of convict life in Van Diemen’s Land to a wide audience (Mercury 1886: 29 April). Several different versions of the play were produced and performed in Hobart and other parts of Australia, as well as internationally.

> “Perhaps no more significant proof of the interest attaching to Mr. Clarke’s work could be adduced than to mention that no fewer than four dramatic companies – three of which are playing different dramatic versions founded on the novel – are on the road” (Evening Post 1886, p. 32: 5 October)

The popularity of this production, the report admits, rests on the familiarity with the plot and the fact that the entire audience had read the book:

> “It must be admitted, however, that any Australian audience would be severely critical upon the drama, for who has not read the work from which it is taken? Last night there were few, if any, of the crowded circle, stalls, pit or gallery, who
had not, and many of them were anxious to let all near to them know they had done so, for on all sides one could hear voices anticipating each movement in the progress of the piece” (Mercury 1889c, p. 3: 16 February).

In the same edition of The Mercury, in February 1889, there was an advertisement for the photographers, Anson Brothers who were selling photographs taken during the convict settlement at Port Arthur. The photographs include both the interior and exterior of the principal buildings and ‘general descriptive scenes’. The heading of the advertisement is ‘His Natural Life and Port Arthur’, linking the novel, play and place together. The fictional story was more acceptable than factual descriptions and provoked the imagination by providing a context which was easy to understand.

“To visitors from the Australian colonies the place is one of special interest, for there are few indeed who have not read Marcus Clarke’s great work, and to visit the spot where such scenes, so graphically described by that author, took place is the ambition of many of them” (Mercury 1889e, p. 1s: 17 March).

Another commentator pointed out that:

“Visitors and residents alike crowd down to wander through the scenes where the hero of “His Natural Life” lived and suffered, and to see how England used to house and treat her prisoners. When such a spot becomes a favourite pleasure resort there can be no other feeling than one of interest” (Benson 1889, p. 3: 16 February).

In December 1909 the film For the Term of His Natural Life was shown in Hobart, where it was enormously popular. It had already played for 150 nights in Sydney and 100 nights in Melbourne (Mercury 1909c: 6 December). It was shown in Hobart for two nights.

“The audience repeatedly applauded very heartily, and at the close of the long animated picture, which throughout was wonderfully distinct and free from blur, the applause was loud and prolonged” (Mercury 1909d, p. 3: 7 December)

The packaging of particular episodes in history is a form of commodification, especially when only one version of the story is provided and the interpretation has been limited to images that satisfy sectoral interests (Waitt 2000). The story of For the Term of His
Natural Life, as mentioned earlier, provided one such version of convict Port Arthur. It also provided the ‘authenticated’ image after the set for one of the plays was designed following a visit to the historic site (Mercury 1886: 29 April). The continuing use of the name of the play in the advertising for various entrepreneurial activities at Port Arthur continued to build a strong connection between the place and the fictional story. This form of packaging and construction of history was in the interests of the business community who invested in tourism at Port Arthur. The interpretation of the history of Port Arthur through the story, play and film was one method of ensuring that it remained relevant for several generations, both as a historic site and as the location associated with the story. The specific portrayal of Port Arthur through this story was a deliberate economic strategy on behalf of those who wished to promote tourism and was a form of position innovation as they sought to attract new audiences. The linkages between place and the images portrayed in the play were used as an argument in favour of preserving the historic buildings, especially while the Government was threatening to auction them for building materials during the 1880s and 1890s.

THE INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

FIRE AND RUINS – A CHANGE IN PLACE AND WHAT IT REPRESENTS

Internal events that affected how Port Arthur was perceived during the late nineteenth century included three severe bushfires. The first, on 28 February 1884 destroyed the Church and those in 1895 and 1897 destroyed the Penitentiary, Hospital and the Model Prison. The report about the first fire in 1884 took four days to reach Hobart due to the remoteness of the Peninsula, when not only were there no serviceable roads, but there was also no daily scheduled boat service. The small community, including all residents, turned out to fight the fire in the Church, testament to the mateship ethos and the tradition of the bushman. News of the 1884 bushfire was received as follows:

“A letter from Carnarvon (Port Arthur), received in town yesterday, reports that the church at that place was destroyed by fire on Thursday last. A man named James McArthur, in the employ of Colonel Garnett had set fire to growth on his master’s land, adjoining the church reserve, and borne thitherward by a strong
N.W. wind, which was blowing at the time, the flames reached the church. The residents on the township immediately turned out, and did all they could to save the building, but without avail, and it was completely gutted” (Mercury 1884a, p. 2: 4 March).

With hindsight it is possible to discern how social attitudes towards Port Arthur began to change following the fire in 1884. The Church, rather than being a bastion of Christian righteousness and morals, became a romantic, ivy clad ruin, creating a visual image which divided the past, as a penal settlement, from the present which was the picturesque folly. The uniqueness associated with having a ‘ruin’ became the point of difference, or the competitive advantage for the place as a tourist destination. The ruin represented history which, despite not being very salubrious, created a narrative to explain the present and to provide gravitas for the story of Tasmania. An English visitor wrote:

"You have a ready way of making ruins in this colony. At home we prefer to conduct a visitor through the crumbling cloisters of some ancient abbey which like the dark ways of the priests who built it, is, if not quite overthrown at least exposed to its inmost recess to the light of day. Nothing less historic than a church battered down by Oliver Cromwell is an accepted ruin. But here, in Port Arthur, is a modern church without a roof with broken fronts, with perished windows, and to complete the picture, with green ivy climbing up its blank and crippled walls. Yes, it is undoubtedly a ruin” (The Tasmanian Mail 1884a, p. 2: 17 May).

As the writer hints, ruins tell stories eliciting an emotional response (Macaulay 1953) which is part of an aesthetic experience (Dewey 1934). The earliest pleasure taken in ruins was inextricably mixed with triumph over enemies, moral judgment, vengeance and the excitements of war (Macaulay 1953). In 1884 the ruined church was symbolic of the end of a system from which Australia sought to be temporally, spatially and politically separated. The ruin of the Church symbolised the absolute end of the previous era. The Church at Port Arthur, although relatively young to be a ruin at 50 years, had history associated with a notorious past, which became a catalyst for myth making. The setting of the ruined church, within the old penal settlement, provided the story and aesthetic sensibilities which changed the visitor experience from one of
sensationalism and titillation, flavoured by horror, to one of romance and aesthetic appreciation. The late nineteenth century was a period during which the Romantic Movement in England was building gothic revival buildings with their connection to medievalism and belief that the pre-industrial age was a golden age (Pevsner 1943). In this light, the ruins of the church at Port Arthur were seen as picturesque, and although a ‘real’ ruin rather than a purpose-built folly, they provided the same aesthetic response in those who visited the place. The Church, as a ruin by fire, was not universally seen as a loss of heritage, but rather a gain, which made the place meaningful and symbolic.

Interpretation of the Church in newspaper and guidebook descriptions had previously centred on its size or the legendary tale of its design by a convict who was consequently given a ticket-of-leave. Following the ruination of the Church, descriptions became more emotive and the values associated with the Church were focussed on the uniqueness of its ruined state and what that represented:

“The picturesque old church, ivy clad, and surrounded by splendid trees, is the only real "ruin" in the colonies” (Mercury 1889d, p. 3: 1 February).

Again a month later:

“...the old Church, with its ivy clad walls, is indeed a ruin not to be found in any of the colonies” (Mercury 1889e, p. 1s: 17 March).

Many of the descriptions of the church describe it as being ‘ivy clad’ or ‘covered in ivy’. Ivy was symbolic of resurrection (Drury 1994) and was representative of the new Tasmania rising from the ashes of the old system. The description of the ivy is a cue for the imagination as it creates a visual and romanticised image of the place, where the harsh stonewalls are softened by time and made aesthetically pleasing by being covered in ivy. It also made a good comparison to the other buildings, before they too were destroyed by fire and describes the aesthetic experience of being in the place:

“the church presents a striking contrast to its near neighbour the Penitentiary. 
One is a ruin, the other a well preserved building; the one, with ivy clinging closely and thickly to stone towers and minarets, is a picture of varied beauty, the other big, dull, monotonous; the one suggests noble aims and aspirations,
In the absence of tangible evidence or forms of explicit knowledge, the construction of a heritage story resulted in mythmaking and provided an opportunity for innovation through the flexible combination of known and imagined pasts. Bell (2003) refers to the temporally and spatially extended realm in which myths are formed, transmitted, negotiated and constantly reconstructed as the mythscape. The ruined Church was tangible evidence of Tasmania’s history, but as a ruin it engaged the imagination and provided a mythscape. Beattie reiterated this point in the 1920s in the foreword to his guidebook, Port Arthur. The British Penal Settlement in Tasmania when he says:

“.. a reliable history, founded on official records, can never be compiled, because the records have all been destroyed, and no one now lives who is in a position to fill the gaps which these missing records have left” (Beattie n.d.)

Further bushfires ruined what was left of the Government buildings at Port Arthur over the following 13 years. The next fire occurred in 1895 and destroyed the model prison, Government House, the Hospital as well as several private houses (Launceston Examiner 1895: 26 January). The reason that so much damage was done during this second fire was because:

“there appeared to be very little hope of saving the principal prison buildings, as all the inhabitants were engaged in endeavouring to save their own property” (Mercury 1895a, p. 3: 26 January).

In 1895 there was uncertainty about who was responsible for looking after the government buildings at Port Arthur. Due to political wrangling, the Penitentiary had been leased to the Town Board of Carnarvon for 99 years for recreation purposes in 1893 but the key was held by the Sub Inspector of Police as the Premier disapproved of the arrangement (Mercury 1898: 4 January). The key was eventually handed to the Town Board in 1897, only a few days before the next, most devastating of the bushfires took place on 31 December 1897 (Mercury 1898: 4 January). The narrative about the last of the fires is given in great detail unlike the reports about the previous fires. Two reports state that the most striking contrast is for those who visited on Boxing Day 1897 and returned just one week later to witness the destruction during the intervening
week, making people feel part of the excitement at the eventual ruination of all of the ex-prison buildings (Launceston Examiner 1898: 4 January; Mercury 1898: 4 January). A boat trip was organized to take passengers to see the destruction, The Launceston Examiner commented that there were “a full compliment (sic) of photographers to get the latest pictures of the buildings of the historic Port Arthur” (Launceston Examiner 1898, p. 5: 4 January). The Mercury commented that:

“the destruction which visited Port Arthur was of a more intelligently merciful kind than which visited another part of the colony, for the buildings destroyed were in the most cases not homes, but places associated in the long ago with crime and human suffering. The fire and tempest had a method in its work, and it was of a merciful kind” (Mercury 1898, p. 3: 4 January).

There was satisfaction that the old buildings had been destroyed along with the associated feelings of shame and horror correlated with the penal system. The term ‘patriot’ (below) points not only to loyalty towards the self governing colony which Tasmania had been since 1855, but also to the fact that during the 1890s Tasmania was instrumental in the discussions about Federation between the Australian states. People were identifying themselves as Australians and were patriotic about their country.

“There are many who will make no concealment of their satisfaction at the destruction of the Penitentiary. On holiday visits to Port Arthur in years gone by you always met the man who ‘would like to put a limited quantity of dynamite or gunpowder’ under the Model and the Penitentiary, and so remove the last trace of the ‘system’ that flourished there 50 years ago. Had the fire and tempest of Friday last been under the immediate direction of one of those patriots a more effectual attempt could not have been made.” (Mercury 1898, p. 3: 4 January)

The separation of the tourists into those motivated to visit for pleasure and those motivated by sightseeing define them by their activities and the sort of gaze they use in constructing their own experience of the event (Urry 1990). The report in The Mercury describes the tourists as follows:

“But let us get ashore with these 600 people who have come from town with the SS Manapouri with the twofold object of pleasure and sightseeing. The pleasure
seekers pure and simple appear to be numerous enough. They are easily distinguishable from the sightseers. They sit on the grass in the shade of a tree – an oak from England or a willow from St. Helens – to feast in the view of the devastation around! The sightseer had “something to eat” on board the steamer, and saved all the time he could for investigation and inspection” (Mercury 1898, p. 3: 4 January)

Although, ten years before, many had argued against the dismantling of the Port Arthur buildings when the Government sought to auction them as building materials, the destruction of the buildings by fire was accepted as inevitable:

“Thus Fate seems determined that Port Arthur should be ‘wiped out’. The name of Carnarvon appears to be an inadequate effacement. People now shake their heads and say that the place is ‘gone!” (Mercury 1898, p. 3: 4 January).

The values associated with the ruins were evidence of an event that was uncontrolled and the denouement of nature, fate was seen as responsible and the fires were accepted as the next episode in the history of Port Arthur. The remains that had been left by those people who had removed buildings as materials and left the foundations behind were considered in a different way:

"I would point out also that where buildings have already been sold and pulled down for the sake of the material, the result cannot be considered satisfactory from the point of view of those who wish to obliterate all relics of the convict system. The buildings, it is true, have been demolished, but the more portable and valuable material only has been taken away. The foundations remain, and together with broken blocks of stone and debris form a far more unsightly spectacle than did the buildings as they originally stood, and, to my mind, more painfully recall the past” (Mercury 1889c, p. 1: 16 February)

A sense of history and myth developed as the ruins came to represent a passed era; the fact that the buildings were irreplaceable was tempered by an understanding that as ruins they symbolised permanency and became a marker of identity (Macaulay 1953). The aesthetic view shifted from harsh reality found in the complete but unused buildings to a romantic imagery. As a memorial to the past and an attraction in the
present, the insecurity and uncertainty about the future was removed because as ruins they had little economic value as building materials.

Twenty years after the last of the fires, on Armistice day in 1918, the day of celebrations and commemoration at the end of the First World War, the author Anna Brennan visited Port Arthur and described it as Australia’s “only bona fide ruin” (Brennan 1918). This tag was adopted by the Tasmanian Tourist Department which reissued her article as a pamphlet, which they headed “Peace at Port Arthur: Australia’s only Bona-fide Ruin” (Ely 1992). Brennan describes Port Arthur as being a “tourist resort built upon a memory” (Brennan 1918):

“...for the most part the walls alone of the buildings, gaunt and skeleton-like stand witness to its past. They stand witness also to the beautiful workmanship, the grace of design, and the excellence of material that went to their making” (Brennan 1918).

She suggests that anyone visiting who did not know the history of the place might at first think they had arrived at an ancient monastic house where the

“...ruined ivy clad churches, the avenue of old trees, would seem most fitly to echo the footfalls of quiet, prayerful monks. Yet in truth the odour of sanctity was not there” (Brennan 1918).

At the end of her article she brings Port Arthur into the contemporary day, where so often the descriptions are of the place in the past and the imaginings are associated with times of punishment and horror. She points to a continuous link between the convict era and the contemporary age when she remarks on the sensory experience of hearing the clock. But on Armistice Day, Port Arthur, like all other places was more interested in the present and the ending of a chapter in global history:

“The little township is taking its evening rest, when suddenly a shot is heard, then another. We know what it means. Here, as elsewhere, throughout the Allied nations, the great news has come. The still spring night breaks into pandemonium. There is no sleep till late that night, and before I close my eyes the old town clock has struck twelve. For eighty years that clock has marked the hours at Port Arthur. For many they must have gone slowly enough in those
The fires became a catalyst for change at Port Arthur as they not only changed the image but also the meanings associated with the place. The destruction of the buildings meant that the past could never be repeated; they would never again be used as a prison or place for interring lunatics or paupers. Those who had invested in property or businesses at Port Arthur had their belief that tourism was to become the main industry of the region confirmed. However, their economic interests rested with their investment rather than the maintenance or preservation of the core heritage attraction.

The discussion concerning the future of Port Arthur during the 1880s shows how different meanings were attributed to the place and the values associated with it. In 1889 the Church was in ruins but the Penitentiary, Model Prison and hospital were still standing. However with no one taking any responsibility for maintenance they were deteriorating badly. By 1889 there was a geographic and mental divide between the township that was becoming popular with visitors and the state of the major government buildings that were left to rot. A series of letters to the newspaper from several Hobart residents, locals and tourists make some salient points about the values associated with tourism, heritage and conservation:

“Whether we like it or not the convict days are part and parcel of the colony’s history, and the pulling down of these buildings can neither alter the fact, nor cause it to be forgotten. In any case, they are the last buildings that need be interfered with, for they do not obtrude themselves offensively on the public gaze. On the contrary, they are so isolated that a special journey must be made to visit them” (Benson 1889, p. 3).

By the end of the decade there was a debate waging between those who believed that Port Arthur should be demolished and those who believed it should be preserved as evidence of the past. The economic value of tourism, not only in Port Arthur, but also in Hobart, was raised as one of the reasons for preservation:
“Hobart itself depends not a little upon visitors, and is interested in developing all the local attractions, of which Port Arthur is unquestionably one of the chief”

(Benson 1889, p. 3)

By 1889 tourism was established and private individuals had an economic stake in the success of Port Arthur. They were cognisant of the competition wrought by other attractions and understood that they needed to maximise their competitive advantages in terms of heritage resources. The points raised were that Port Arthur was a unique point of interest:

“The prison buildings at Port Arthur form the chief attraction in drawing thither tourists. The model prison has made Port Arthur famous, and were there no other sight many would deem it worth their while to take a trip to the Peninsula” (Mercury 1889d, p. 3: 1 February).

A concentration on natural attractions rather than heritage resources would not provide the necessary competitive advantage due to more competition and less convenience:

“Carnarvon has, doubtless, many natural attractions, and may in time become a fashionable watering place; but Tasmania possesses too many beauty spots, more accessible, to make it at all probable that Carnarvon will be, without artificial attractions, for some time to come a favourite seaside resort” (Mercury 1889d, p. 3: 1 February)

As unique attributes, the heritage values of Port Arthur are pointed out:

Where the buildings are situated they do no harm to anyone in any shape or form, and once removed it must be remembered they cannot be replaced

(Mercury 1889e, p. 1s: 17 March);

This author goes as far as suggesting that rather than selling the buildings for a paltry sum, the Government should restore them

I do hope that a very strong effort will be made to retain the buildings in their present position, and that pressure will be brought to bear upon the Government to not only cause them to remain as at present, but to grant a
small sum to enable them to be put in a good state of repair, and so keep them in a good state of preservation. Such relics of the old days as are to be found at Port Arthur are not to be seen in many places at the present time” (Mercury 1889e, p. 1s: 17 March)

On 7 March 1889 a deputation of ‘interested gentlemen’, who included entrepreneurs, businessmen and landowners from Hobart and Carnarvon visited the Minister of Lands in an attempt to persuade him to withdraw the Penitentiary and Model Prison from sale. These were individual entrepreneurs who had invested in tourism and knew that the main competitive advantage for the area was Port Arthur. They represented an informal network of suppliers who provided accommodation, access and amenities on the Tasman Peninsula.

Mr Whitehouse, the steamboat proprietor, stated that he had taken a great many people to the Peninsula and he recognised that all who were connected with the Peninsula derived a substantial benefit from tourism and he suggested that the Government should lease the buildings to someone who would retain them as a showpiece (Mercury 1889f: 7 March). Mr Cowen owned the hotel and had over 300 guests during the 1889 season, but he questioned whether this would continue if the old buildings were removed (Mercury 1889f: 7 March). He pointed out that there was a multiplier effect for the township, produced by tourists coming to see the prison buildings, and consequently suggested it was worth saving them. Dr. Benjafield mentioned that once the road through Wedge Bay was completed it would become the most direct route to Carnarvon, opening it up to more people and becoming one of the most popular watering places in the island (Mercury 1889f: 7 March). If the Government waited until this happened the buildings would be worth much more than at present.

Mr Walker argued that a large number of visitors went to Port Arthur and if the buildings were removed then people would not visit (Mercury 1889f: 7 March) He thought it a “great mistake to remove old buildings such as these, simply because they reminded them of the past history of the colony”, (Mercury 1889f, p. 3: 7 March). He alluded to the fact that the dramatized version of "His Natural Life" (this was the shortened title given to the play) was being produced at the Theatre Royal night after night without causing anything like ill-feeling in the community. The isolated position of
the buildings at Port Arthur meant that the land was not required for any other purpose so it was senseless to remove them (Mercury 1889f: 7 March). Rather than demolishing the buildings, Mr Lodge suggested that the buildings yielded revenue to the colony in an indirect way and that the expense incurred in maintaining them would be covered by charging a small entrance fee to visitors (Mercury 1889f: 7 March). He went on to argue that the buildings did not only represent the past, but were also evidence of progress:

“...wherever relics of the past had been destroyed universal regret had been expressed, and it would be so if the old buildings at Carnarvon were demolished. if they were allowed to remain visitors to them would simply be looking at things as they once were, and they would then be able to realise the progress that had been made” (Mercury 1889f, p. 3: 7 March).

The Minister of Lands pointed out that many of the deputation were gentlemen of Hobart and not Carnarvon (despite owning property there), and that several residents of Carnarvon had requested he sell the buildings due to their poor state of repair (Mercury 1889f: 7 March). He believed that the majority of residents wished to have the buildings removed and should the Government decide to keep them as a show piece they would cost a large sum of money to repair (Mercury 1889f: 7 March).

“The idea of keeping them as a record of the old days of the colony was repugnant to his feelings as he considered them monuments of disgrace to the British Government. If there was anything good about them then there might be some reason for preserving them, but when he thought of the cruelty and misery that had been practiced and experienced there, he had not the slightest sympathy with those who wished them to remain." (Mercury 1889f, p. 3: 7 March).

The Minister’s original intention was to impose a condition that the buildings would have to be removed following sale, but he changed his mind and decided that the buildings could remain if it suited the purchaser’s purpose. He went on to add that in his opinion Tasmania did not need a show place, “as there was a sufficient attraction in the beautiful scenery available on all sides, and the health-giving climate” (Mercury 1889f, p. 3: 7 March). The agreement to leave the buildings in situ, meant that the
competitive advantages which lay in the historic site and attracted tourists and tourism investment would remain.

The debate continued for several days with letters to the newspapers pointing out that a great deal of money had been spent on improving access and that many individuals had invested money in hotels, jetties and boats, and now the Government was proposing to do away with the only points of interest on the Peninsula (Mercury 1889a: 9 March). In order to maintain the built heritage attraction, the Government would have to invest in preservation; comparisons were made with England where the National Trust had been set up in 1895 to preserve and protect threatened buildings (National Trust 2011) and the conservation ethic was in its infancy:

“While the English Government has lately [sic] been taking a very great interest in the preservation of the landmarks of its ancient history and its historical architecture, even going to the extent of repairing historic castles that are in the hands of private owners, very few States would undertake to retain and keep in a condition of preservation at some annual expense a huge and ugly penitentiary and a so-called model prison, with all their brutal and degrading associations. ... In any case, it must be the place and not the buildings as they would appear in a few years' time, at the present rate of their destruction, that will form any future attraction, and to preserve them would not only necessitate a considerable outlay to repair them, but a caretaker and other expense” (The Tasmanian Mail 1889a, p. 3: 9 March).

On 11 March, 1889, the day before the sale, the commentary in The Mercury swayed towards the Government viewpoint, and once more commented on the dilapidated state of the buildings:

“The old prison buildings at Port Arthur are to be sold tomorrow and by this time, most persons have, we think, reached the conclusion that the sooner they are cleared away the better.... On the other hand, it must be remembered that the buildings themselves are fast going to decay, and in a few years will attract nobody, for they will be ruins without anything to make them worthy of respect, or even of remembrance” (Mercury 1889b, p. 2: 11 March)
The sale of the buildings went ahead, but the result was disappointing for the Government. A Mr Woolnough bought the Model Prison for £630.00, the Penitentiary was passed in as there were no bids over the reserve of £800.00 and Mr Cowan (mentioned earlier as part of the deputation, and who owned the Carnarvon Hotel), spent £13.00 to purchase a row of wooden tenement buildings which stood against the guard house (Mercury 1889g: 13 March). This left the Government as owners of the Penitentiary and responsible for its upkeep.

At the start of 1890, some people still felt that the Government should retain the buildings at Port Arthur, and there was a level of frustration with those which had been bought privately and the perceived short-sightedness of the Tasmanian Government for not managing the ruins more proficiently. As the following, somewhat indignant letter from Mr J. Black of Adelaide explains:

"In these new countries it is the duty of Government to preserve all interesting relics, of which we have so few. That the convict buildings at Port Arthur are exceedingly interesting is proved by the increasing number of travelers [sic] who undertake the journey from Hobart to inspect them, even with the existing difficulties of conveyance. At present the penitentiary is the only building which can be inspected internally, for the Model Prison has been bought by an elderly, and apparently, crusty gentleman from England, who declines to let visitors have the key, and warns them off by notice as trespassers. If money was the object of the Tasmanian Government why did they not retain the prison and charge 1 shilling a head to all the summer visitors who wish to see its curious interior? ... As the number of visitors to Port Arthur annually grows so will the feeling of indignation grow against the vandalism of the Tasmanian Government" (Mercury 1890b, p. 4: 17 January).

TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

In the preceding sections we have seen how attitudes and perceptions about Port Arthur changed during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century’s. Change was largely incremental and organic rather than planned and was a result of both internal and external events that, as has been seen, changed the meanings associated with Port
Arthur and its development. Discussions about the future of the site and the popular story and play of *For the Term of His Natural Life* kept the place in the minds of the contemporary generation.

As mentioned earlier, despite changing its name to Carnarvon in 1880, all tourist excursions advertised their trips as visiting Port Arthur. The name separated tourism and non-tourism interests, as notices pertaining to the town, Government or Council business referred to Carnarvon, whereas all tourism related coverage was for Port Arthur which was re-adopted as the name for the town in 1927, when the importance of tourism was acknowledged and the portrayal of the convict settlement had changed over time.

To reiterate, uncertainty about the future of Port Arthur was manifest in two ways: first, it heightened the urgency to visit by those who wished to observe the place first-hand before it might be demolished. The result was that any trip arranged to visit Port Arthur continued to be heavily oversubscribed (Young 1996b). Second, tourism development began slowly; hampered by uncertainty as no one could predict how popular the place would be without its historic associations and therefore there was an unwillingness to invest. Following the bushfires and the continuing popularity of Port Arthur as a destination, local tourism businesses began to develop which would have been adversely affected had the old prison buildings no longer been the attraction:

“... if the prison is demolished or shut off from inspection, the present annual stream of visitors will be considerably lessened” (Mercury 1889d, p. 3: 1 February).

Prior to the bushfires that would turn them into ruins, the Penitentiary and Model Prison were problematic because of their scale and the potential cost of development. However, people still imagined a future for Port Arthur that would be based on tourism; it was the type of tourism which was in question. Small investments were acceptable for Tasmanian investors but they were less willing to take the risk of turning the larger buildings into tourism ventures. As in the 1860s, mentioned in the last chapter, hopes centred on creating a sanatorium, but this time the proposed occupants were ex-colonial residents from India (The Tasmanian Mail 1883b: 20 January), and again five years later, the same suggestion:
“...this part of the island, if properly developed, would become the Brighton of the Australias. It could be, for example, a sanatorium for Indian officers and others, who would come down there to recruit their decaying or decayed health...” (The Tasmanian Mail 1888b, p. 3: 23 June).

Another suggestion was that investors from Melbourne might take the risk:

“...if the Government would withdraw the reserve of the large buildings from sale, it is then not unlikely that Melbourne speculators would go in for making Carnarvon a pleasure resort for Melbourne visitors” (The Tasmanian Mail 1883a, p. 3: 20 January)

In 1884, many residents of Port Arthur were farmers and not interested in tourism as a primary source of income, with the press reporting “Carnarvon folk do not contemplate with unalloyed satisfaction the irruption [sic] of excursionists in their quiet domain” (Mercury 1884b, p. 3: 27 December). A description of Port Arthur in March 1884 provides a picture of the place at that time. The image is one that suggests that it was quite isolated and self-sufficiency was a requirement for any who wished to live in Port Arthur. The impression is that the place was ‘a resort-in-waiting’:

“It is to be regretted that this charming place is not converted to some use instead of allowing it to remind one of Goldsmith’s ‘Deserted Village’. Port Arthur certainly has charms for some: for instance, Colonel Garrett, who, together with his family, enjoys the summer months in what should be a pleasant resort. The evening before leaving we saw the colonel taking healthy exercise (not on a velocipede, but between the shafts of a wheelbarrow), conveying articles which had arrived from Hobart. Judging from the colonel’s mode of transit, I imagine that every man at Port Arthur is his own horse” (Riggs 1884, p. 3)

These comments were made only a few days after the destruction of the Church at Port Arthur that, over time, had a profound effect on the social perception of Port Arthur as a place, and what it represented; as will be considered in the Discussion chapter.
As mentioned earlier, the innovations which took place at Port Arthur, during the 1880s, were at the inception of individual entrepreneurs who recognised opportunities for enterprise by providing a variety of services for tourism. The tourism system which enabled innovation incorporated a network of suppliers involved with accommodation, access, advertising, amenities, activities, and attractions, all of which are necessary for a tourist destination area (Leiper 2004a).

In the mid 1880s the Church was in ruins, but the Penitentiary, Model Prison and Hospital, as well as many of the other historic buildings were intact. The built infrastructure created an illusion of authenticity (Waitt 2000) enhanced by ex-convicts who returned to Port Arthur to act as guides. The tourist experience which the first visitors underwent was epitomised by ‘Being There’ (Tilden 1957). They were embodied in place where they could understand the scale of the site, the harshness of the buildings and its remoteness. Whether Port Arthur’s authenticity was linked to its history or as its location for the Marcus Clarke story For the Term of His Natural Life, is debatable.

During the late 1870s and early 1880s there was no formal tourism infrastructure in place; day trips were most popular as there was no hotel accommodation which easily serviced Port Arthur until 1883 when the Whitehouse Brothers opened an Inn at Norfolk Bay (Mercury 1883: 5 March), mentioned in the last chapter. By 1885 the Commandant’s House had become the Carnarvon Hotel and by 1887 many owners leased their houses to tourists and a frequent lament was that there was not enough accommodation for all those who wished to visit Carnarvon.

"We are anticipating a great influx of visitors this summer, almost every available house having been let for one or two months... Several other houses are to be built very shortly, so that there will be no lack of accommodation for residents or visitors in the future should the capabilities of our excellent little hotel be over strained” (The Tasmanian Mail 1887, p. 4: 31 December).

By 1893 there was both a hotel and a boarding establishment at Port Arthur, and the climate was being promoted as a main attraction of the place: “the enjoyment of the beautiful scenery, and a health restoring salubrity of climate unequalled in the colonies”
(Mercury 1893, p. 4: 11 November). Opening a temperance hotel at Port Arthur was being actively discussed in December 1893, suggesting that there was enough business to warrant another form of accommodation (Mercury 1893: 28 December).

By 1889, access to Carnarvon had improved in several ways, thanks largely to the increase in tourist numbers and the growth of the resident population:

“You will remember a few years back that the residents were agitating through our late Hon. Member for the expenditure of money on the road from Taranna to Carnarvon, so that those who felt an interest in the history of that little town should have an opportunity to visit it, and the residents at that time had great difficulty in getting from Carnarvon to Taranna. Since then I believe I am correct in saying thousands of pounds have been spent on roads and jetties for the accommodation of Carnarvon visitors and resident” (Mercury 1889a, p. 3: 9 March).

By 1887 passengers were able to take a scheduled boat service to Port Arthur. This service departed from Hobart on Mondays and Thursdays at 08.30am, returning on Tuesdays and Fridays at the same time (Mercury 1887: 6 October). The same advertisement mentioned accommodation, food and beverage and transport to Carnarvon, suggesting that several suppliers were operating together to provide the overall product. By 1889 the boat Pinafore had been replaced by a new vessel which was larger and could accommodate more visitors to the Tasman Peninsula.

“The boat Pinafore has been replaced through the energy and perseverance of Whitehouse Brothers to accommodate visitors and the residents of Tasman’s Peninsula by the Taranna; which is a smart and safe boat” (Mercury 1889a, p. 3: 9 March)

By September 1890 Mr Whitehouse had replaced the boat Taranna with a larger vessel, called the Nubeena (Mercury 1890a: 25 September), suggesting that business was flourishing. The road access to Carnarvon from Taranna had also been greatly improved and a four horse carriage service was offered by Sam and George Wellard, who was described as the most large-hearted and best-informed of any of his competitors (Mercury 1895b: 7 November).
Physical access to Port Arthur in 1893 was further improved with the opening of the Wedge Bay road which meant boats no longer had to go into Norfolk Bay offering a shorter sea journey (Mercury 1893: 11 November). It is also reported in December 1893 that “the public buildings have been renovated, and things generally are of a more reassuring character” (Mercury 1893, p. 3: 28 December), suggesting that the Government had made some expenditure towards halting the deterioration. However, shortly after the bushfire that spread through the Model Prison in 1895, any maintenance seems to have stopped:

“All that remain of that terrible regime are deserted structures of stone, brick and mortar, and these are rapidly passing away. Old Father Time and Dame Nature seem to have united more effectually than usual in hastening the consummation. Everything appertaining to those grim buildings is speedily decaying” (Mercury 1895b, p. 4: 7 November)

Guides, many of whom were ex-convicts, added drama and daring as well as entertainment to the visitor experience, not only through their first-hand knowledge of the system, but also by virtue of their exaggerated interpretation (Weidenhofer 1990). Some earned extra shillings for showing the marks of flogging. Others spent their time manufacturing ‘authentic’ convict artefacts for sale to visitors (Weidenhofer 1990). The last of the convict guides retired in 1910 (Weidenhofer 1990). A visitor to the site in 1895 describes the interpretation as “those kinds of inhumanity to man which are escalated to give the most hardened a shudder to hear recounted by the local “old identity” (Mercury 1895b, p. 4: 7 November).

Those who followed the ex-convicts as guides at Port Arthur were also characters. Alf Mawle, a guide in the early 1900s, was remembered fondly by the author Charles Barrett in 1944 in his book Isle of Mountains, who described him as:

“A delightful old fellow, with a repertoire of quaint sayings and a quaint way of imparting his knowledge to visitors. He seldom took care of his aitches; but he ‘knew his ekker’, as a schoolboy remarked after going the rounds of Port Arthur with Alf. Nothing could stop him, once he had started off with his amusing patter, standing heels together and feet placed in the correct quarter to four o’clock position. Alf was word perfect with each of his pocket histories: one for
the prison building, one for the penitentiary, one for the church – one for every relic on his list” (Barrett 1944).

One writer suggests that although the story by Marcus Clarke tells the history of the site, he would also like to know about the Commandant’s life and society in the settlement, suggesting that interests of some visitors were not wholly on horror, but:

“there is no one left to recount with anything approaching truthfulness the many receptions and gay parties that we know formed part of the life of those who resided within the walls of what is now the Carnarvon Hotel and enjoyed the delightfully sylvan and marine scenery which surrounds it” (Mercury 1895b, p. 4: 7 November)

In April 1888 communication with Hobart and other places was still difficult. There were complaints about the lack of a telephone in Carnarvon, when a young woman met with a mishap:

“and was exceedingly anxious to wire to her friends, but was informed that the Government had not permitted telephone or electric telegraph communication to be extended to Tasman’s Peninsula” (The Tasmanian Mail 1888a, p. 2: 7 April)

But the following year the situation had been resolved:

“... We have also a telephone which is largely patronised by visitors, and the hotels at Taranna and Carnarvon are fairly patronised. We have also a good conveyance running from Taranna to Carnarvon” (Mercury 1889a, p. 3: 9 March).

The historic buildings were not the only attraction at Port Arthur, and other suggestions for excitement included:

“shooting and fishing (sea and rod fishing), boating, golfing and lawn tennis ... Carnarvon, small as it is, not being without a nice little coterie of society people who greatly contribute to make life down there worth living. Indeed, the place boasts of having started the first golf links in the colony, and has at present the only one in the South” (Mercury 1895b, p. 4: 7 November).
By 1896 it was possible to reach Port Arthur by road from Hobart, albeit on substantial lengths of sand roads (Mercury 1896b: 11 April), and special events were arranged to attract visitors:

“The new Town-hall will soon be ready for opening, probably early next month, on which occasion some extra attractions will be offered to the public, and two or more steamers will, no doubt, make a special excursion to celebrate the event” (Mercury 1896a, p. 4: 20 February)

The 1880s and 1890s provided the peak period of tourism activity at Port Arthur during the first wave of development. It was promulgated by individual entrepreneurs seizing the opportunity to create tourism businesses and working together to create a network of tourism suppliers. Innovation lay in the combined efforts of those who invested in tourism and developed a system of services by which Port Arthur could develop as a tourist resort. How Port Arthur was being sold as part of a larger Tasmanian tourism product is the focus of the following section.

TASMANIA PROMOTED

In 1892 Tasmania, along with the other Australian colonies, was in a deep depression (Young 1996b). Promoting Tasmania to an international audience aimed at improving the economic position by encouraging tourism led to the establishment of the Tasmanian Tourist Association in May 1893. Initially an information service, it also included booking facilities, ticket sales and a labour bureau (Tasmania 2006). By 1910, Tasmania was being promoted internationally through Cook and Sons Travellers’ Gazette, to potential tourists from New York, London, Bombay and Melbourne, extending the target market for visitors (Mercury 1910: 25 October).

In 1913 the Tasmanian Tourist Association was replaced by the Tasmanian Government Tourist and Information Bureau, part of the Railway Department (Archives Office of Tasmania 2010). This agency was responsible for advertising and promoting the State in addition to the services that had been offered by the Tourist Association, further managing the images of Tasmania which were used to attract visitors. Most of the attractions advertised were nature-based including national parks and caves (Archives Office of Tasmania 2010). Port Arthur was only one of many places that were suggested as a destination.
A brochure produced in 1913 to promote Tasmania was called *Tasmania for the Tourist*. It contained brief descriptions of places to visit, how to get there and what was available once people arrived. In 1913, many of those who visited were not experienced as tourists and therefore this booklet provided suggestions about how they should pass their time, what they should see and do, as well as brief descriptions of places to visit. By 1913 the recognisable image of Port Arthur was portrayed by the novel and 1908 film of Marcus Clarke’s book *For the Term of His Natural Life*, as described:

"The most famous part of Tasmania, without doubt, is the Peninsula, including as it does the ancient penal establishment of Port Arthur, this locality being made historical by the fascinating story told in the pages of Marcus Clarke’s literary masterpiece as well as other novels" (Tasmanian Government Tourist and Information Bureau 1913).

The description of Port Arthur is very succinct and briefly explains the site as being established in 1830, lasting for 47 years and then lists the names of the buildings before mentioning that the Church was built by convicts, the locations of Point Puer and the Isle of the Dead. Suggestions about how to spend time include taking a guided tour for one shilling per person, or taking a boat to the Isle of the Dead, or alternatively visiting Remarkable Cave, three miles away. The experience incorporated accommodation in the Commandant’s House and amenities such as tennis (Tasmanian Government Tourist and Information Bureau 1913).

**DEGRADATION, DESTRUCTION AND DIFFICULT ACCESS**

In 1905 the ruins at Port Arthur were once again under threat as heritage values competed with economic interests. One correspondent heard that a local inhabitant was to be allowed to build a hotel out of the stone remains of the prison and hospital:

“Destroy the ruins and no one will ever make that long and arduous journey simply to stay at a good hotel, however well managed. ... Is it yet too late for the Government to withdraw its permission, and thus save the one thing that causes visitors from all parts of Australasia [sic] to include Tasman’s Peninsula in their pleasure trips, namely, the historic ruins of the old convict settlement at Port Arthur?” (Mercury 1905, p. 6: 17 February)
By 1908 the tradition of the Boxing Day trip to Port Arthur was established, but despite the popularity of the place for tourists, the deterioration of the buildings was a concern:

“the advance of time and the ravages of fires have left little for the tourist to see. The most favoured of the ‘relics’ was the Church, the approach to which is made through an avenue of English oaks and which has a most rustic appearance. The penitentiary is in a tumble down condition, and the hospital, guardhouse and other structures have but bare walls to remind the visitor of the system and even these no doubt will be completely obliterated by the march of progress” (Mercury 1908, p. 8: 28 December).

The road journey to Port Arthur had improved by 1908 and there was a bi-weekly coach trip from Hobart, plus an additional boat service; the numbers of visitors presumably rose, although there is no reliable data which provides figures for this period (Young 1996b). However, not all were happy with the arrangement:

“…the Peninsula landing-place should be changed, at any rate during the season, from Taranna to Nubeena, lessening thereby one half the time of the sea passage, and enabling folk from Hobart to spend their weekends here” (Mercury 1909b, p. 2: 25 January)

On Boxing Day in 1909 it was evident that Port Arthur, although popular, had a great deal of competition in terms of being a destination for tourists. The reports of the excursions offered on that day include: by rail and road, the Derwent Valley; Elwick Races; Cascades; Long Point beach; and as boat trips include: Port Esperance; Brown’s River; the New Norfolk Regatta; South Arm; Port Cygnet; trips up the river; Eaglehawk Neck and Wedge Bay in addition to the Port Arthur trip. In total upwards of 7,000 people were transported by water on trips, of which only 152 went to Port Arthur (Mercury 1909a: 28 December). Those who did visit on Boxing Day 1909 followed the usual routine, including a visit to the remains and some light pilfering as “relics of some of the old buildings were brought away as mementoes” (Mercury 1909a, p. 6: 28 December). There appears to have been no thought of preservation or conservation at this time.

As mentioned previously, in 1893 the buildings at Port Arthur had been leased to the local Municipal Council for recreation purposes for a period of 99 years. Following the
bushfires, the majority of the buildings were no longer useable for recreation, with the exception of the Town Hall (ex Asylum building) and recreation grounds. The low population in Carnarvon provided a minimal income to the council that did not cover the cost of preservation or the upkeep of the ruins. In 1910 the Municipal Council suggested that they leased the church to the Tourist Association on the proviso that it was repaired (Mercury 1910: 25 October). Two years later, the other historic buildings were included in the discussion with the aim of preventing their destruction (Mercury 1912c: 19 March). The value of tourism to the area was linked to the importance of preservation of heritage as well as nature:

“the whole question of the tourist traffic to Port Arthur needed the most earnest attention as the traffic was annually increasing to the locality, partly from its scenic value and partly from its historical interest, and it would be well for the Government and municipality to realise the value of the district from a tourist standpoint, and the necessity for the preservation of interesting objects in the opening up of attractive scenery” (Mercury 1912b, p. 6: 21 May).

The point of contention was the amount of money the association would have to spend on the ruins if they took them over and the point arose that charging an entrance fee would not be necessary as “there is nothing to be seen on the inside. Everything is on the outside.” (Mercury 1912a, p. 6: 18 June).

The construction of an acceptable past which included the aesthetic and picturesque elements but removed those which were difficult to explain was suggested:

“What seems to be desirable is that this ameliorating work of Nature should be assisted. Port Arthur contains much that is worth preserving, but also much that it were better to remove and forget. “Let the dead past bury its dead” unless it can teach us good lessons or help us to good thoughts! Some ruins, even of tragic and mournful interest, are worth retaining; others a wise discrimination would raze. At Port Arthur, for instance, the beautiful old ivied church, the ferocious 'model prison', the asylum Town-Hall, the citadel terrace, Smith O'Brien's cottage, and one or two other architectural features seem well worth preserving while the great penitentiary with its ugly stacks and factory like walls, seems nothing more nor less than an eyesore dominating the whole place
with gloom and ruination. If this dangerous rubbish heap were wholly removed and replaced by ornamental gardens, the church and other worthy ruins made safe, and some little attention given to the lovely avenues of trees, Nature’s flowers and foliage would soon convert the depressing scenes of Port Arthur into an abode of beauty and peace” (The Daily Post 1913b, p. 4: 3 February)

Despite the discussion about preserving the ruins at Port Arthur, their heritage value was not appreciated and the ruins were still being used as a quarry in July 1913 (Mercury 1913: 16 July). At the same time maintenance rather than renovation of the buildings was being proposed (Mercury 1913: 6 July), despite the suggestion that a relatively small sum of around £50 is all that would be needed to carry out the most urgent repairs (The Daily Post 1913a: 8 February). In 1916, following the protracted discussions about what to do with Port Arthur, the management of the ruins was handed to the Scenery Preservation Board, whose role was to preserve areas of natural or historic interest which had scientific or aesthetic appeal (Archives Office of Tasmania 2006). At first the management of the site was focussed on maximising the economic return and basic restoration was carried out. Guides were employed who were paid on a per head basis, entry fees were fixed and regulations displayed as well as the sale of souvenirs such as drawings of the buildings (Young 1996b).

By 1918 the buildings at Port Arthur were reported as being ‘kept in order’ but management was minimal (Mercury 1918: 9 July). Tourism was still popular and there was not enough accommodation for all those wishing to stay over the peak Christmas period in 1918. Suggestions were made for the buildings adjoining the Commandant’s house to be remodelled as chalets - built from the ruins, again calling into question whether there were any heritage values as the place continued to be used as a quarry (Murdoch 1919). On the other hand, the tourist values were well appreciated and suggestions offered as to the future of Port Arthur:

“the best I have ever seen with its beautiful English trees, the stone jetty and fine bay, and the scenery would attract tourists in the thousands, especially in this period of motor-car transit. Gates should be erected immediately across the oak tree avenue in front of the church and it should be put in proper order by being cultivated and the briars and debris removed from about the glorious trees” (Murdoch 1919).
Forty years after the closure of the penal settlement, the businesses providing tourism services at Port Arthur were run and owned by the second generation of operators. Private investment provided two boarding houses and two hotels in 1921 (Mercury 1921b: 22 June) all of which were well patronised in the summer. Once road access was possible, day trips by car were popular, but the problem of catching the 5.00pm ferry back to Hobart from Bellerive reduced the amount of time people could spend at Port Arthur (Mercury 1921a: 20 August). In 1925 the buildings at Port Arthur were placed under the control of the Tasman Municipal Council once again for a term of three years at a time when tourism to Tasmania was at its lowest ebb (Young 1996b).

CONCLUSION

During the first phase of innovative activity at Port Arthur, those who recognised the entrepreneurial opportunities for tourism, such as the Whitehouse Brothers who owned the boat service and George Wellard who provided coach transport, provided new services and forms of access. Although they worked at their own enterprises, their combined efforts led to the development of a tourist resort, which enabled visitors to access the historic remains. This innovative partnership led to the packaging of each of the trip components into a single product by 1887. The network of operators was extended after 1893 to include the newly opened Tourist Association which offered a booking service for those wishing to visit Port Arthur. Thomas Cook’s Tours also opened an office in Hobart in 1893, and by 1896 were priding themselves on providing overland tours to Port Arthur (Davidson & Spearritt 2000). Economic interests were not the only drivers of innovation at this stage, but social drivers were responsible for changes in interpretation and how the present was reflected in the story of Port Arthur.

The ruination of Port Arthur following the bushfires had a profound effect on the image of the place and what it represented, exaggerated further following the 1908 version of the film For the Term of His Natural Life. This period marked changes in perception as Port Arthur slipped out of the living memory of contemporary generations who had known and lived with convicts. Seen through hindsight the place slowly became valued for its heritage associations, especially where these could be used to encourage the economic benefits of tourism.
Another major event that changed the perception of society during this period was the First World War which marked Australia as an independent nation with its own history. This was reflected in a national identity and historic myth that was created by Australians to tell their story. How Port Arthur was to fit into this story became a contentious subject between those who supported obliterating the tangible evidence of a period that was not considered to be part of Australia’s history and those who saw the penal settlement as testament to the progress which had occurred since. The effect of this division on Port Arthur resulted in neglect due largely to under-funding. As the place was managed by organisations interested in its scenic and aesthetic attributes, rather than the built heritage, there was no urgency to repair or restore any of the ruins. The ruins, seen as a backdrop that set a romantic scene for the natural attraction, meant that their value lay in being ruins and any restoration could have destroyed the illusion of the ancient past which they promulgated.

At the end of this period disequilibrium was based on uncertainty, as the built heritage was still under threat of destruction while the place was used as a quarry, and as it slowly deteriorated for lack of maintenance. There was also disequilibrium in the story of Port Arthur and whether it was to emphasise the horrors of the place or to tell the tale of reform and repentance which was reflected by the ivy-strewn church. Disequilibrium created an environment in which innovation could prosper as changes in physical structure and attitudes towards the place altered with generational change. The end of the First World War had caused Australians to consider the national identity they wished to promote and how their history was to be mythologised. Consequently Port Arthur experienced more disequilibrium due to its negative connotations for the broader Australian history and the uncomfortable questions it presented for Tasmanians who felt shame about its associations with the convict era and how this might be reflected on them personally.

The next Chapter will consider Port Arthur in the period starting in 1926 when Tasmanians were forced to rethink the image they presented to a range of different audiences. It will also consider how the management of Port Arthur changed including the innovations that were implemented in an attempt to maintain relevance to a range of audiences and its significance as part of the Australian mythscape.
BACKGROUND

Throughout the period under review in this chapter, social and economic change drove innovation in many forms. Innovation occurred in the development of new tourism products and a new interpretation of the historic story which encompassed the interests of a new tourist market. The second period began in the mid 1920s at a time when tourism numbers were low at Port Arthur and other attractions were beginning to compete for visitors. This was a period of economic depression, peaking in 1932, but not showing recovery in Tasmania until the start of the Second World War in 1939. During the initial period there were two external events that kept Port Arthur in the public eye and sparked discussion; these included the filming of the third version of For the Term of His Natural Life; and the sale of Beattie’s Museum. Other events, which contributed to changing the perception of Tasmania for potential visitors, included the Come to Tasmania Carnival; hosted by the Tourist Bureau in 1926, it was an innovative attempt to increase tourism and immigration to Tasmania. An event that renewed interest in Port Arthur was the centenary of the Church in 1936.

The destruction wrought by wars in Europe resulted in an appreciation of heritage that had not existed previously. The loss of built heritage sustained (mainly) in Europe, but witnessed by many Australian soldiers, during the Second World War was a catalyst towards revaluing heritage assets. In Australia this materialized as the Burra Charter (1979) which adopted the philosophy and concepts of the Venice Charter (1964), aimed at conserving places of cultural significance (ICOMOS 1999, p. 6). A history of Port Arthur during this period identifies the changes in social perception and the management decisions taken in order to maintain the relevance of Port Arthur to a changing audience. Both barriers to, and opportunities for, innovation occurred and will be examined in this chapter. The chapter starts by considering the external and internal environments which contextualised the period, including the events that framed the perceptions of the Australian population as well as how Australia was considered.
globally. Actions and events changed the national identity of Australia and the meanings reflected by heritage sites, such as Port Arthur.

CHANGING TASTES, ATTITUDES AND IDENTITIES

The end of the Victorian period in 1901 heralded the emergence of modernism, which brought changes in social and political thought and introduced new technologies that changed the way people worked and lived. Modernism brought new forms of philosophy, arts and culture which encouraged society to question the traditions and stories of the past and the authorities which promoted them (Stephen, Goad & McNamara 2008). Although in Australia there was, at first, some hesitation in accepting the changes which came with modernism (Melleuish 1998a).

Politically Australia began to take its place on the world stage in terms of politics and trade, becoming a founder member of the League of Nations constituted by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 (United Nations 2010). Nationally the fear of foreign subversives meant that censorship was widely employed in the 1920s and 1930s across a range of media including publishing and film (White 1981p.141) and protectionist policies were used to encourage the sale of Australian-made goods in preference to foreign imports (Melleuish 1998b).

Socially, people enjoyed increasing amounts of leisure time, (Lynch, R & Veal 2006), particularly after the eight hour day was achieved nationally for all workers in the 1920s (Barker 2000). However, there were increasing numbers of ways to spend leisure time, and visiting historic sites was only one choice amongst many. Cinemas opened in the major capital cities and picture houses continued to be popular, bringing moving pictures and by 1929 news and talking films (Cook 2004). Radio also grew in popularity during the 1920s. The access to national and international media awakened a social consciousness about how national cultures were perceived by those from other places and managing the national image became an important political focus (Stokes 1997).

For predominantly Western cultures, the era immediately following the First World War was one of political revolution and industrial strife with the rise of trade union movements and the preponderance of national strikes. It was an era during which the
‘common man’, having proved himself in the trenches, spoke out for his beliefs and an egalitarian society (Melleuish 1998b). As mentioned in the previous chapter, the image of the ‘digger’ was seen as the embodiment of the Australian hero with all of his virtues (Day 1998; White 1981). The notion of the digger and the hardships he underwent in war resulted, through hindsight, in a more sympathetic view of the convict era. One commentator speculated on what would have happened if Charles Dickens rather than Marcus Clarke had written about Van Diemen’s Land, suggesting:

“He would have come out not only with his unique power of description, but with his fiery hatred of cruelty, hardheartedness and hypocrisy, his radical contempt of incompetent and shuffling governments, and his ability to make folk reformers whilst amusing them” (Mercury 1931a, p. 6: 24 August).

In the early 1930s social engineering in the form of eugenics was a popular theory (Hawkins 1997). Some people in Tasmania considered that this theory explained away convict ancestors, and used it to argue that Tasmania had benefited from its convict population:

“Nature, more kindly than men, corrects mistakes, not prolongs them... Nature mercifully corrects a damaged strain in a generation or two, and the posterity may be better than before” (Mercury 1931a, p. 6: 24 August).

After the Second World War the sentiment changed further with places like Port Arthur being used to enable future generations to realise the extent of ‘man’s inhumanity to man’, and that the value of the ruins at Port Arthur was “a milestone by which we can measure our progress” (Mercury 1940b: 2 March).

**ECONOMIC DEPRESSION IN AUSTRALIA**

By 1929, Australia, along with most other countries in the Western world, was in the throes of the Great Depression. The effects were hard due to Australia’s dependence on exports and foreign loans (Valentine 1987). A growth in social problems resulted in homeless and racism between those of British descent and new migrants, many of whom were forced to take lower wages to find work (Valentine 1987). The depression reached a peak in 1932 when unemployment in Australia rose to 32 per cent (2001). In
1930 the three major problems associated with the economic collapse in Australia were posited to include the level of foreign debt and unemployment; overproduction; and overpopulation (Giblin 1930). The Commonwealth Government provided aid to the States for investment in public works programmes in an effort to reduce unemployment (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2004). One such project was to build a road to the top of Mount Wellington in Hobart; called the Pinnacle Road it opened in 1937 as an attraction for those who wished to reach the top. Its close proximity to Hobart meant this road became a tourist experience overtaking Port Arthur as Tasmania’s most popular attraction by 1939 (Editorial 1939: 21 July). Other investments in Tasmania included the hydroelectric scheme and other manufacturing industries, such as Cadbury’s chocolate (Felton 2006). Mining and Forestry also grew during the 1930s, and immigration to Tasmania was encouraged by the employment opportunities offered in the State.

In the 1930s there were demands for the ‘de-Pommification’ and ‘un-Yankeefying’ of Australian culture (White 1981). International relations were further strained by Australia’s determination to change its economic base to industry rather than agriculture, with the aim of becoming self sufficient rather than dependent on Britain for imports (White 1981). In the late 1930s the population of Australia continued to grow through assisted immigration from Britain as well as 15,000 political refugees from other countries in Europe (Langfield 1999). As the population grew and the number of immigrants from non-British backgrounds arrived in Australia, the significance of the colonial past diminished.

The problem which faced tourist destinations, where the competitive advantage was its heritage, such as Port Arthur, was in making the place relevant to the new generation of visitors, who enjoyed leisure pastimes including beach holidays, fishing and hiking, as well as the new immigrants who knew relatively little about Tasmanian history. An additional concern was that purpose built attractions, such as the Luna Park theme parks, were opening in other states and proving immensely popular (Luna Park - History 2010).
The 1940s were a period that was burdened by the Second World War (1939 – 1945). During the war Australia’s allegiance shifted from Britain to the United States, changing forever the relationship between the two nations. Australia was seen to be “breaking free from the historic bonds of Empire” (Day 1999, p. 438). This was particularly pertinent following Japan’s declaration of war in the Pacific in 1941. Prime Minister John Curtin famously said:

“Without any inhibitions of any kind I make it quite clear that Australia looks to America, free of any pangs as to our traditional links or kinship with the United Kingdom” (Black 1995, p. 195).

The change in society wrought by the arrival of American troops on Australian soil from 1941 onwards resulted in the adoption of American cultural norms and traditions (White 1981). Following the Second World War, the influx of non-British immigrants to Australia, resulted in a shift in the national identity of Australia (White 1981, p. 162). White points out the difference between the Australian Type and the Australian Way of Life when he says that:

“Whereas the Australian ‘type’ had been seen as an extension of the British ‘type’, and Britain had set the standard against which the developing Australian character was measured, it was the United States which provided the standard against which Australia and other Western nations, measured their ‘way of life.’” (White 1981, p. 162)

By the 1960s many of the historical buildings in Hobart had been demolished to make way for commerce, roads and modern office blocks and some feared that the heritage values of the State would be obliterated. In an attempt to persuade Tasmanians to change their view of their convict heritage, links to America were reinforced:

“our history begins with convicts, and we have long been ashamed of our past, but it is about time we got rid of our inhibitions... after all, we only got our convicts because it became increasingly difficult to continue exporting them to America, which had been accepting them for a couple of hundred years” (Mercury 1961, p. 8: 11 November).
IMMIGRATION AND THE NEW AUSTRALIANS

Although Australia and the United Kingdom signed the assisted passage immigration scheme providing free passage for ex-servicemen after the Second World War, Australia also accepted 300,000 displaced persons from Eastern Europe (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001). The purpose of immigration at this time was to encourage permanent settlement to increase the population, rather than to attract any specific skill set (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001). The result was a growth of suburbia where the new generation looked towards their Australian future rather than looking back to the past in a different place. Leisure time was spent on the beach or at the sporting fixture and places which wanted to attract tourists had to offer the activities and amenities to satisfy their needs.

The 1940s and 1950s were a very prosperous time for Australia, with more people working in the newly emerging manufacturing industries, leading to full employment (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2008; Peel 1997). In Tasmania, during the 1940s and 1950s, there was a wave of prosperity as manufacturing industries produced clothing and textiles for export as well as wool, zinc and apples and the construction of the hydro-electricity infrastructure (Breaden 1951a; Fenton 2008). This was coupled with longer paid holiday entitlement and more money to spend travelling, with more places available for travel and the birth of mass tourism (Vanhove 1997). Established tourist resorts like Port Arthur were faced with the challenge of remaining relevant to this new generation of travellers, and consequently their tourist product had to be adjusted to suit the needs and wants of market demand.

The value of tourism to Australia was recognised when a report entitled Australia’s Travel and Tourism Industry 1965 (Harris Kerr Forster & Company, Stanton Robbins & Co Inc & Australian National Travel Association 1966) was commissioned. This report predicted that Australia had great potential to maximize tourism as an industry, if the infrastructure, attractions and services were upgraded (Craik 2001). Also in 1965, the Australian Council of National Trusts was set up in Canberra, aimed at preserving and conserving Australia’s indigenous, natural and historic heritage (National Trust of Australia 2010).
To recap, the external environment underwent major shifts in political, social and technological terms during the period under review. Disequilibrium was caused as immigration changed the demographic make-up of the Australian population, meaning that the heritage values associated with colonial history were no longer as relevant as they had been previously. In order to retain its significance as representing a period of Australian history, Port Arthur had to change its presentation and story to connect with the newly emerging audience. Changes in technology and working practices also changed the profile of the tourist who encompassed interstate and international arrivals. Tourists also became more experienced at ‘being tourists’ at this time and their demands and expectations altered respectively. How these changes affected the marketing and packaging of the Tasmanian product is the focus of the next section.

MARKETING TASMANIA – AND PORT ARTHUR

Position innovation was imperative during the period between the two World Wars if Tasmania was to attract tourists in the increasingly competitive Australian market. A series of marketing initiatives took place in 1926, leading up to the “Come to Tasmania” Carnival. This was advertised as a “State-wide Programme to Entertain Tourists in November” (Mercury 1926b, p. 14: 9 September). The Carnival was advertised on the radio and was aimed at those who wished to “seek enjoyment in the true holiday spirit or desire change of air and scene for health reasons” (Mercury 1926b, p. 14: 9 September). One of the less well advertised aims of the carnival was to encourage immigration into the State by imbuing “each and every visitor with the wish, sooner or later, to take up their permanent quarters in Tasmania, and so increase the population of the State” (Mercury 1926b, p. 14: 9 September). Entertainment at Port Arthur during the Carnival included a ball that was held in the Town Hall. A newspaper editorial extolled the virtues of visiting Port Arthur, described as Australia’s ‘only bona fide ruin’, and pointing out that this distinction has never been disputed (Mercury 1926e, p. 10: 8 September).

In 1934 the Government agency responsible for marketing Tasmania was the Tasmanian Government Tourist Bureau which operated as a booking agent and had offices situated in major towns on the mainland. It was closed during the Second World
War, reopening in 1946 as the Tasmanian Government Tourist and Immigration Department which, as the name suggests also had responsibility for encouraging migrants to settle in Tasmania. In the 1930s the decision had been made to promote the scenic beauties of Tasmania rather than the convict past. Although it was almost impossible to ignore the convict heritage because “there is always an old bridge or a building to speak of convict work and whose booklets and museums keep alive those grim old memories” (Mercury 1930b, p. 7: 6 September). The brochures promoting the State included practical information about transport and short descriptions of the attractions and amenities in each destination. Port Arthur did no independent advertising except that done by individual suppliers. The Tourist Bureau required payment for advertising in their publications:

“The Director of the Government Tourist Bureau wrote asking if the council would contribute £10 towards the publication of a book, “Tasmania the Wonderland”, and it decided to do this, provided sufficient other bodies joined in to make the publication possible” (Mercury 1933c, p. 5: 5 April).

In 1939 the acclaimed photographer, Frank Hurley made two promotional films. Dubbed scenic travelogues, they were released in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane (Mercury 1940a: 1 January). Hurley described Tasmania as ‘sleepy’, saying that the “the whole place has a holiday atmosphere” (Mercury 1939c, p. 8: 30 January). He specifically called for the preservation of Port Arthur, giving it national status:

““He urged that at Port Arthur “what little the vandals have not already destroyed”, should be carefully preserved. “It is more than a Tasmanian relic: it is a national treasure,” he contended. “Recently sufficient bricks went away in one overseas ship from Port Arthur to build a house”” (Mercury 1939c, p. 8: 30 January).

During the 1930s brochures were produced which created a glossier image of Tasmania targeting a higher spending market segment. The brochure, ‘Tasmania the Wonderland’, was available:

“In a stiff binding in blue and gold, and also with a thick paper cover. The descriptive matter which comprise the contents are beautifully set out on thick art paper” (Mercury 1933a, p. 2: 8 December).
Many of these brochures were written by ‘outsiders’ and were more objective than the newspaper articles written for a local audience by local journalists, or letters written by ‘concerned’ citizens. Much of the information they included was aimed at interstate or international tourists planning to bring their own motorcars, so much of the text describes how to get around and what to visit. The inception of the motoring holiday changed the type of experience which visitors had in Tasmania, giving them more freedom, especially when linked with camping, which was becoming increasingly popular by the 1930s (Davidson & Spearritt 2000).

The figures for the end of financial year 1932 for the Government Tourist Department showed that business had remained the same as for 1931 (Mercury 1933d: 5 January) but this is not surprising considering that it included the worst years of the depression in Australia. The packaged Colourline Tours had shown an increase in numbers, probably because of their reduced rates (see section below). Port Arthur had successfully maintained its visitor numbers but mainly as a daytrip from Hobart (Mercury 1933d: 5 January). Other leisure activities at this time included: winter sports (when the season was good); angling, where Tasmania was considered the leading trout fishing ground of the Commonwealth; and walking in the national parks and caves (Mercury 1933d: 5 January).

The Tourist Bureau complained that they had had a reduction in funding with which to advertise during 1932 and consequently were concerned that they would not be able to compete against destinations such as New Zealand. The Commissioner for the Railways, who had control of the Tourist Bureau, recognised the importance of tourism in Tasmania, and pointed out the dangers in not being able to compete:

“The tourist business is one of the mainstays of the State, but unless money is found for publicity it must inevitably wane. The Island has many adjacent competitors who pursue their propaganda with vigour, recognising the value returned for the outlay” (Mercury 1933d, p. 2: 5 January).

During the 1930s a brochure called *Tasmania for the Tourist* referred to the “ancient penal establishment of Port Arthur”. The temporal suggestion in the word ‘ancient’ immediately created a distance between the contemporary tourist resort and the penal settlement. This brochure was written specifically for motorists with descriptions of the
roads around the Tasman Peninsula. It describes a little of the settlement and what can be seen, but not very much detail about the history, suggesting instead that tourists procure a guide for one shilling to show them around. Postcards were another form of advertising which met with some criticism, as many displayed “men harnessed to ploughs and carriages and marching in procession in chain gangs” (Garnett 1932, p. 6: 22 February). Consequently, the images associated with the convict era remained as the most recognised symbol of Tasmania.

In 1938 it was suggested that there was not enough specific advertising for Port Arthur and not enough information to attract visitors there:

“I visited the Port Arthur ruins recently. We were delighted with all we saw; but I do not think enough is made of this attractive tourist spot. We were told that there were not many visitors to Port Arthur compared with other places. Some of the scenery is the grandest and most beautiful that can be seen anywhere, and it is a thousand pities that this historic old spot is being allowed gradually to fall into decay, with the ruins fast disappearing” (Mercury 1938a, p. 6: 17 February).

In 1944 the brochure called *Tasmania. The Island State of the Australian Commonwealth. Brief Facts Regarding History and Development*, was produced by the Tasmanian Government Tourist Bureau (Anon 1944). This brochure provides more detail about the state of the tourism industry in Tasmania than it does about the history and does not mention Port Arthur specifically at all. The brochure was aimed at potential migrants and therefore covered the industry and employment opportunities available.

After the Second World War recommendations for a long-term development policy for tourism at Port Arthur were suggested. Concerns about the standard of accommodation and the lack of amenities such as tennis courts and skating facilities were mentioned, as well as suggestions for developing sailing, motor boating and canoeing (Mercury 1944c: 10 February); all of which targeted tourists who were active, energetic and interested in outdoor pursuits. If Port Arthur, as a tourist resort, was to compete with other places on the mainland and elsewhere, then it needed to ensure it provided the appropriate amenities to meet the demands of this segment of tourists.
Tourism marketing was the responsibility of each State and the newly emerging overseas markets in Great Britain and the United States were identified as places to target. Consideration was given to opening Tasmanian offices in both countries (Mercury 1944c: 10 February). It was suggested that tourism might become Tasmania’s most lucrative industry in the post-war period, and rather than simply restoring the ruins at Port Arthur as links with the past, it was also intended to beautify the area (Mercury 1944c: 10 February). The historic and heritage values of the ruins were recognised as tourism assets and their preservation was advocated in the interests of attracting tourists. In the years immediately following the Second World War, the promotional messages from Tasmania were mixed. The scenery and natural attractions were the primary promotion, but there was growing recognition that tourists also wanted to see evidence of the convict era.

More promotional material was produced in the post war years, including, in 1947 “The Garden of Tasmania”, issued by the Tasmanian Government Tourist and Immigration Department which was sold at a cost of 5/- shillings (Mercury 1947c: 24 December). This publication incorporated photographs by Frank Hurley, and a short commentary that suggested that the scenery drew tourists to Tasmania. Port Arthur was included at the end of the book and the only commentary reads “Port Arthur, situated on the Tasman Peninsula, is historically famous and naturally beautiful” (Hurley 1947a). Of the five black and white photographs showing Port Arthur, two are of the Church, one is of the Powder Magazine, one is a street scene showing the Penitentiary ruins and the other shows a scenic view of the two bays at Eaglehawk Neck. Convicts and penal settlements are not mentioned at all in this publication.

In 1949, according to the Superintendent of Scenic Reserves, “Tasmania’s historic buildings over the century mark helped to attract tourists” (Mercury 1949c, p. 22: 26 August), but that “Rocks were the basis of scenery” (Mercury 1949c, p. 22: 26 August) and those in Tasmania were better than on the mainland because they were not so old and worn down (Mercury 1949c: 26 August). Tasmania was still attempting to lure immigrants and used promotional films that combined tourist attractions and information about industry and construction. A series of films called the Film Diary was shown throughout Australia and overseas and promoted Tasmania for its “area schools,
Port Arthur, the manufacture of paper, hop, apple and mining industries, the Scottsdale dehydration plant, and old and new bridges” (Mercury 1949a, p. 4: 19 February).

During the 1950s several marketing publications were produced by the Government Tourist Department, which gave a brief description of Port Arthur but promoted it mainly as a destination from which activities could be enjoyed, where the experience was recreational rather than the heritage. These promotional materials were not guidebooks. Their purpose was not to transmit knowledge but to promote Tasmania. They described Port Arthur as a whole and did not go into detail about each building, preferring to include only some of the more sensational stories in brief form. Frequently the brochures were reprinted year after year with very little change in the text apart from some occasional updating of photographs.

Film was used again to attract visitors to Port Arthur from the 1950s, mainly sponsored by the Tasmanian Government Film Bureau. Around 1958 a film called Port Arthur was made; it showed ‘thousands’ of people making their way to Port Arthur each year, in bright sunshine, for their holidays. It told the audience that only a handful of people still lived in the old settlement and that tourists provided for their livelihood. The film then moved to show a guided tour, led by Derwent Martin, a well-known guide at Port Arthur. Other scenes included the torture implements, the Isle of the Dead and the Church as well as ‘Port Arthur’s most horrific place, the Model Prison’ (Tasmanian Government Film Unit 1958). Some of the more dramatic stories were included, particularly those about the ‘blood of murdered convicts which stained the foundations of the church’ (Tasmanian Government Film Unit 1958), and how the oldest of the oak trees was planted by a convict, so it would grow to stand always in his memory, adding pathos and tragedy to the interpretation. At the time this film was made the Penitentiary was closed to visitors due to the unstable state of the masonry and the museum was privately-owned (Tasmanian Government Film Unit 1958).

A second film, made in 1962, was entitled Enchanted Corner, which begins with scenes of beaches and scenic attractions. Expressive language is used to describe Tasmania as a “wonderland of history and beauty (Anderson 1962)” surrounded by “the fury of 1,000 miles of ocean coast of majesty in storm or calm” (Anderson 1962). The film suggests that if tourists use Port Arthur as a base, they can make countless other excursions to take in several activities including beaches, water-skiing or hiking to Remarkable Cave.
and fishing or potting for crayfish. The footage showing the fishing and other activities is longer than that showing the heritage aspects of Port Arthur (Anderson 1962).

The images of Port Arthur promoted during this period concentrated on the ruins as a backdrop against which nature could be appreciated and as a destination in which several recreational activities were available. The fact that the publications and films were made by Tasmanian Government agencies stressed the importance of constructing an image which was acceptable to the majority of Tasmanians. This was especially important following the debate surrounding the film *For the Term of His Natural Life* in 1926, which will be discussed later in this chapter, but which showed Tasmanians how important it was to control the constructed image.

During this period more people had leisure time to travel and many took organised trips. This was a new type of tourist who visited for a short period and en masse. The experience of being at Port Arthur for a packaged tourist was different from either the recreationalist or the independent heritage tourist. Port Arthur was one destination amongst many others during a packaged coach tour or on a cruise. This meant the interpretation had to engage those who were interested in the heritage story as well as those with alternative motivations for taking the trip. The limited time packaged tours spent at Port Arthur also changed the experience and the type of interpretation required.

**PACKAGED TOURS**

One innovation during this period was the development of all-inclusive packaged tours. Many of the tourists visiting Port Arthur during the 1920s and 1930s did so as passengers on all-inclusive package tours arranged by the Tasmanian Government Tourist and Information Bureau. The ‘inclusive trips’ from the mainland were arranged through the Melbourne and Sydney offices of the Tasmania government tourist bureau (Mercury 1927b: 5 January). The reason for their popularity was because:

“People desirous of visiting the State pay a certain sum of money at the mainland bureau, and we arrange a fortnight’s tour of Tasmania for them. That is all the expense they are put to – of course with the exception of pocket-money – and they are given a comprehensive tour of the State” (Mercury 1927b, p. 6: 5 January)
Port Arthur was included as part of two scheduled tours including the popular four day East Coast Trip to Launceston, where it was considered to be one of the major attractions for the tour (Mercury 1927b: 5 January). In 1931 the Great Depression was nearing its zenith and those who were able to take holidays wanted to know exactly how much their holiday would cost (Mercury 1931b: 15 October). Competition was fierce and prices were reduced, usually because suppliers were forced to lower the cost of accommodation and transport if they wished to benefit from the packaged tour business (Mercury 1931b: 15 October).

In 1937 the most popular trip organized from Hobart was to the top of Mount Wellington (Mercury 1937a: 31 December). Port Arthur was the second favourite, but had competition from the National Park, the Huon Channel, Mount Nelson (via Ridgeway), and also from specialized trips which included visits to orchards to taste fruit, or industrial sites such as Cadbury-Fry-Pascall, the IXL Preserving Factory and the Cascade Brewery (Mercury 1937a: 31 December). The West Coast to Strahan was a popular motoring trip, as were the routes between Hobart and Launceston via the Great Lakes or the East Coast. Other forms of recreation included visiting caves, especially Mole Creek, although in 1937 the cave at Hastings was about to be opened for tourism, and discussion about bathing facilities at the hot springs was underway. New skiing huts were built at Ben Lomond, and the track between Cradle Mountain and Lake St Clair was completed in the summer of 1938 (Mercury 1937a: 31 December); now known as the Overland Track. Tasmania was enjoying a tourist boom, and recreational, leisure and tourism opportunities extended across the State. If Port Arthur was to compete for market share, the activities offered had to be attractive to the active, participatory and constantly moving tourism cohort, plus there had to be a competitive advantage and point of difference.

In the 1950s America was targeted as a developing market for tourists and American operators arranged package tours. Port Arthur was included in the itinerary (Mercury 1950: 16 October). One comment from an American tourist was that “Your scenery is fine, but we would like to see more people and how they work and live when we are on our tours” (Mercury 1950, p. 5 October), which suggests that the scenery might not have the competitive edge needed for tourists used to international travel, who wished to discover a different type of knowledge about the places they visited.
CRUISING

By 1930 it was imperative for the Tourism Bureau to be promoting Tasmania internationally as well as interstate. A representative of the Cunard cruise line, when asked why cruises were not already coming to Tasmania, replied that “You do not bring your attractions sufficiently under the notice of those in other parts of the world” (Mercury 1930c, p. 9: 18 January). The situation was rectified and by 1937 steamers and cruise ships were bringing thousands of tourists to Tasmania (Mercury 1937a: 31 December). Most of the visitors arranged their sightseeing after they arrived, and the bureau provided agents on board the steamers to arrange shore trips and provide information (Mercury 1937a: 31 December). In January 1939 the Ormonde cruise ship of the Orient Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. became the first to include Port Arthur on its cruise itinerary. The ship anchored off Dead Island (otherwise known as the Isle of the Dead) and 700 passengers were ferried to shore, described as a ‘red letter event’ for Port Arthur (Mercury 1938c: 16 December).

The types of tourist to visit Port Arthur during this period changed as different forms of access were provided. Many people were able to be tourists for the first time, especially following the introduction of the eight hour day (Barker 2000), meaning that more people now had leisure time. How Port Arthur went about reinventing its story and rejuvenating the destination to accommodate the new types of tourists is the focus of the next section.

SENSITIVITIES—AN UNWANTED IMAGE

One of the major events which occurred during the period under discussion in this chapter, included the filming, in 1926 of the Marcus Clarke book, For the Term of His Natural Life. At a time when Tasmania was attempting to create a new image, sensitivities about how this story would be portrayed came to a head during early 1926, as the benefits and disadvantages of the film was debated in the newspapers. The arguments which were put forward gave an insight into the public feelings associated with Port Arthur and what it represented 50 years after the closure of the penal settlement and 63 years after the last convict had been transported from England.
Technology provided the means to communicate through film by the 1920s and when images were linked through a story, perceptions about the place being filmed could be changed (Beeton 2005). The proposed film illustrates the extent to which the fictional story *For the Term of His Natural Life* had become the unofficial history of the convict era, including its more spectacular events. In 1930 there was still an echo of this sentiment when one correspondent said:

“The trouble to Tasmania is that Marcus Clarke’s genius has so far swayed and shaped popular thoughts and impressions that “For the Term of His Natural Life” has clouded and obscured the facts of history. Fiction appears to be truth. Port Arthur has become Tasmania to the tourist” (Bridges 1930, p. 12: 6 September)

The relationship between Britain and Tasmania was shown to be a contradictory one, with, on the one hand, the blame for the penal settlement being placed firmly with the British Government removing all responsibility from Tasmania:

“Mention the indisputable fact that the convicts were Englishmen, sentenced in England by Englishmen, deported in British ships to an English colony of torture, and you are heralded as unpatriotic” (Member of Scenario Writers’ Forum 1926, p. 5: 5 August)

On the other hand, Tasmania was part of the British Empire and consequently wished to protect the prestige and reputation of Britain.

“The question is one of British, not Tasmanian, reputation, and of whether Tasmanians wish to assist enemy propaganda of the most dangerous kind against British rule” (Mercury 1926a, p. 6: 11 August)

The announcement that Eva Novak had sailed from the United States to star in the film which would partly be made on location at Port Arthur also explained that “few novels are more adapted to translation to the screen” (Mercury 1926d, p. 11: 23 July). The announcement also promised that the theme would be treated “delicately, eliminating gruesome details and accentuating the love interest and romance” (Mercury 1926d, p. 11: 23 July). As an important consideration it also mentioned that £40,000 would be spent, mostly in Tasmania, during the filming, and that “the unsurpassable beauty of the backgrounds will be strongly brought out in the film” (Mercury 1926d, p. 11: 23
The value of promoting the State for tourism was constantly emphasised by the producers and those involved in the filming (Mercury 1926f: 24 July). Despite promising to concentrate on the romantic elements of the story, rather than the horrors, realistic visual images were achieved once authentic costumes and other relics from Beattie’s Museum were duplicated as props (Mercury 1926f: 24 July).

Immediately that the announcement was made, questions were raised in Government which specified that although there was no Commonwealth constitutional power to prevent the filming from taking place, there might be powers which could be used to stop it from being exported (Mercury 1926h: 24 July). Censorship was within the remit of the states, each of which had their own Board, and those films which were to be exported overseas were most prone to scrutiny (Roe 1989). Protests against the film came not only from Tasmania. The Argus in Victoria declared that “nothing can be more offensive to Australian feeling, or a more provocative affront, than the carrying out of this hateful project” (Mercury 1926j, p. 9: 27 July). Reaction against the filming included ‘strong disapproval’ from the Royal Society of Tasmania which considered it to be a bad advertisement as the book was “written up from the very worst records relating to a rather dark page in Tasmania’s history” (Mercury 1926g, p. 9: 27 July). Other concerns included the reputation of Tasmanians and the perceived stigma attached to the name of Van Diemen’s Land:

“We shall run the risk of being looked at askance as coming from the island with such a record. We have lived down the notoriety of ‘Van Diemen’s Land’ and we do not want to do that work again”

(Waterworth 1926, p. 9: 27 July)

Fears were voiced that visual images would be more powerful than literal ones:

“Film propaganda appeals to the eyes of ignorant and well-informed alike, with unique power to affect the passions and imprint indelible memories. The chain gang, the merciless flogging of convicts, the maddening cells of solitary confinement, the cruel horrors we could formerly read of but many of us not imagine, can now be photographed and thrown on a screen exactly as though part of our real life today!”

(Mercury 1926a, p. 6: 11 August)
Others feared that the reputation of Tasmania would be ruined if people realised it was the same place as the notorious Van Diemen’s Land

“Why proclaim to the whole world, with the indelible impress of the latest scientific method or reaching the memory through the eyes and the emotions that ‘Tasmania’ is the old “Van Diemen’s Land”? It is inhuman cruelty” (Mercury 1926k, p. 9: 27 July)

There was a belief that people from elsewhere would be ignorant of the convict era and there would be no reason to let them know what had happened:

“What is likely to be the effect of bringing before unthinking people in the Empire, in America, and in other countries all over the world, the hideous happenings of a re-imagined past that even by the mute stones of Port Arthur prompts good Englishmen and good Australians to exclaim, when they hear the stories as visitors, “What brutes” (Mercury 1926k, p. 9: 27 July)

The hysteria continued, with the vast majority of letters and comments offering negative opinions about the proposed film. The arguments became more exaggerated, including the suggestion that Tasmania would no longer be able to borrow capital due to its tarnished reputation; and that immigrants would no longer wish to live in Tasmania because they would be suspicious of their neighbours’ origins. Port Arthur was compared to visiting the Chamber of Horrors at Madame Tussauds in London (Mercury 1926f: 28 July). Tasmanians felt disempowered. They had no choice about whether the film should go ahead and no control over the images that were to be portrayed. As a result, they blamed America as the perpetrator suggesting the film was “American venom against the British Empire” (Mercury 1926a, p. 6: 11 August). The film was referred to as propaganda (Mercury 1926f: 28 July), and there were even suggestions that it would “pave the way for a Communist insurrection or a new war” (Mercury 1926i, p. 4: 30 July). Further criticism was concerned with America’s attitude towards Britain:

“It was known that in the United States there was a certain body of opinion strongly antagonistic to Great Britain, which lost no opportunities of showing bad points of British rule.... Americans (this writer stated) looked upon Australia as a place of droughts, strike and penal settlements. The effects of this film
would be most serious. It would be shown throughout the world, and would harm British prestige” (Mercury 1926c, p. 5: 10 August).

The motives of Americans in wishing to make the film were questioned, as was their trustworthiness in terms of the images which would be produced:

“My experience of American films and “producers” is that they leave nothing sacred…. American producers are only out for money, and such a film would mean millions to them… they seem to have no original ideas except money. This film must be stopped. It serves no useful purpose, neither beautiful, moral or educational. It is merely a money proposition by which American producers will profit. It must be stopped” (Colleyshaw 1926, p. 7: 31 July).

Others voiced their regret that the buildings at Port Arthur were still standing, wishing they had been pulled down “instead of using them for a sensational, sight-seeing tourist crowd” (Cranstoun 1926, p. 7: 30 July), and the blame was placed on the Government for not having destroyed the tangible evidence of the past (Mercury 1926j: 27 July). Others suggested that if permission for making the film was now refused people would think it was because the scenes depicted were still existent in Tasmania (Mercury 1926m, p. 5) and due to the authentic location the fictional part of the film would give the impression that the events were still taking place at Port Arthur (Mercury 1926a: 11 August). Warnings were issued that if the picture could not be filmed in Tasmania due to censorship, there was nothing to stop others making a more unpleasant version and filming it elsewhere.

“America will produce the film elsewhere by imitation, and after suffering the loss of their preparations, will have little mercy on our feelings and ...’put the dirt in’” (E.P.W. 1926, p. 5: 5 August)

There were however a few voices of support for the film. They reiterated that the film was going to concentrate on the romantic elements of the story and the nobility of the principal character – as “to be successful, a picture must not be horrifying” (Fairplay 1926, p. 4: 30 July). Another correspondent defends the film:

“As a background the old days are full of interest. There can be no confusion re period, as some unthinking correspondents suggest. Do your apprehensive
writers expect to see a gushing Rufus Dawes singing before a microphone or lounging idly by the sea shod in Oxford ‘bags’? The story will be ‘lightened’ considerably to contain sufficient interest and appeal. I doubt if any producer would be heartless enough to even attempt a picture sticking strictly to real happenings at Port Arthur. ...Such a gruesome story would not pay for the amount of raw film used” (Member of Scenario Writers’ Forum 1926: 5 August)

The actors arrived in Tasmania on the 30 August 1926. Eva Novak’s arrival attracted large crowds of onlookers, and her first visit was to the Port Arthur Museum in Murray Street, Hobart (Mercury 1926g: 31 August). Once the actors arrived it effectively brought the discussion to an end. Norman Dawn, the producer gave an interview in which he stressed that the film was an adaptation of the Marcus Clark story “made according to Australian standards, passed by Australian censors, and financed by Australian capital” (Mercury 1926g, p. 7: 31 August). He went on to promise that the film would include the ‘superb’ scenery around Port Arthur. An open invitation was offered to the people of Tasmania to watch the film while it was being made, resulting in “a large number of visitors from the city watched the “shooting” of scenes in the historic setting” (Mercury 1926e, p. 10: 8 September). This became an immediate attraction with excited crowds visiting Port Arthur as a favoured motor trip. An illustrated editorial appeared in the newspaper in September 1926 describing the way in which films were made, the job of the actors at work, including the parts played by Tasmanian extras, and the reasons it took so long to make a feature film (Representative 1926: 15 September).

In July 1927 the film was released and all fears were pronounced to be ‘groundless’. An acceptable image had been produced after all.

“The picture makes it very clear that at the close of the terrible period of convict settlement, the British authorities realised that Australia was far too valuable to be left a dumping ground for those who ‘left their country for their country’s good’, and that an era of migration of the best types of British settlers was then ushered in. The film, far from damaging Tasmania, does the island State a service by advertising the beautiful scenery. ... It is country every tourist will want to see for himself, when once he has viewed the picture” (Cinema Notes 1927, p. 10: 1 July).
Going further in proclaiming that the film was a success in terms of public relations and advertising for Tasmania, the Premier stated that:

“I certainly think it is a picture that every Tasmanian should see, if only to see what changes have taken place in our whole outlook on life” (Mercury 1927d, p. 3: 25 August)

The minor criticism, rather ironically, included in this editorial is that

“There was certainly a feeling, too, that more could have been made of some of the Tasmanian scenery, nor does one recollect that any of the numerous titles and sub-titles mentioned the fact that the picture was largely made in Tasmania” (Mercury 1927d, p. 3: 25 August)

The discussion which pertained to making the film of *For the Term of His Natural Life* made Tasmanians consider the image they wished to present to the world as well as how they managed their reputation in terms of trade and tourism. As a consequence, uncertainty meant the focus for all promotion used to attract tourists and immigrants were nature and natural scenery. The film itself was not the enormous success that had been forecast, as it was one of the very last silent films to be released at the exact time that ‘talkies’ were becoming the norm. An obverse effect that the film had was that *For the Term of His Natural Life* was no longer considered to be the unofficial history of Port Arthur. Turning the story into a romance proved that it was fiction, while the fact that the film was made by ‘outsiders’ showed Tasmanians that the image they suspected others had of them was wrong, and that it was their responsibility to create their own image in the future.

**THE BEATTIE MUSEUM**

The story of the sale of the Beattie Museum provides a contemporary narrative about the values placed on heritage resources during the late 1920s and early 1930s and the social attitudes towards the convict era at the time. In 1927 Beattie, an inveterate collector of convict curios and relics of the colonial era put his collection on the market. The collection had formed one of Hobart’s major tourist attractions and he had hoped that the Government would buy it, but they had not been forthcoming and there was a threat that it would be sold interstate. The collection was eventually bought by the
Launceston Council to be displayed in the Queen Victoria Museum (Mercury 1927a: 24 September). The first section of the museum in Launceston was opened in May 1928, and related to the lives of the early Tasmanian settlers and some of the first Governors, rather than concentrating on convicts:

“Only a little of Tasmania’s early history really relates to the prison life of Port Arthur, yet the penal settlement and all that it stood for has been, unfortunately, made the centre around which the bulk of all tradition has gathered” (Mercury 1928b, p. 11: 12 May)

The second section opened in December 1928 which comprised mainly the handiwork of convicts as well as some personal belongings of Sir John and Lady Franklin (Mercury 1928e: 19 December). In June 1930, Mr. Beattie died suddenly, but being an avid collector, he had already put together the:

“nucleus of another, and gradually added to it by acquiring further mementoes of olden times, until the second collection of articles closely resembled the first. He had offered this collection to the Hobart Corporation, but the negotiations were not successful” (Mercury 1930a, p. 7: 25 June).

He had hoped that the second collection would be bought by the Hobart Corporation and placed on show in the Lady Franklin Museum at Lenah Valley (Mercury 1930a: 25 June). In 1932 the future of this second collection was being discussed, but not everyone thought it a good idea to buy it:

“its retention would be detrimental to culture. It is not conducive to higher thought expression to have so gruesome an object constantly before the people with records which ought to have been destroyed by the Government when the convict system was abolished” (Garnett 1932, p. 6: 22 February).

In 1935 a bequest was left to the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery by a Mr. William Walker that enabled the purchase of the second Beattie collection. This collection became the Port Arthur Room and was one of the most popular attractions in Hobart, especially for those who had no time to visit the site of Port Arthur

"The Port Arthur room was an historical record of a time in the history of the State which happily had passed into very distant memory. He reminded his
listeners that the exhibits in the room were records of a period of great cruelty in the treatment of prisoners, not only in Tasmania and England, but over the whole world. He referred to that aspect of the subject in order that they should have a true perspective when viewing the collection in the room. Nevertheless, it was essential that there should be some punishment for the maintenance of law and order. Concluding, the Governor said that it might not be inappropriate to remind the gathering that it was Empire Day. He referred to the stimulus to their historic sense which the celebration of the day administered, as they recalled some of the noble history which belonged to the Empire”

(Correspondent 1935: 26 May)

In 1935 there appeared to be an upsurge of interest in history which may have stemmed from the opening of the Port Arthur room which quickly became a popular tourist attraction; the aim being that it would attract people to the museum and help it to expand to more collections (Mercury 1935c: 27 May).

**MANAGEMENT AT PORT ARTHUR**

Management of the Crown Reserves at Port Arthur had been under the auspices of the Scenery Preservation Board since 1916 (1915b). In 1926 they were leased to the Municipal Council as mentioned in the previous chapter, and then in 1938 they were placed in Government hands once more. The Port Arthur and Eaglehawk Neck Board was created to manage them (1938), which had the “power to administer the area, and be responsible for the supervision and maintenance of the buildings” (Mercury 1938f, p. 6: 24 June). In 1947 the Port Arthur Scenic Reserves Board took over (1947), which lasted for three years, before returning to the Scenery Preservation Board in 1950 (1915b). In 1962 the Tasman Peninsula Board became responsible for the management of the buildings at Port Arthur until it was absorbed into the Parks and Wildlife Service in 1971(1971). In 1987 the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority took over responsibility for the heritage site and still holds that position today (1987). Their management will be discussed in the next chapter.
Between 1925 and 1938 the Municipal Council controlled the reserves at Port Arthur. The original agreement was for a three-year term that had been extended (Lennox 1994). The Council were responsible for stabilizing the ruined buildings and ensuring visitor safety but not for managing tourism or promotion. In an effort to earn some income from the ruins, the Municipal Council placed a turnstile at the entrance to the penitentiary in 1926 to collect fees, but not all visitors passed through the turnstile. In 1927 the penitentiary was in a dangerous state of repair and the Council liability was under question:

“The old Penitentiary buildings are in a very insecure state, and liable to fall at any time. The municipality makes a small charge for the privilege of seeing through these ruins, so if any misadventure should occur, a responsibility may attach to those who are collecting these fees” (Murdoch 1927, p. 4: 5 January)

The following year there were complaints that the buildings were still falling down, despite 15,000 people having paid to enter since the turnstile was installed (Mercury 1928a: 7 January).

“Port Arthur is fast falling to decay, which seems a pity. A portion of the model prison and model chapel should be restored ... undoubtedly the prison buildings are a great attraction” (Mercury 1928a, p. 13: 7 January).

Not only was there a lack of maintenance, but also very little management. Although the guides were meant to clean the site they were only paid per head for showing people around and not for janitorial duties, hence they ignored this aspect of their role (Young 1996b):

“Nearly every person who goes to Port Arthur is rapturous over the ruins of the church, which should be guarded as a sacred charge, but instead what greets us when sight-seeing there? Utter desolation and that wonderful stone staircase in a lobby at the main entrance littered up with rubbish of many sorts in a state of putrification! Why not place a door to prevent so evident a misuse? ... Then in front of the church, old timber and garden pruning’s were laying about, decaying. So much paper and litter were scattered all round the building that I picked some up and burned it, and this had not been previously done for many a long day. Why do visitors throw film and cigarette wrappers away without
thought as to whether they will be eyesores to others?” (Murdoch 1927, p. 4: 5 January)

In February 1927 Port Arthur was inspected by the Public Health Department following the number of complaints which had been received concerning the unhygienic conditions, and suggestions were made that the Council should install a septic tank to improve the sanitary conveniences (Mercury 1927c: 15 February), as well as:

“... that tenders be called for cleaning up portion of the Model Prison, flooring some of the old cells, and hanging some of the old original doors in place”
(Mercury 1927c, p. 11: 15 February)

Despite agreeing to maintenance work nothing had been done six months later when funds were requested from the Public Works Department (Young 1996b). In 1929 the Tasman Council claimed to have spent considerably more on the reserves at Port Arthur than they had raised in tourism through the entry turnstile (Mercury 1929a: 10 September). Work included repairs to the model prison and penitentiary, fencing, repainting, building walls, paying wages, installing a sanitary scheme, materials, working on roads and clearing away rubbish in the township, as well as, controversially, the cost of £20.10s.6d towards advertising in the film *Tasmania at Work and Play* (Mercury 1929a: 10 September).

In 1929 tentative suggestions were made in the press that the buildings should be bought back by the Government as a major tourist attraction for Tasmania, which was essentially a ‘tourist State’ (Mercury 1929b: 10 January). In September 1930 the Council wrote to the Scenery Preservation Board requesting funding on a pound for pound basis to cement the steps at the front of the Commandant’s House (Mercury 1930b: 6 September). In the same meeting there was a discussion about buying the old Government Cottage and the Fountain at Port Arthur, but the Council did not see how they could afford to acquire the land at that time (Mercury 1930b: 6 September). The third point raised in this meeting was the need for a camping ground at Port Arthur, and it was decided to inform campers that suitable areas existed at Safety Cove, Stuart’s Bay and Port Arthur (Mercury 1930b: 6 September). The request for a campground came from the Autocar Club of Tasmania and is evidence of the changing pattern of tourism in the 1930s in Tasmania.
By 1935 there were calls for the Government to assume control of the Port Arthur reserves and to hand them over to the Tourist Department to manage. Complaints ranged from those about advertising posters and signs which spoiled the atmosphere; to the lack of information or any sort of guidebook (Mercury 1935b: 14 June). These complaints, amongst others, led the Minister for Tourism to consider preserving the ruins, because Port Arthur “still remained one of the biggest tourist attractions in the State, and every care should have to be taken to ensure the preservation of the ruins” (Mercury 1935d, p. 11: 10 August). Two years later a deputation from the Tasmanian Society approached the Minister for Lands and Works to suggest that a scheme should be set up to enable the Government to take control of all the places of historic interest in the State (Mercury 1937c: 13 November).

Heritage values were tightly aligned with the economic return from tourism leading to the suggestion that a National Trust should be formed to “promote the permanent preservation of lands and tenements of beauty or historic interest” (Mercury 1937b, p. 2: 16 November). The report described the buildings at Port Arthur as the most important in the State and “worth untold money to our country, and they form one of the greatest attractions we can offer to tourists” (Mercury 1937b, p. 2: 16 November). Port Arthur was the competitive advantage which Tasmania had over any of the other Australian States, and were “something the other States would give much to possess” (Mercury 1937b, p. 2: 16 November).

By the middle of 1938 there was a call for the Government to take direct control of the historic buildings at Port Arthur because the Council had allowed them to deteriorate rapidly, and there was a fear that Tasmania would lose one of its main tourist assets. William Radcliffe, owner of several buildings at Port Arthur, including the museum and a member of the Progress Association, discussed further below, accused the Council of spending the money collected from tourists at the turnstiles on the roads and other works rather than on the buildings. A letter was sent from the Progress Association to the Premier, Mr. A.G. Ogilvie to suggest that the Government should take control (Mercury 1938d: 1 June). This request was acted on very speedily and three weeks after the letter was sent, the Government placed the ruins under the auspices of the Scenery Preservation Act, which proclaimed “the area under the Act will ensure that its future is safe and that the ruins are efficiently protected from further damage.”
Again, the decision was based on the tourism value of the ruins: “as the ruins were such an attraction to visitors, every care should be taken to ensure their preservation” (Mercury 1938e, p. 8: 24 June). A year later, in July 1939 the Government took another step towards complete control, when they began to buy back those buildings that had been sold into private hands:

“*The Premier ... stated that too many old buildings and relics in various parts of the State had been allowed to disappear, and the Government had purchased some of the Port Arthur buildings before it became too late*” (Mercury 1939a, p. 9: 21 July).

The Port Arthur and Eaglehawk Neck Board and the Scenery Preservation Board recommended that the buildings purchased should include the Commandant’s House; Powder Magazine; Smith O'Brien’s Cottage; the Old Police Court, Hospital, Government Cottage, and the Fountain. The Government already owned the Church; Penitentiary; Model Prison; Isle of the Dead; and Point Puer, as well as other sites such as the Coal Mines at Saltwater River (Mercury 1939a: 21 July). The Government was also considering buying William Radcliffe’s collection of relics, which formed the Port Arthur Museum, and putting them on show in the Commandant’s House. They were at the time on show in Radcliffe’s shop.

The Government decided that Port Arthur should become a show place. This move was innovative as far as Tasmania and Australia was concerned as

“*The Government appreciates the commercial value of Port Arthur in relation to its historic associations and recognises that as time goes on these buildings and relics will become more and more valuable*” said the Premier. ... Relics have been bought privately and have been taken away from the State. Buildings have passed into private hands and been pulled down. The Government has determined that the most interesting of the sites at Port Arthur should be acquired before it is too late and hopes to make it a ‘show place’ that will become world famous. It is already more inquired after than any tourist resort in the State, and probably more visit it than any other place, with the exception of Mount Wellington” (Mercury 1939a, p. 9: 21 July)
If Port Arthur were to be a showplace, it had to be a self-supporting one, and that depended on attracting tourists:

“There is no reason why Port Arthur cannot be made self-supporting for considerable sums are received through the turnstile at the model prison, and an admission fee will also be charged to the museum proposed to be established at the commandant’s house. ... Other countries exploit their historic associations with immense profit and Governments are acquiring objects of interest to tourists. It is felt that Tasmania should not lag behind in this respect, for our tourist traffic has already reached large dimensions, and the Government intends to take every reasonable step to foster it” (Mercury 1939a, p. 9: 21 July).

By December 1939, £2,500 had been spent on buildings at Port Arthur, the justification being that “Port Arthur is one of the greatest tourist assets Tasmanian possesses” (Mercury 1939b, p. 2: 8 December). Not only were they valuable in terms of tourist revenue, echoing the sustainable tourism ethos of today, they were also preserved because “the community and future generations are entitled to as much preservation of the story expressed in stone as this and previous generations” (Mercury 1939b, p. 2: 8 December).

In 1940, following the outbreak of war, the question of what to do with the ruins at Port Arthur was once more debated. The self-sufficiency which Port Arthur had been expected to achieve was curtailed by the drop in tourism numbers due to the war (Mercury 1940b: 2 March). In 1944, tourists returned to Port Arthur and in the season ending in April 1945 there were more visitors to Port Arthur than in the three previous years combined (Mercury 1945: 2 April). Many tourists wanted to see inside the Penitentiary buildings, which had been closed for several years because of their unsafe condition, but due to the amount of tourist interest it was suggested they should be made safe and opened for inspection (Mercury 1944a: 14 December).

In 1945 there was a call for a group of historically-minded people to care for the remaining treasures that still existed in Tasmania, based on the value of tourism to the State and because “Tasmania has the only historical ruins in Australia” (Willes 1945, p. 3: 25 July). This was followed by a proposal from the Port Arthur Board that the Government should purchase land and buildings in a tourism development programme.
This plan was based on a report called the McGowan Report which resulted in the purchase of the township for £21,000 by the Tasmanian State Government (Mason, Myers & de la Torre 2003). The plan aimed to retain the historic and architectural beauty of Port Arthur and recognised that the competitive advantage of the site lay in its unique attributes, and rarity value as a historic convict site (Mason, Myers & de la Torre 2003).

In 1947 the Port Arthur and Eaglehawk Neck Board was disbanded and replaced by the Port Arthur Scenic Reserves Board. Their work would be coordinated and expenditure controlled, through the Scenery Preservation Board with the purpose of making it more efficient, with fewer members (Mercury 1947b: 12 July). A Mr. Sharland was appointed to oversee the various Boards that reported to the Scenery Preservation Board. At the time he was also President of the Tasmanian Field Naturalists Club, Ornithologist of the Tasmanian Museum, Vice President of the Royal Australasian Ornithologists Union and had honorary life membership of the Gould League of Birdlovers (Scenery Preservation Board 1947). Unsurprisingly, his main focus lay with the natural and scenic assets of Port Arthur.

The first purpose built tourist infrastructure at Port Arthur was proposed in November 1947. It included a residence for a ranger and refreshment rooms to provide an amenity for tourists (Mercury 1947a: 12 November). However, maintenance of Port Arthur was still under fire in 1948 when two New Zealand travellers described their experience “the lack of facilities for tourists is appalling ... Muddy and swampy tracks plus the uncontrolled growth of blackberry bushes” (Mercury 1948, p. 6: 25 June). In 1949, more money (£5,000) was requested for the resumption of various properties at Port Arthur (Mercury 1949b: 8 April) although detractors suggested instead that the history of Port Arthur should be closed and “kept forever from the public” (Mercury 1949b, p. 5: 8 April). When the discussion turned to purchasing the collection of relics from the museum one commentator pointed out that they had originally belonged to the Crown and it seemed “wrong that the State should have to buy them back again” (Mercury 1949b, p. 5: 8 April). Other criticisms at the same meeting focussed on the commercial degradation and exploitation of tourists:
“He noticed for sale beakers with pictures of Port Arthur on them. Immediately they were washed the pictures came off. A vase marked 56/- in the morning had dropped to 35/- in the afternoon” (Mercury 1949b, p. 5: 8 April).

The economic value of tourism at Port Arthur continued to drive Government decisions about its preservation:

“The Government was getting a return of more than £2,000 a year from Port Arthur, which it took over recently at a cost of £25,000. As Port Arthur was developed, revenue would increase. It was one of Tasmania’s best sellers, as 80 p.c. of tourists insisted on going there” (Mercury 1949c, p. 22: 26 August).

By 1950 it was reported that 20,000 people had visited Port Arthur in a ten month period bringing in a substantial revenue, which led one wit to comment that:

“doubtless the authorities in those days used to impress on their charges that crime does not pay, but in the long run that was proved false with Port Arthur. It is now the greatest producer of direct revenue among all our tourist assets” (Column 1950, p. 17: 3 June).

In 1951, 16,301 people had paid to visit the Port Arthur ruins in a six month period (Mercury 1951). This encouraged the Government to spend more money on improving the parklands as well as renovating the hotel and opening Smith O’Brien’s Cottage as a youth hostel for 20 people (Mercury 1951: 14 June). The acquisition of the buildings at Port Arthur continued through the 1950s with the preservation of the Church and Town Hall as top priorities. A new recreation ground was built on the foreshore in front of the Penitentiary. In 1952

“the settlement is number one drawcard for tourists, who, last season spent £2,230 in inspection fees alone. Port Arthur is Crown property, and is one aspect of scenery preservation that pays dividends. Yearly returns to the Crown are nearly £4,000” (Mercury 1952, p. 10: 14 October).

By the early 1950s holidays were considered a right rather than a privilege and tourists were experienced enough to demand a level of quality to which they were accustomed. Despite the income from tourists, complaints about the lack of a guidebook and the
state of the camping site suggest that the expectations of tourists had changed and Port Arthur was not satisfying their needs:

“there are no facilities to induce people to camp. There is one table. Fireplaces are broken. There are only two containers for paper, both always full. There are no lights on roads, fresh fruit and vegetables are not obtainable, and the highway is in a bad state” (Marshall 1954, p. 4: 4 February).

**PORT ARTHUR PROGRESS AND TOURIST ASSOCIATION**

A group of local business owners formed the Port Arthur Progress and Tourist Association in 1927. This organisation was made up of various stakeholders concerned about maintaining Port Arthur as a tourist resort in order to ensure the sustainability of their own businesses. The majority of the members were local residents and their contribution to Port Arthur was twofold, first by carrying out minor repair work on the ruins; and secondly, by acting as a lobby group, they sought to raise Government funds for preservation and repair of the site. The Association ceased to exist in 1941, during the Second World War.

In 1928 they lobbied the Premier to request funds (about £1500) from the Government for repairs to the ruins under the auspices of the Association rather than the Council (Mercury 1928f: 18 February). This request was unsuccessful (Mercury 1928d: 7 May). They lobbied for financial support again in 1930, also unsuccessfully, although the Governor agreed that the Association would spend funds wisely if they were forthcoming. He also suggested that a foreshore esplanade and a golf course could be included, in addition to the repairs (Mercury 1930c: 18 January). The Association also attempted to persuade tourists to stay overnight rather than just visiting for the day, which the majority did. They argued that those on day trips spent only 120 minutes at Port Arthur, of which 60 minutes were used for lunch (Mercury 1933b: 18 April). As mentioned in the previous chapter, the 5.00pm timing of the ferry across the Derwent River dictated the rushed return to Hobart (Brimage 1933: 13 December). As the Progress Association had the interests of its members in mind, a longer time spent in Port Arthur meant more opportunity for tourists to spend money.

The Association was instrumental in seeking funds for restoring the Church as it approached its centenary. They stressed its national importance because of the claim to
be Australia’s ‘only bona fide’ ruin (Theobald 1933: 9 March). During the early 1930s suggestions to repair, restore or even rebuild the Church had been made and its importance as the most valued building was emphasised in terms of tourist revenue and heritage value:

“The value of the ruined convict settlement of Port Arthur to the tourist business of Tasmania is too evident to need comment. The reputation of Tasmania as “the playground of Australia” owes much to this resort, with its matchless scenery and picturesque buildings, of which the old church comes easily first in association and beauty” (Theobald 1933, p. 6: 9 March)

In 1933 the plea for funds fell on deaf ears; in 1935, as the centenary approached, another call began after a visitor from Sydney donated £1 towards a fund for restoration, the total for which was estimated at between £700 - £1,000. The Association appealed to the public once more:

“The admiration of tourists and travellers the world over, so valuable an asset should not be allowed to continue its crumbling towards decay. The centenary of the old church occurs next year, and a fitting celebration of so important an anniversary could not be more appropriately carried out than in ensuring its permanence as an object of delight to future generations” (Mercury 1935a, p. 17: 6 April).

Some commentators wished to see the Church completely restored and once again being used (Vigilant 1935: 8 April). The aesthetic values of the church rested in its architecture (Mercury 1938b: 12 July) including the 13 spires which gave it rarity value (Mercury 1938a: 17 February). Other commentators compared it favourably to the ruined monasteries in England, including Glastonbury Abbey (Mercury 1938a: 17 February). Not enough interest or money was forthcoming in time to repair the church for its centenary, but work was carried out in 1937:

“the old church at Port Arthur was being reconstructed at a cost of £600 ... and that on Dead Island some thousands of beautiful bulbs had been planted” (Mercury 1937c, p. 9: 13 November).
Although the Progress Association did not have much success in raising funds for restoration or maintenance they did ensure that Port Arthur was a focus for discussion during the 1930s. Membership of the Progress Association strengthened the relationship between the network of tourism providers in Port Arthur as they worked together to ensure the on-going rejuvenation of Port Arthur.

GUIDES AND GUIDING AND OTHER FORMS OF INFORMATION

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s there was discussion concerning the guides at Port Arthur and how much of their information was authentic and where that information might have come from. In the 1920s, fifty years after the closure of the penal settlement, the second generation of guides were “old enough either to have remembered what they saw, or to have remembered what either ex-convicts or their parents told them” (Hayes 1927, p. 3: 23 September). A visitor from Victoria who stayed at Port Arthur in January 1932 described the commentary of Alf Mawle, a second-generation guide mentioned previously:

“The guide, Alf, gives us little details, always prefixed by “Now, ladies and gentlemen—” And, at the end, he recites “The Convict’s Dream” and “The Stowaway”. An old man of 64, his father and mother were married in Port Arthur Church...” (Whitehouse 1932).

Alf Mawle escorted visitors “among the ‘h’oaks, ‘h’elms and ‘h’ashes that had thrived for so long” (Weidenhofer 1990). As mentioned earlier, when Charles Barrett, author of Isle of Mountains, visited in the 1940s he regretted the passing of Alf Mawle and felt that the guides were less imaginative in their storytelling in their attempt to impart authentic information and knowledge. In 1935 the guides’ talks were still overly-exaggerated and sensational, leading one visitor to complain that the tour led by ‘Harry the guide’ included scenes of “many revolting and cruel incidents”, and being shut in the dark cell, “it was with a sigh of relief we emerged again after less than a minute’s captivity” (Parish 1935).

By 1952, the guide, Mr Tom Free had conducted more than 100,000 people around the ruins (Mercury 1952: 14 October). When he died in July 1967, aged 92, he was described as one of Tasmania’s best known personalities, “who for nearly a quarter of a
century had been the official guide at Port Arthur” (Obituary 1967). Since the 1950s the Port Arthur guides have not been as well-known.

William Radcliffe, mentioned earlier, was very involved in tourism at Port Arthur during the 1930s. He was a member of the Port Arthur Progress and Tourist Association and an avid collector and storekeeper in Port Arthur, who opened the first on-site museum of convict curios. He also owned the Powder Magazine (tower) and Smith O’Brien’s Cottage. In 1935 he was asked by Mr. Emmett of the Tourist Bureau to provide a suitable talk for the guides to give to tourists. Radcliffe’s suggested talk was dry and factual, full of information with only an occasional story to lighten the narrative. In 1939, questions arose concerning the authenticity of the guides stories, and it was suggested that the guides “should be compelled to stick, as far as a guide was able to stick, to the truth as ordinary persons knew it” (Mercury 1939b: 8 December), suggesting that some may have still been prone to dramatizing their narrative. However, when Charles Barrett visited in the 1940s he compared the present guide with his memories of Alf Mawle:

“the new guide proved to be a different kind of man. He spoke good English and knew what he was talking about. … I was often rude enough to move away before he had finished his guide-talk” (Barrett 1946)

In 1938 Radcliffe responded to complaints in the newspaper about the amount of property at Port Arthur that was in private hands, and therefore not available for visitors meaning that the guides were forced to talk about the buildings from the outside. His response explains the position of the Council at the time:

“At the beginning of the tourist season I offered the round tower to the Tasman Municipal Council so that its guides could take tourists through the buildings, the Council in return to keep the tower in repair. The Council declined the offer, stating that it could not repair private property. I then suggested that the Council pay me a small rent, the proceeds of which I would devote to repairs. This offer also was refused.... At present the guides employed by the Council explain these buildings from outside. Although I am not receiving any benefit by so doing, I have informed all the guides that if they wish they may take their parties through these buildings, provided the Council does not object. Anyone
visiting Port Arthur will not be debarred from going through the tower and exile’s cottage. These buildings are open for inspection, and no charge will be made” (Radcliffe 1938a)

As mentioned in the previous chapter, there was no official guidebook for Port Arthur. In 1928 the production of a guidebook was again under discussion (Mercury 1928c: 28 March) with the suggestion that the Port Arthur Progress and Tourist Association (mentioned above) should be responsible for publishing

“an illustrated booklet detailing the history of the settlement, and mentioning the most important facts connected with the early days of the Peninsula” (Mercury 1928c: 28 March).

As the Progress Association had no funds, nothing happened and no book was produced. This was rectified by the 1940s when several publications were for sale providing various types of information for visitors. Some of the books were pictorial whereas others were more descriptive.

In 1941, Beverley Coultman Smith, dedicated his book, Shadow over Tasmania (Smith, BC 1941), to the Hermit of Point Puer, Mr. J.D. Danker. Mr Danker reportedly lived amongst former convicts who had returned to Port Arthur following their release, telling him stories which conflicted with the official version of events. Tourists would make their way to his home to be regaled with “tale after tale of the convict days and ‘old lags’ he had known” (1939). Coultman Smith used the stories, as narrated by Mr. Danker, in his book which takes a very different view of convict days to those stories of horror and terror and describes life in the penal settlement as reforming, offering those who were incarcerated a better future than they would have had in England. In summing up Port Arthur he says

"Nature has bestowed her beauties and her curiosities lavishly on this tract of land where lie the memorials of a system of which we should be proud, not ashamed - for it laid the foundations of Tasmania today."(Smith, BC 1941, p. 148)

Beverley Coultman Smith continued to be an advocate for the reforming nature of Port Arthur and attempted to change visitors’ perceptions of the place through his
interpretation. He published several other books including *Port Arthur’s Convict Days: An historic and pictorial review of Port Arthur, Tasmania* (Smith, BC 1955), which opened with the statement that:

“the horror tradition that surrounded Port Arthur and convict Tasmania is dead. Today intelligent people realise that Britain’s transportation of felons to the Australian colonies was a far sighted and on the whole successful colonisation scheme” (Smith, BC 1955, p. 1)

In 1951 a photographic publication called *Beautiful Hobart and Surroundings* by J.C. Breaden, which included photographs of Port Arthur, but the only explanation about Port Arthur described the Penitentiary as being capable of “accommodating 657 men in separate cells and dormitories” (Breaden 1951b), but nothing more informative about it having been a penal settlement or a mention of convicts. In 1953 a visitor complained that the only way of discovering any information was to go with a guide, otherwise there was “no hope of learning what the various buildings are and the history attached to them” (Mercury 1953: 9 November). This commentator added:

“the only signpost is a small one which points vaguely in the direction of O’Brien’s cottage and the hospital. The penitentiary is indicated only by a notice prohibiting entry because of the risk of falling masonry, and the model prison only by a notice barring entry to all except those accompanied by a guide” (Reporter 1953).

This situation was rectified by 1963 when an official history of Port Arthur had been printed and was for sale in the “store situated close to the jetty” where “the harbour and present-day surrounds reflect a tranquillity far removed from those earlier days” (Tasmanian Motor News 1963: February).

**THE CREATION OF SYMBOLS**

During the period under review in this chapter, the symbols used to signify the heritage values of Tasmania were mixed. The Tourist Bureau recognised the value of the convict past to Tasmania, and displayed implements of torture in its window as a promotional display (Garnett 1932: 22 February). At the same time Tasmania was promoted for its
scenic attractions, being referred to as the “Switzerland of Australia” (Victorian 1933: 9 February):

“*This State has marvellous scenic attractions, all within easy distance .... and that is why we prefer it to the mainland States, where one has to travel enormous distances through uninteresting country to reach the scenic resorts*”

(Birrell 1934, p. 6: 20 January)

At Port Arthur, the ruined Church was not only symbolic as a romantic ‘folly’ but represented a link between the present and an imagined past. It was suggested that a new tradition should be an annual service:

“*with the lights from the town’s power plant to illuminate the scene. Such a function would be a link with the past, and the atmosphere one to conjure the imagination*” (Mercury 1944b, p. 3: 21 December).

Port Arthur was variously described as pretty and romantic (Hoppe 1930: 17 May), and many commented on the contrast between the aesthetic experience of being at Port Arthur and the image portrayed by the guides telling the story of horror:

“*much has been done by historians to reconstruct the horrors that were enacted in this spot. Sitting at tea on the stone-flagged verandah [sic] of one of these comfortable old houses – it used to be the doctor’s house in convict days – I reconstructed a very different set of pictures. The peace and serenity of the place took possession of me, and filled my mind with visions of past happiness. .. All that was lovely and of good report had lingered in the atmosphere, and the evil had been completely shed away – had vanished into nothingness*” ..“to the sensitive spirit the air is full of little ghosts of love and mirth. One knows beyond question that they were once living forces, since they have left such an enduring mark upon the place. More real were they than the transitory emotions of hatred and dejection, which have fled, leaving no trace of their existence”

(Spencer 1927, p. 10: 9 November).

Another tourist experience describes the sensory nature of the visit and the way in which embodiment within the landscape can symbolise hope and promise:
“to those with ‘the seeing eye, the hearing ear, and the understanding heart.’

Tasman Peninsula presents many lovely pictures, where the hills glow and the lambent sea whispers. The full world rolls in a rhythm of praise. All that is typical in sight, sound and scent may be seen in this Land of Promise, whence one is impressed also by the feeling of limitless beyond of sea and land, and the sense of man’s inseparable union with the whole” (Rowlands 1931, p. 8: 25 February)

A suggestion that the gardens at Port Arthur should be reinstated as well as preserving the ruins was made in the 1930s along with a growing interest in the people who had lived and worked in the settlement. Some of the visitors tried to imagine life at Port Arthur for those who were not convicts, particularly the women, who lived in the penal settlement, and more pleasant symbols of the past began to shape the development of the heritage story:

“People forget that the English ladies there must have tried, with flower and shrub, to make it as much like England as possible. Surely, a little could be done now, in fairness, to recreate the better part of those days ... the enclosure planted with old-fashioned English flowers, hollyhocks, pleatees [sic], sweet William, lemon thyme, verbena, etc. and hardy shrubs such as lilac, flowering currant, lavender and jassamine [sic]. It need cost very little, and should be a commercial proposition as well as an act of decency. No dahlias or gladioli, I pray you – or leg irons!” (Victorian 1935, p. 8: 26 April).

Following the Second World War, this wish seems to have been achieved as Port Arthur is described as having

“an old world charm about its layout, and the English trees, shrubs and flower which flourish there. The surroundings too, are beautiful as are the wildflowers” (Mercury 1945, p. 3: 2 April).

The ruins at Port Arthur symbolised the sacredness of the past meaning it was possible to see how much society had progressed:

“I would not have these ruins other than they are today. I find only a Divine justice in the fires which swept Port Arthur as the very cities of the plain, I would not have this brooding silence broken by gay and swinging breeze, or this dim
light illumined by summer sun. Always I would have this shattered might of stone and iron preserved to view as an inheritance, not for our race alone, but for humanitarians from about the world. Here are the monuments of victory; here is a battleground of liberty and faith against oppression, cruelty, and shame. Here is no place for morbid mind or cheap sensation-monger; here in truth is hallowed ground” (Bridges 1930, p. 12: 6 September).

And the ruined Church was used as a symbol of repentance and reform when the fires cleansed the past and offered redemption:

“Without doubt it must have been a fine-looking building before the flames descended upon it and wrought destruction, like a fire from heaven consuming a sacrificial offering” (Corringham 1935, p. 11: 22 June)

As mentioned previously, the Church was also symbolic of the permanence of Australia, when it was built, it was a stone edifice in a new colony which had no guarantee of succeeding. By the time the Church had become a ruin and was one hundred years old, standing as testimony to the success of Australia as an independent nation.

INNOVATION AT PORT ARTHUR

The changes that took place during this period were slow and incremental, driven by internal and external events. External events including the filming of For the Term of His Natural Life, and internal events such as the centenary of the Church forced Port Arthur back into the public gaze as the discussions about the future of the ruins continued. One of the major changes in this period was the desire to see Port Arthur razed and the history of the penal settlement obliterated, which had been prevalent earlier, was replaced by an appreciation of the heritage values in terms of tourist revenue. The fact that history offered a competitive advantage as something unique in Australia was also appreciated for the first time, although most of the heritage interest came from non-Tasmanians, while Tasmanians were amongst those who took holidays in Port Arthur for the other activities it offered.

The type of experience which tourists had when they visited Port Arthur also changed. In the 1920s road access was possible but difficult, however once a bridge had been
built across the Derwent River in 1943 (Rackham 2005), people had the ability to stay longer and enjoy more at Port Arthur as they were no longer limited by the timing of the ferry to return to Hobart. At the beginning of the period, Tasmanians perceived their history as shameful but the filming of *For the Term of His Natural Life* forced a discussion about which image Tasmania wished to portray to a global audience. For the first time Tasmanians realised that they needed to control this image and that it was mutable. The constructed image had to be socially acceptable as well as inviting for potential tourists, but scenic attractions rather than the historic attractions were given primacy during the 1930s and 1940s.

By the 1960s it was increasingly evident that the heritage of Port Arthur was a competitive advantage that would attract more tourists than scenery. At the time of growing consumerism, tourism was recognised throughout the State as a large and successful industry and tourists were becoming increasingly demanding and finicky about what they accepted from tourism suppliers. The Government buy-back of the most historic buildings at Port Arthur was particularly innovative, involving an element of risk. It was also a pioneering step in advance of any similar action or attraction in Australia. Pioneer Settlement in Victoria, was opened in 1963, as the first open air museum which was the only similar attraction at the time – although not an authentic site as Port Arthur was. The purchase of the buildings was in the interests of tourism rather than preservation for heritage values, but heritage provided the competitive advantage and was a driver for innovation.
CHAPTER SEVEN:
A PLACE FOR HERITAGE TOURISTS

BACKGROUND

The period that is considered during this section lasted from 1971 to 1997. During this period the tourist resort was transformed into a heritage tourist attraction. The changes that occurred were slow and incremental, but comparing the situation at the start and at the end of the period shows how radical they were. The chapter starts by analysing the external environment to discover how social perceptions changed towards Port Arthur, driven by a combination of events. It then goes on to consider the internal environment and the actions taken to maintain the relevance of Port Arthur to a contemporary audience. The chapter ends with a tragic event that has not yet been absorbed into the story of Port Arthur; as such it marks the time-lag which must pass before events can be seen through hindsight and interpreted from an acceptable perspective with a level of objectivity.

THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

There were three specific external events which occurred during the first 25 years of this phase which changed how Port Arthur was perceived and managed. These included the Burra Charter and Australian Heritage Commission; The Franklin Dam debate; and the Port Arthur massacre, all of which will be discussed in this section. Other events that affected the perception of Port Arthur and its heritage value included the Bicentenary in 1988 (covered below under the section on Australian national identity) and the severe economic belt-tightening that took place in the mid 1980s.

THE BURRA CHARTER AND THE AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

The first event concerned how the issue of conservation affected the heritage value of Port Arthur. The Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance, known as the Burra Charter, (Appendix 5) was adopted in 1979, as mentioned previously. This
Charter set out the principles that guide the preservation and restoration of historic buildings. The Australian chapter of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) developed the Charter. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Venice Charter (1964) was the prototype that specified that although the agreement was on an international basis, each country should be responsible for applying it according to national culture and traditions. The Burra Charter is the version specific to Australia (ICOMOS 1999). This Charter introduced a new mind-set for those involved in planning the future of Port Arthur. The management plans drawn up during the 1970s advocated restoration and development; following the adoption of the Burra Charter, conservation became the primary driving policy for Port Arthur. Agreement to follow the principles laid down in the Burra Charter provided the framework for the management of Port Arthur from 1979 onwards. This new attitude led to the Conservation and Development Project, which will be covered in more detail below, but which is, to a large extent responsible for the built heritage evidence of Port Arthur today.

The Australian Heritage Commission was established in July 1976 for the purpose of listing and protecting places of heritage values on a Register of the National Estate. From the outset, the work of the Commission was controversial and severely criticized by those who believed that it would limit the ability of industry, particularly the extractive industries of mining and forestry, both of which were important in economic terms for Tasmania (Felmingham 2006; Gale & Jacobs 1987). By 1978 the commission had published lists proposing 6000 places for inclusion on the Register of the National Estate, 470 of which were removed following objections (Ashton & Cornwall 2006). In 2004 the Australian Heritage Commission was replaced with the Australian Heritage Council (Australian Heritage Council 2010). Although outside the case study period, in August 2010 Port Arthur was listed on the World Heritage List (UNESCO 2011).

THE FRANKLIN DAM DISPUTE

Although seemingly unconnected with Port Arthur, the outcome of this dispute had severe economic effects which impacted on the development of Port Arthur, which will be discussed below. In 1979 the Tasmanian Labour government passed plans for the second stage of a hydro electricity development, which proposed to build a dam on the Gordon River on the west coast of Tasmania. The proposed plan was to create a man-
made reservoir, flooding 35 kilometres of the Franklin River, including the destruction of Aboriginal artworks and threatening several endangered species. Conservationists promoted the area as ‘Tasmania’s last wild river’. The conservation movement grew to encompass not only Australian but international interest and was the catalyst for a significant political battle. The Tasmanian State Government supported the plan despite lobbying and a blockade of the area by conservation activists. The Federal Government was against the plan and passed legislation to stop development from proceeding, which the Tasmanian Government ignored. The battle ended in the High Court, which ruled against the Tasmanian Government and the development was stopped in 1983. The National Parks and Wildlife Service were strongly in support of the ‘No Dam’ lobby and proposed that a national park be set up in the same area as the proposed Dam, setting them against the State Government (Commonwealth v Tasmania (The Tasmanian Dam Case) 1983; Bandler 1987). When the Tasmanian Government agreed to forgo construction of the dam they were paid $500 million in compensation by the Federal Government (Felmingham 2006).

To exacerbate the situation, in 1983, the Hawke Labour Government was elected to power under an election commitment to restricting expenditure, tax revenues and deficits. This was a response to a prolonged period of recession plus a falling Australian dollar and external debt. In May 1986 the Treasurer, Paul Keating warned that consumption had to be reduced if Australia was to avoid becoming a ‘banana republic’ (Head 1988). Consequently, by the mid-1980s fiscal spending had been reduced substantially alongside an insistence that public enterprises must pass the test of efficiency if they were to survive (Head 1988). During 1986 the Tasmanian State Government unsuccessfully attempted to negotiate for an extension to the funding for the Port Arthur Conservation Project (discussed in detail below), which ceased to be operational in late 1986. In May 1986, Barry Cohen, Federal Minister for the Arts, Heritage and the Environment, announced that there would be no further Commonwealth money available for the project, and if further assistance was considered necessary:

“The Tasmanian Government should have used Bicentennial funds or the compensation funds provided by the Commonwealth for the cessation of work on the Franklin Dam … it was unreasonable for the State to seek additional
funding as the State Government had not pursued either of the courses ... the (State Government) would have a bloody hide coming back to us and saying it was all our fault when they have chosen not to use money from the dam compensation and the bicentenary ... they did not think highly enough of the project to spend one cent from those funds” (Mercury 1986a, p. 1: 9 May).

THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE

This event, which completely changed perceptions of Port Arthur, occurred on the 28th April 1996, when a lone gunman walked into the Broad Arrow Café at the Port Arthur Historic Site and commenced a killing spree. His rampage spread through the café, gift shop, carpark and exit routes before arriving at the toll booth, a local garage and eventually a bed and breakfast, where he killed a hostage and was eventually captured. In the end 35 people were murdered, 21 injured and many others left with mental scars which have still not healed.

Even though the massacre occurred largely within the physical location of the historic site, it is considered to be an external event in terms of this research, as the management of the site had no control over what occurred. However, the place was acutely affected by the massacre. The comment about the event, in the guidebook, which is given to everyone at the entrance to the site today, under the heading, frequently asked questions, reads:

“our staff are always keen to help visitors with enquiries, but this is one area about which they prefer not to be asked. Many lost close friends, colleagues and family members on that day, and understandably find it painful to talk about. Rather than ask our staff, please read the plaque at the Memorial Garden or ask for a brochure at the Visitor Centre” (Clark 2006)

The section about the Memorial Garden gives more detail about the massacre, explaining why the garden exists as a “place of quiet beauty and calm contemplation” (Clark 2006) within the shell of the semi-demolished café.

The distance in time between the massacre and the present is deemed too short to gauge how it will be absorbed into the story of place in the future. At the present time there is still uncertainty about the event which prohibits it from becoming an
interpreted part of the story as too many people were directly affected and the event lives on in their memory. Consequently, the event has been left at a loose end for those who knew nothing about it before their visit to Port Arthur. For some of those still involved at Port Arthur the massacre remains a very large part of the present and has, to an extent, been protected from tourism. The lack of a full explanation means the site of the massacre and its story appears to be somewhat private, something from which outsiders are excluded.

NATIONAL IDENTITY IN AUSTRALIA

Since the 1960s many commentators have identified a shift in social outlook from that of modernism to postmodernism. In terms of national identity, this has led to a period of ‘post-nationalism’ (Habermas 1992; Jupp 1998; Stokes 1997). Postmodernity brought a move away from a single national identity, towards a greater range of identities to which individuals could choose to belong or not. Personally relevant identities include gender, race, ethnicity, and the age (Stokes 1997). It was no longer enough for heritage places to reflect one national identity; they had to be representative of a plethora of identity types, reflecting meanings for each. This has increasingly challenged those tasked with interpreting heritage places and maintaining their relevance during the last fifty years.

The Bicentenary in 1988 urged Australians to reflect on the past two hundred years and the events that had shaped the nation and its people. In a period when postmodern attitudes and the deconstruction of traditional norms was prevalent, the Bicentenary was a challenge for Australia and what it meant to be Australian (Arrow 2009; Healy 2001). Australia’s contested history was escalated by the Bicentenary celebrations, including attitudes concerning the convict era. An image representing a multicultural demographic was adopted to portray the nation as productive, diverse and future focussed (Melleuish 1998b) in an attempt to incorporate all ethnic identities into a national identity (Kapferer 1996). The shifting national identity once again changed how heritage places such as Port Arthur were perceived within the Australian story. It also meant that the interpretation of the convict story and the signs and symbols used to
trigger meaningful engagements altered in line with the new expectations of a contemporary audience.

**MANAGEMENT: PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**

In 1971 the Parks and Wildlife Service became responsible for the management of Port Arthur, as mentioned above. For the first time the site was managed primarily as a tourist attraction rather than a township or a resort. At first, planning took place, but as National and global attitudes towards heritage and conservation changed, the plans were superseded before they could be acted upon. The Scenery Preservation Board had considered the ruins as little more than a backdrop to create scenery, but when the Parks and Wildlife Service took over, they were tasked with managing the entire site for tourist purposes. Due to economic constraints their priorities were basic, and involved trying to stop the buildings from collapsing onto tourists and ensuring they were not a health hazard:

“When the National Parks and Wildlife Service assumed responsibility for the site in 1971 it was presented with a shambles. All but one of the convict-built buildings was on the verge of being condemned, the ruins collapsing and visitor facilities were decidedly unhealthy. The Park Service attempted to remedy as many of the problems as it could concentrating on visitor safety, sewerage, clean water and visitor facilities” (Egloff 1984, p. 73).

As will be seen below, between 1971 and 1996 much discussion centred around producing Management Plans rather than acting on them. Because these plans were released as drafts with comments invited, the submissions from private individuals, as well as public organisations and Government Departments, have been illuminating and a useful primary source to understand the concerns which were paramount at discrete periods.
THE 1970S PLANS

The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) were appointed to manage Port Arthur under the terms of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1970. A proviso of the Act (Part IV) was that a management plan had to be produced. In May 1972, Peter Murrell, Director of the NPWS wrote a letter to the Lands Department asking for a plan of the grounds which were considered to be part of the historic site. This request shows how confusing the situation was at the time, especially concerning land ownership, and this issue had to be sorted out before any planning could commence.

“during land tenure studies it appeared that, although this Service has indeed the control of most of the township, the land holdings concerned are very much fragmented through the existence of proclaimed but unconstructed streets and remnants of private property, crownlands [sic] and foreshore reserves” (Murrell, P 1972)

At the beginning of 1972, Mr Murrell wrote to various Government Departments for their contributions to a management plan for Port Arthur. Neither the Marine Board nor the Department of Roads wished to add anything. The Lands Department replied with a memorandum which shows that the values attached to Port Arthur were based on its representation as a historic marker for the Australian nation, rather than just the economic benefits from tourism:

“it is considered that the primary aim of the management plan should be the preservation and development of Port Arthur as a national monument. In this regard Port Arthur is an historic relic to the Tasmanian people in particular and to the Australian people as a whole. Any other objective in the development of Port Arthur must be subsidiary to this primary aim” (Director of Lands 1972).

Further suggestions from the Department of Lands included the segregation of the historic site by separating the public amenities, car parking and concessionaires to an area outside the core historic site (Director of Lands 1972); these proposals were the

---

8 Throughout this chapter and subsequent ones, direct quotations are included from various unpaginated sources. As such, it has not been possible to include a page number next to the reference.
first to point towards the eventual partitioning of the heritage fabric and the day to day tourist business and facilities. The fragile nature of the ruins and the deteriorating materials from which they were built meant some rebuilding would be needed and long term reconstruction would be inevitable (Director of Lands 1972). Guiding and audio recorded tours, plus discreet labelling and key explanatory booklets were the favoured forms of interpretation (Director of Lands 1972).

The appointment of a ranger was proposed, who would be in charge of maintenance, ground keeping, cleanliness and public discipline, but who would not be involved with any architectural or conservation aspects of the built fabric, which would be the responsibility of specialist architectural or headquarter staff (Director of Lands 1972). The separation of the roles between those involved with tourists and those involved with conservation was already evident in this memorandum which advocated that dealing with tourists was not a specialised role whereas someone qualified, from outside the site, would take responsibility for the built fabric (Director of Lands 1972). The memo also pointed out that if no finance was forthcoming then the plan would be of little use. Dividing the plan between those aspects which would require little capital and those which would entail more expenditure was suggested. Finance would be raised through introducing an entrance fee and continuing to charge for the guided tours (Director of Lands 1972).

The Director General of the Tourism Development Authority also forwarded comments to the NPWS, specifically two reports on Port Arthur that had been commissioned by the Tourism Development Authority the previous year. These were sent to the NPWS on 17 March 1972 (Butler, L 1972a). The two reports, to an extent, formed the basis for the plan that was eventually written, but not implemented until 1975. Some of the ideas found their way into the 1985 Management Plan. The changes made between the drafts and the plans, as well as those commentaries from interested parties are a record of shifting attitudes about the values of Port Arthur over this period. Although the Tourism Authority commissioned both reports in 1971, they are included here as their importance lies with their initial contribution to the NPWS draft plan in 1972.

Alan Nelson of Roy Grounds & Company produced the first report for the Tourism Development Authority. The notable aspect of the Nelson report is that it considered conservation and restoration as a priority:
“what remains in Tasmania at Port Arthur, Salt Water Creek, Maria Island and other locations constitute the only significant ruins in Australia today” (Nelson 1971)

At Port Arthur, conservation was identified as “an immediate requirement” (Nelson 1971) followed by the production of a feasibility plan and estimates for the work to be carried out, both of which would feed into a master plan for management and strategy (Nelson 1971). Conservation specified that there would be no attempt to rebuild or recreate any aspects of the built heritage, apart from those places that the circumstances or the fabric would permit (Nelson 1971). The target market was identified as having: “a vital interest in nations, people, culture and history. Their desire is to absorb and to record” (Nelson 1971).

Nelson suggested that the civic planning should be reinstated, including pathways, roadways, horticulture and the general environment permitting tourists to appreciate the location of the various ruins (Nelson 1971). Models to show how Port Arthur was laid out during the penal settlement era were to be constructed to aid orientation (Nelson 1971). Planning would provide tourists with places to contemplate, photograph and to mentally and graphically record what they had seen; enabling them to construct an emotive image and their own connections to the past (Nelson 1971). All graphics, signs and publications were to be as unobtrusive as possible and a form of branding, following a basic theme, would be installed (Nelson 1971).

The report discussed the reason why the ruins should be more than a backdrop to nature, at the same time as pointing out that tourism by the 1970s was a participatory activity. Nelson’s covering letter says:

“Tourism is not topography, geography, horticulture nor climatic environment. Tourism today is a vast intellectual exercise acted out by individual people moving throughout the world. Tasmania has a great stage on which people may take part in the play. The colony ruins should be part of this vast intellectual exercise and in no way represent the Carnival or Disneyland type of statement being thrust upon the international tourist in many parts of the world today” (Nelson 1971).
The second report commissioned by the Tourism Development Authority was by T.R. Mellor who was employed at Australia’s first open air museum, Swan Hill Pioneer Settlement which was opened in 1963 and features a collection of original and replica heritage buildings and experiences such as sound and light shows, horse carriage riding and craft demonstrations. His comments are concerned with the tourism aspects of Port Arthur. The Mellor report also describes Port Arthur as ‘the national monument of Australia’ and emphasises its relationship with national identity.

"Its importance as a national monument: To anyone conscious of the origins of the Australian Nation, Port Arthur is in fact a significant national monument and to see it in such a state of disrepair and disarray at this point of time is civic prostitution of a landmark in the Australian heritage” (Mellor 1971).

Throughout the report, he accentuates the notion that Port Arthur and its history is something of which Australians should be proud and he suggests that with some significant restoration and skilful presentation Port Arthur:

“can present a unique story to Australia and the world – a vitally interesting and human story of the era and one which we, as Australians, can be rightly proud because of its far reaching effects in the structure of our own nation” (Mellor 1971).

The suggestions which Mellor made concerning the administration, management, development and maintenance of Port Arthur was that “the various ‘convict relics’ of the Tasman Peninsular should be seen as one unit” (Mellor 1971) which he suggested should be placed under a single management authority.

“The Committee of Management should be relatively small (no more than 10) and representative of a number of interested parties who are vitally concerned with the redevelopment of Port Arthur, its preservation as an historic monument and the creation of a major tourist enterprise” (Mellor 1971).

The Management Committee would be responsible for developing: (a) preservation; (b) exhibition and (c) financial planning (capital works and commercial undertakings) with the dual aims of maintaining Port Arthur as a national monument and making it a viable part of the tourist industry, which entailed enclosing the site (Mellor 1971). He
suggested that this plan would instil a feeling of responsibility and pride in achievement which would work towards re-establishing the area (Mellor 1971). The Management Committee:

“should have the power to set charges for all visitors entering the area and to establish such commercial enterprises as conducive to the total atmosphere and without detriment to the historical presentation, for example, souvenir sales, food, producing of literature and the possible “on site” manufacture of souvenirs” (Mellor 1971).

Further proposals were that funding should come from the Government for a set period, while the capital works were carried out. Once this was accomplished, a not-for-profit company would be established which would be answerable to a Board of stakeholders who “proved themselves worthwhile in the developmental period” (Mellor 1971). A relationship with Government would be maintained to ensure access to finance, which might otherwise be unobtainable, and to provide a link between management and the Tasmanian community. He suggested that this would facilitate networking with other tourist operators in Tasmania and on the mainland, in creating future tourism packages:

“It is my opinion that such a total management proposal should be established now to create the magnificent asset with a life and spirit of its own, which would undoubtedly contribute to a marked degree to the economic strength of the State of Tasmania” (Mellor 1971).

The plan suggested a combination of buildings, some of which would be preserved as ruins and others that would undergo a full restoration. In September 1972, Leo Butler, Director of the Tourism Development Authority wrote to Murrell, Director of NPWS, to ask whether any action had been taken based on the two reports, and to offer assistance, including financial help from the Australian Tourist Commission (ATC). He stressed that any funding from the ATC would be for study purposes connected with tourism, and it would be necessary “to inform the Commission in precisely what was being done at Port Arthur” (Butler, L 1972b). The reply stated that nothing had been done due to the lack of qualified staff (Murrell, Peter 1972).

By 1974, Frank Bolt, (Planning Officer) was responsible for preparing the management plan for submission to the Government. In a memorandum to the Director of the NPWS
he agreed to the proposals in the reports of Nelson and Mellor, but had concerns about the parking area and the effect that access might have on the carrying capacity of the site (Bolt 1974a). In a Progress Report on the Management Plan, he went on to make suggestions about interpretation, management and funding, proposing that the value of restoration lay in the expected lifespan for the preserved ruins and suggested 150 years would be realistic (Bolt 1974b). Comments on the Draft Management Plan 1975 (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1975) were requested from any interested parties.

Many of the comments received were about the effect the changes would have on the overall tourist experience of being at Port Arthur. The National Trust for Australia was concerned about the aesthetic qualities of the historic site. They proposed that all new building should be subject to architectural controls to ensure the sympathetic character of the site and not destroy visitors’ impressions,

“such architectural controls are quite simple and generally involve only control of roof pitch, colour, choice of materials, etc.” (National Trust of Australia 1975).

The National Trust was also concerned about the ambience of the place and suggests “that a concentration of picnickers in front of the Solitary Prison should be discouraged as far as possible in order to preserve the tranquillity” (National Trust of Australia 1975). Other suggestions entailed ensuring the skyline silhouette would be in keeping with ruins and not be perfected because “perfect workmanship will destroy the illusion”, and “perfect materials will likewise destroy the illusion” (National Trust of Australia 1975).

Cornelius Rhee, a local resident of Koonya, was a vocal member of the local community who felt disenfranchised. He took issue with the repetition in the report that the NPWS will create a “mood of tranquillity and quiet relaxation, matching the more serious aspects of its historical background” (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1975). In his letter, Mr Rhee points out that

“such an image is in direct contradiction with the historical reality of Port Arthur. There is no way to ‘match’ damning reminders with tranquillity. Many visitors are depressed by the historical meaning of Port Arthur and are disgusted by the efforts of NWPS to facilitate a picnic and snapshot atmosphere in a place overhung by suffering” (Rhee 1975)
He was concerned that there had been no local consultation, despite suggestions that the provision of a new by-pass road, the oval and several houses were gestures of goodwill towards the community. He stated “these activities bear no relationship to local benefits. Locals and local facilities are being displaced” (Rhee 1975). He also described the attitude towards the cottage industries (concessionaires) as ‘weak-willed’ and pointed to a lack of commitment about employment opportunities. As far as ‘beautification’, which the plan suggested would involve the local population in an attempt to improve the access routes, he said “the authors are surely joking” (Rhee 1975).

The Director of the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery, Mr D.R. Gregg commented on the differences between preservation, restoration and reconstruction. He was concerned that the emphasis in the draft plan focussed on restoration and reconstruction rather than preservation and he felt this was wrong (Gregg 1975). He also voiced his concern about the carrying capacity of the site if the proposed ‘son et lumiere’ was to go ahead as a regular event (Gregg 1975). His preferred solution was that:

“Emphasis should be on improving the quality of presentation rather than increasing tourist numbers. What is needed is to ensure that visits to Port Arthur are meaningful and that people take away an accurate appreciation of its significance in Australian and Tasmanian history” (Gregg 1975).

He goes on to stress that the interpretation of the site should centre on its significance to the visitor, should be backed by sound scholarship and not submerged by efforts to entertain (Gregg 1975).

During the late 1970s, during the formation of the Burra Charter, previously noted, shifting attitudes about conservation and the value of authenticity at heritage sites meant that the plan was superseded before it could be implemented. The heritage values of Port Arthur in the late 1970s were appreciated apart from their economic values for tourism and the idea that conserving and protecting the built heritage began to emerge. The idea that a team of specialists might be employed to carry out conservation work at Port Arthur was mooted. Murrell posited that the revised plan
should include a Conservation Plan which could be implemented by such a specialised technical team (Murrell 1978).

In April 1978 Murrell (NPWS) responded to a letter from the Director of the newly formed Australian Heritage Commission following a report which the Commission had made on Port Arthur at the request of the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Murrell 1978). His comments succinctly explain the contemporary values placed on Port Arthur:

“this service holds the view that the physical part of Port Arthur can only have a meaning and value as a backdrop to the long term historical significance of the events that took place here, together with the implication of these events on our life today. Only in this manner Port Arthur will not degenerate into a weird curiosity, but remain a real and significant part of the recent past of this nation” (Murrell 1978).

The state Government valued Port Arthur as a pull factor for tourism to Tasmania, but once conservation became a priority the focus was on protecting the built heritage rather than exploiting it. This inevitably meant a change in the proposed tourist experience and concurrently, the type of tourist who would be attracted to visit. How to find a balance between conservation and tourism was problematic:

“Port Arthur constitutes an important segment of the Tasmanian Tourist Industry which in turn forms a significant part of the island’s total economy, and the Tasmanian Government is likely to be reluctant to follow a policy which may influence the place of Port Arthur in this industry in a negative manner” (Murrell 1978)

When no funding was forthcoming for the specialised team to work on conserving Port Arthur, a request was made to the Federal Government for help. Port Arthur was having difficulty

“obtaining the required resources for the compilation and implementation of a “Conservation Plan”, and would welcome appropriate assistance from the Australian Government in this matter” (Murrell 1978)
The 1975 plan remained a draft and was still being commented upon in 1980 when the next plan was in the process of being drawn up. As mentioned previously, in the years preceding the new draft plan, attitudes changed as a conservation ethos developed during the formulation of the Burra Charter. Once this was implemented in 1979 many of the ideas that had been discussed could be put into effect. In the early 1980s, two things were taking place at the same time: first the NPWS was in the process of developing another Management Plan and secondly, the Port Arthur Conservation and Development Project, which ran from 1979 – 1986, had been initiated.

THE 1980S PLANS

In 1980 a Sydney-based consultant, Ken Latona, of Latona, Masterman and Associates, was commissioned to produce research in advance of drafting a new management plan. This study took place at the beginning of 1981 and each month reported on a different aspect of the plan. Latona surveyed the local community as well as staff from the site, some of whom lived in Port Arthur and were therefore local stakeholders as well as employees.

This section aims to capture the emotive nature of the discussion and the ‘tussle’ involved in developing the 1985 plan which was at the crux of a paradigm shift in values, purpose and significance of the site. This plan was aimed at changing the image of Port Arthur from a place of recreation to a place with ‘sacred’ significance in the development of contemporary Australia. The meanings associated with Port Arthur changed as conservation gained further prominence over tourism. The built fabric became time-bound as the ruins were stabilised, as they were in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The tourist experience became educational rather than entertaining and incorporated the conservation activities into the story of the place.

The shift from tourism to conservation as a primary motivation caused some consternation amongst those working for the NPWS and other Government departments as well as private individuals. The paradigm shift that turned Port Arthur from a tourist resort to a heritage site was not without its detractors, who thought it removed the essence of the tourist experience. Others supported the plan, seeing it as adding to the heritage values and conserving the place for future generations. Some of
the comments that capture the concerns of those included in the review of the draft before general release in 1981, are included below. Frank Bolt, who had been responsible for drawing up the 1975 draft management plan, wrote in a letter to the NPWS that:

“the tenor of the plan seems to give a subtle but distinct impression that the presence of visitors on the site is seen as an unfortunate complication of the site management problems” (Bolt 1981)

His main concern was about the types of tourists who would be welcome at Port Arthur and whether consultants from Sydney would understand the type of experience which many who visited wanted:

“so a rationalisation of this problem has been worked out; only those visitors with an ‘approved’ appreciation of the features of the site will be made welcome; others are firmly referred to places elsewhere by making it difficult for them to pursue their particular form of enjoyment on the site” (Bolt 1981).

He went on to describe what he considered to be the ‘usual’ tourist experience:

“many people visit Port Arthur at least once or twice a year, and under those conditions like to use the site as a backdrop for their own way of enjoying the site, which may include picnics, barbeques, kicking a ball, fishing, walking or even simply reading a book under the trees ... many people actually like sharing their day out in an environment crowded with other people similarly inclined, and it would be presumptuous of the Service to deny these simple pleasures to many people” (Bolt 1981).

He suspected an ulterior motive in planning the location for the café, if recreational tourists were not to be welcomed:

“with regard to the relocation of the café to near the proposed parking area, it is believed that this proposition fails to recognise the variety of pleasures that the average visitor likes to enjoy while at Port Arthur. Without it, the management of the site in fact encourages an early departure of many visitors, and it is difficult to admire the elitist way of thinking that surfaces behind the manipulation of human nature this way” (Bolt 1981).
Another letter concerned about the type of tourist attracted to Port Arthur came from H.R. Schulze, Chief Management Officer at the NPWS, who questioned the statement that ‘people come to see the reality of the site’,

“this statement is of doubtful validity as people come to Port Arthur for a variety of reasons. The consultant seems to believe that visitors to Port Arthur are deeply motivated by its historic significance and this assumption is reflected in many of the prescriptions related to visitor facilities” (Schulze 1981).

Concerning the overall tourist experience, which would be site specific and planned to exclude many of the concessions currently operating, he asks:

‘how will visitors be discouraged from using the local motel? Harassment of bus groups? Picketing? Demonstrators with placards: Go away to some other hotel?” (Schulze 1981).

He also asks whether the proposal for five museums is realistic as there may not be the demand to justify the establishment and maintenance costs, especially as he envisions that:

“what people would enjoy most to see was how the Commandant lived, how an officer lived, how a convict lived, etc. Experience has shown that it is only a minority who read the fine text” (Schulze 1981).

Geoff Lennox, the NPWS Education Officer at Port Arthur, although largely supportive of the proposed plan, wrote a letter making suggestions concerning interpretation, starting with the “basic, general message of Port Arthur” (Lennox 1981), before considering the “potential, aim, message and method of interpretation appropriate to each building, ruin or site” (Lennox 1981). Lennox queried the division of responsibilities between those employed on the Conservation Project (see below) and those employed by NPWS, as “expertise is badly needed in the realm of purchasing and ‘furnishing out’ of buildings that are already programmed for restoration” (Lennox 1981). He suggested that from an interpretive viewpoint, the site should be divided along functional lines, depending on activities during the penal era.

One of the major critics was M.G. Duncombe who was a member of the Port Arthur Steering Committee and Head of the Department of Tourism which was largely
responsible for funding the proposed plan. The crux of the problem was that tourism rather than conservation was meant to be the focus of the research:

“the prime objective from a tourism point of view was to detail aspects of ‘people planning’ in conjunction with the important task of detailing policy relating to the fabric of the site. The draft plan as presented has failed to achieve this aim in an acceptable manner and, in my opinion, has had the opposite effect of negating tourism aspects substantially from what exists at present” (Duncombe 1981).

One of the main points raised concerned the use of the buildings, how they were to be conserved and the priority placed on their subsequent use which appeared to favour reconstruction and adaptation of the buildings for administrative use: “This is apparently acceptable, but the reconstruction or restoration for interpretive, educational, or tourism purpose is not” (Duncombe 1981). He went on to add:

“The so called tourism ‘facilities’ lack completely in imagination and consist primarily of five static museums scattered around in buildings not needed for management purposes... At last count, Tasmania had some 54 museums of various sorts, and quite frankly, the tourist is sick of them” (Duncombe 1981).

Use of the site and its presentation were another issue of contention. The plan proposed using some buildings as conference facilities, but trivialised the idea of living history displays. The Tourism Department suggested the following type of experience for tourists:

“not convict lashings but things that move, work, and interpret the era, ie reconstruction of the semaphore system, a section of the convict railway, an example of a saw pit, boat building slipway, blacksmiths shop, garden plots, etc.” (Duncombe 1981).

Following the barrage of comments, the proposed plan was altered to be less obviously conservation centric and another consultant added tourism and visitor programmes. The end result was the Draft Management Plan 1982, which was released to the public, inviting all interested parties to express their views before 28 February 1983 (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982b). Again the balance between conservation and tourism
interests was paramount and finding a compromise was necessary. In the foreword of the draft plan, the values associated with Port Arthur were laid out and the decision to prioritise conservation in the interests of tourism was made clear:

“a major issue which has arisen is the balance to be struck between technically proper conservation and tourist-oriented restoration and other development. A major aspect frequently overlooked by those advocating more tourist development is the very great importance of the authenticity of Port Arthur to the visitor. Its attraction is its authenticity and it is not necessary at this site to create an atmosphere – it exists through the reality of the structures and events which actually occurred there. There can be no doubt that Port Arthur is to be conserved for the visitor for if it were not for them there would be no prospect of its being conserved. It is therefore consistent that the Service’s first concern is for the maintenance of authenticity and the avoidance of developments which would degrade this most important National (and perhaps World) Heritage Site” (Pearsall 1982).

Many people, individuals and organisations made comments on the draft plan and these were incorporated in a document filed on 16 February 1983 relating to 39 submissions (Murrell 1984). The paradigm shift that changed Port Arthur from a heritage place for tourists into a place for heritage tourists (Poria, Butler & Airey 2003) was inconspicuous and many commentators did not realise it was happening. Geoff Pearsall, Minister for Tourism in a letter to the Premier summed the situation up when he said that the plan “pays only lip service” to tourism (Pearsall 1983a). He went on to admit that the delay in the publication of the draft had been due to a second consultant having to be employed specifically to cater for the requirements of tourism (Pearsall 1983a), which the original Latona plan had sought to disparage.

Pearsall’s letter is critical of the actions of the NPWS, stating that for the first two years of the project “the majority of the grant was spent upon the development of this State’s leading visitor caravan park” (Pearsall 1983a). He also voiced concerns that the NPWS was attempting to duplicate the type of experience offered at other attractions, competing with smaller operators during a tough economic period and should the living history presentations go ahead, “staffing requirements would escalate to such levels that they could prove to be unacceptable” (Pearsall 1983a).
Other comments concerned the concessionaires with some new services proposed, for example, a convict ship with full scale replica and ‘convicts’ dressed in costumes, or horse-drawn bus tours around Port Arthur once cars had been banned (due to vibrations of the foundations). The Koonya farmer who made this suggestion had built the buses at his own expense and was waiting for permission to use them in July 1983 (Submissions 1983). Other submissions from individuals complained that moving the jetty meant local fishermen would no longer be allowed to use it for recreational (or professional) purposes. This was further evidence that the recreational resort was turning into the historic site from which locals and tourists with interests other than history would be excluded. During its Carnarvon era and until 1983, tourism entrepreneurs had managed the business aspect of Port Arthur, aimed at making a profit. The concessionaires in the early 1980s included the ferry to the Isle of the Dead, the pottery concession, the souvenir shop and the café; but they were slow to realise that the place was changing. Slowly, the NPWS, through the development of their draft plans, were slowly taking over the management of tourism rather than being restricted to the maintenance of the buildings. The site was sacralised for its historic significance, and conserving the Australian heritage became the main function of management at Port Arthur. It was no longer a resort that offered business opportunities to private enterprise, but a Government controlled entity. The local sense of place was threatened as changes were made by outsiders, and the community felt disenfranchised as they had no control over the site, its values or its management (Wells 2010).

The draft plan was eventually submitted to the Government in November 1984. The eventual result was The Management Plan 1985, which once accepted could not be reviewed for another 5 years. An analysis of the changes that were made to the plan between the 1982 draft and the final published version in 1985 shows how attitudes, values and priorities changed in the interim period. The attitude towards accommodation being in short supply, and therefore limiting the opportunity to design longer term interpretive experiences in 1982, changed to acknowledge that if the interpretive experiences were attractive enough they would entice visitors to stay for longer on the Peninsula. This change recognised the central role that attractions play in tourism (Leiper 2004b).
Proposed changes to the visual image, suggested in 1982 were altered in the 1985 plan. For example, the avenue of cedar trees was to be removed in 1982, but pruned in 1985 and the small wooden Anglican Church was to be moved in 1982 but left where it was in 1985; the same was true for the Senior Rangers Cottage. All of these objects date from the post penal settlement era, and represent the Carnarvon period and later. Additional experiences proposed in 1985 which were not included in 1982, included suggestions that a section of the tramway should be reconstructed on the redundant part of the old Nubeena Road; and that the shipyards and lime kiln should be restored, and a walking trail introduced. In 1982 the Isle of the Dead was to be left as it was but by 1985, pathways, landscaping and a programme to stabilise the headstones were added.

One of the major differences between the draft and the final reports was in what Port Arthur symbolised, and to whom. In 1982 it read:

“To all people, however, Port Arthur is a symbol of Australia’s convict background, the predominant feature of early European settlement. It is a particularly important part of the Tasmanian heritage: the island’s convict past, whether accurately known or not, is central to Tasmanians’ image of themselves” (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982a p.50)

Whereas in 1985 the reference to convictism as essentially Tasmanian has been removed, and the statement reads:

“To all people, however, Port Arthur is the pre-eminent national symbol of Australia’s convict background, which in turn was the dominant feature of early European settlement. Port Arthur has a quality of the shrine about it, to which Australians come to touch something of their common past.” (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1985)

Change was also evident in what the tourist experience was perceived to be and which meaningful triggers were to be incorporated into working towards its production. In 1982, the tourist experience was based on heritage and the embodiment of the tourist in the heritage place, augmented by events and activities in which they could choose to participate, including outdoor theatre concentrating on historic themes;
demonstrations of historical occupations; demonstrations of conservation work; and
walks:

“To attract more visitors some side attractions will need to be provided, but they
will support and not run counter to the visitors’ sense of being where it
happened amongst the real, tangible evidence. Apart from catering to the needs
of visitors who seek a place for a pleasant stroll or outdoor lunch, the site will
also provide a program of events and activities relating to Port Arthur’s history”
also ““Victorian pastimes (late and post convict) such as band recitals, cricket
and large picnics in period dress” (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1982a, p.
52 and 59)

By 1985, the tourist experience was to be observational and educational in an effort to
preserve the perceived authenticity of the site, and the notion of engagement was
severely curtailed. Education rather than interpretation or entertainment was proposed
as the linking factor between the place and the visitor:

“Any side attractions permitted on the Site will be required to support and not
run counter to the visitor’s sense of being amongst the real, tangible evidence of
history … It is recognised that visitors need to identify in some way with the
people who created and lived in convict Port Arthur, and this need will at least
initially be met by providing information through publications, signs and other
means which will relate the Site to its early inhabitants … A continuous program
of “dramatising” the Site through such devices as costumed re-enactments has
some financial, logistical and philosophical difficulties which make it an
unsolved problem, but an imaginative educational program will use dramatic
techniques experimentally in the teaching of history” (National Parks and

By the time the 1985 Management Plan was accepted by Government (The Port Arthur
Historic Site Management Plan), there was already consternation concerning on-going
funding for the Port Arthur Conservation Project, which will be considered in the
following section. The Federal Government was tightening its fiscal policy during 1986,
leading to a reduction in the available financial assistance for heritage projects. This was
exacerbated in Tasmania, having already received substantial funding towards the
Conservation Project at Port Arthur, which was perceived as unfair by the other states.
This situation was compounded by Federal Government dissatisfaction with the Tasmanian State Government for not having used the dam or bicentennial funds, mentioned previously, towards extending the Port Arthur Conservation Management Project. The Tasmanian Government, on the other hand, disputed this suggestion because “Tasmania should not have to use its bicentennial funds on a project which has national significance” (Mercury 1986b: 3 April).

The ability of the NPWS to manage the historic site was questioned in March 1986,

“the NPWS has remained oriented towards the management of natural environment, and is not seen as being geared for the management of historic sites. .. If the program stopped, NPWS would not have sufficient staff on site to keep all the buildings open, or to continue with the present regular guided tours of the site” (Fogagnolo & Pos 1986).

Further criticism of the NPWS grew, based on their inability to manage Port Arthur efficiently after two items from the Radcliffe collection, which had previously been part of the on-site museum owned by William Radcliffe, were unaccounted for, plus other managerial concerns.

“We do not want to lose the expert team of workers on the site, but instances such as the ‘missing’ parts of the Radcliffe collection, the present failure to charge a common entry fee to the site and some of the priorities in the use of renovated cottages should all be looked at closely” (Mercury 1986f: 2 April)

By May 1986 the Commonwealth confirmed that it would not consider spending further money on Port Arthur unless it was on an agreed plan that did not include an open ended Federal commitment. The Federal Government’s preferred course was that there should not be an entrance fee, but that the place would become commercially viable through the use of entrepreneurs at the site (Mercury 1986a: 9 May). However, the suggestion that private enterprise should be allowed to manage the site was rejected by the State Government (Mercury 1986c: 12 May). The rejection followed speculation that the management of Port Arthur would be taken over by the Four Seasons Hotel, which was situated on the historic site. The hotel was planning to spend a substantial amount on upgrading their rooms and consequently it was important for them that the
historic site remained attractive to potential tourists. Their suggestion was to create an experience similar to an open air museum with re-enactments (Mercury 1986e: 10 May). Further criticism from private operators was that the site had not been approached as a ‘total concept’, resulting in piecemeal conservation work rather than reconstructed buildings (Mercury 1986d: 13 May). Mr Smith from the hotel Penny Royal in Launceston stated that “purists and some sections of the conservation movement seemed to think they had a God given right to keep Port Arthur as a ruin” (Mercury 1986d: 13 May).

By October 1986, it was obvious that the funds were not to be forthcoming from the Federal Government. The Minister made a statement about the interim management of Port Arthur in which he acknowledged that with the staffing levels as they stood, none of the buildings, newly restored by the Conservation Project, could be opened to the public and nor could the historic structures be maintained. Interpretation through guided tours would also be severely curtailed if action was not taken. The Minister continued to point out that the cost of neglect would be extortionate; at the same time, the public would be denied the benefits resulting from the substantial expenditure on conservation and development to which their taxes had contributed (The Minister for Lands 1986). He went on to proclaim that buildings surplus to staff accommodation needs should be sold or leased, a toll booth erected and an admission charged in order to maximise economic returns and enable Port Arthur to pay for itself (The Minister for Lands 1986). In 1987 the National Parks and Wildlife Service, was incorporated into the Lands Department and responsibility for the heritage buildings was taken from them. This was seen, by some, as retribution by the State Government for the NPWS stance during the Franklin Dam debacle, mentioned earlier. The management of Port Arthur was handed to an independent authority in October 1987, called the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority (PAHSMA), which is the body still tasked with management of the site today.

PORT ARTHUR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

During the period that the National Parks and Wildlife Service were responsible for the management of Port Arthur, the Port Arthur Conservation and Development Project (Project) was initiated, which ran from 1979 to 1986. The purpose of the Project, as far
as the National Parks and Wildlife Service was concerned, was to conserve and enhance
the historic qualities of the place.

“The Port Arthur Conservation and Development Project is a very significant
step in the understanding and conservation of the National Estate: ‘the things
we keep’” (Murrell 1983)

The Project was established through a joint funding agreement between the Federal
and State Governments and provided $9 million over a six year term. The Foreword
written by G. Pearsall, Minister for National Parks and the Environment, in the mid-
project report suggests that, from a Government view, the main driver for preserving
the ruins at Port Arthur was economic, tied to the value of tourism to the State.

It reads:

“the essential character of Port Arthur will ensure its continued role as
Tasmania’s prime visitor destination. Hundreds of thousands of people every
year are entranced, fascinated by the pervading atmosphere of despair and
deprivation emanating from the ruins of this major colonial penal settlement....
Recognition of Port Arthur’s heritage value and its impact on the Tasmanian
economy has led directly to the creation of the Port Arthur Conservation and
Development Project” (Pearsall 1983b).

The Project focused on conservation, employed specialists and explicitly laid out Port
Arthur’s significant values and points out some of its unique features which are listed as
follows:

“For many years last century it was one of the British Empire’s major penal
settlements. With convict labour it became a notable industrial centre...Port
Arthur is a nationally-recognised symbol of Australia’s convict past. This has
made it a major tourist destination...Port Arthur’s buildings and ruins provide an
unsurpassable picture of penal settlement in Australia. They form a recognisable
entity unlike more urban sites” (Port Arthur Project 1983).

From an innovation viewpoint, this was the first conservation project of its type to be
carried out anywhere in Australia. The project involved research into the history of the
site, its design, structure and the materials used in building. In order to carry out the
work a team of specialists was employed including archaeologists, historians, architects, engineers, a curator and an interpretation officer, plus staff and volunteers who worked on various research programmes (Port Arthur Project 1983). Importantly, the Project was to deal with the entire site as one entity for the first time, rather than as a group of independent buildings. The Project was considered by many to be a success, stabilising the ruins at the same time as maintaining the picturesque aspects of the site in which the aesthetic values lie. As a historic record, the ruins: “tell us much about the lives of the convicts and their present derelict state is symbolic of the passing of that era” (Woollan 1986). There were some detractors however, including those such as Dr Kay Daniels, a historian, not associated with the project, who considered the whitewashing and renewal of the cottages detracted from the sense of history surrounding the place (Fogagnolo & Pos 1986).

In 1986 there was no further funding available to retain those employed on the Project or to fund their activities. This led to the formation of the Friends of Port Arthur (the Friends), which acted as a lobby group to protect the long term interests of Port Arthur and other historic sites on the Tasman Peninsula. Their aims were to support the continuation of conservation, restoration and development work; to ensure that the management, interpretation and any other work did not damage the historic integrity of the site; to promote management based on the principles of the 1985 Management Plan (based on the Burra Charter); and to ensure that the management of the site remained a public responsibility not precluding commercial involvement (Friends of Port Arthur 1986).

The Friends wrote to the Premier in August 1986 suggesting that Port Arthur should be run by a site manager, a curator, a gardener and an information officer; all of whom should be qualified and care about the heritage values of Tasmania. They pointed out that since the Project staff had left, the site was beginning to slide into neglect which included the disintegrating walls at the coal mines; the abandonment of the plant propagation programme; and the lack of a curator to accept public donations of furnishings and artefacts (Hamilton 1986). Their aim was to professionalise the roles of those involved in maintaining the integrity of Port Arthur and their concern was that those who had been employed to work on the Project were leaving for other jobs due
to uncertainty about future funding. This impacted on the conservation of the site and on the local community as they lost valued members to other places.

In September 1986, briefing notes for the Minister sum up the situation, confirming that funding would cease on 31st March 1986. Despite continued representation to the Federal Government for an extension, the Prime Minister refused to agree that the Project should be extended. The State Government provided an additional $245,000 between March and September to pay for the continued employment of temporary staff while a proposal for long-term management of the site was under discussion in Cabinet. An entry fee was suggested as a way of increasing revenue for the site (Bennett 1986). At the end of the Project, an article in *The Mercury* summed up the Conservation Project, saying

“The ruins tell us much about the lives of the convicts and their present derelict state is symbolic of the passing of that era. The problem was to stop the process of decay in a way that did not detract from the aged appearance of the ruins. The success of this work can be judged by the fact that the ruins have stopped collapsing and the visitor cannot see what is now holding them up. ... The next era at Port Arthur will be as challenging as the last, since there is now so much more to look after, and a deeper knowledge of its worth” (Woollan 1986).

The demise of the conservation project and the associated lack of funding for conservation forced the pendulum to swing back to prioritising tourism as the focus of the site. This time, it included conservation as an additional cost to be accounted for in the effort of making Port Arthur self-sufficient.

THE PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

As mentioned earlier, in October 1987, the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority was formed. The Board was required to balance history and archaeology with tourism at the same time as becoming a viable commercial enterprise. The 1985 Management Plan stipulated that it was not to be reviewed until 1992 at the earliest. The plan stated that the Interpretation Officer was to be responsible for the promotion of Port Arthur (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1985). This was pertinent to the commercialisation of Port Arthur as it sought to become economically feasible as a business. During the late 1980s and into the early years of the 1990s most of the
commentary about Port Arthur in the newspapers was in the form of promotional excerpts. Before 1996 there was very little discussion about Port Arthur in the letters columns, and most of the articles in the main part of the newspapers referred to the activities and social events which were organised in an effort to attract business, as mentioned in more detail below.

During the period between 1987, when the new authority came into being, and 1992, the earliest date under which the Management Plan could be reviewed, shifts in attitude towards the convict ancestry of Australians began to occur. During the bicentennial year in 1988 an interest in Australian history emerged, including curiosity about the convict heritage of places like Tasmania and the emergence of pride in convict ancestry. This was reflected in values such as equality and mateship which were related back to the convicts (Lewis 1988).

The requirement in the 1985 plan to include activities which promoted Port Arthur to both locals and tourists resulted in events such as the Colonial Village Fair in November 1988 during the bicentennial year, which was advertised as providing: “a source of interest, education and entertainment for all the family” (Sunday Tasmanian 1988: 20 November). Special interest programmes relating to Port Arthur history such as medicine, archaeology, Irish history and gardens were included; as were art sales, period stalls, a bush dance, fishing competition, period costume parade, brass band, singers and a rural fire brigade display; plus a tug of war between the sailors from HMAS Ardent and the “fittest and strongest of the ‘remaining convicts”’ (Sunday Tasmanian 1988: 20 November). Other rather eclectic activities during the three day fair included a free showing of the film For the Term of His Natural Life, a ghost tour, piano recitals, lace making, baton twirling, Maori dancing, wood chopping, a concert by the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra, and an ecumenical service in the ruins of the Church.

During the next couple of years, small conservation projects continued to be undertaken, such as excavations in the ornamental gardens around Government Cottage to discover which plants were used in the early years of the settlement (Mercury 1989b: 11 January). The night-watchman’s barrack was also restored as a tourist shelter, having been used as a public toilet block since the 1920s (Mercury 1989a: 18 August). During the late 1980s the interpretation of the site centred around
positive stories about convicts, such as how they were ‘craftsmen of distinction’, culminating in an exhibition of convict craftworks, presented by the Queen Victoria Museum as a temporary display at Port Arthur (Sunday Tamanian 1989: 10 September). The stories humanised the convicts and provided tangible evidence of their lives. When Professor Manning Clark opened the refurbished museum on the site in April 1990, he said:

“it was long overdue for Tasmanians to accept what happened when the white man first came to Tasmania. “Now we have a different picture in our own minds,” he said. “The convicts built the churches, the schools, and the old buildings – they had courage and strength” (Sale 1990)

Other activities included the extension of the ghost tours throughout the summer season (Tasmanian Country 1989: 1 December) and the success of ‘volunteer’ archaeologists (tourists) who helped to excavate the watchman’s quarters and penitentiary cell block (Mercury 1990: 1 January). Another special event used the kitchen in the Commandant’s cottage, where a cook in period dress baked bread and scones for visitors to try. This was accompanied by the book Convict Recipes which was on sale in the museum (Fyfe 1992; Mercury 1992b: 4 September). During the summer holidays in 1992-93 there was the chance to experience life in an early Victorian era school house where neat slate work and use of quill, nib pen or sand tray would be required (Bingham 1992).

Corporate sponsorship was one form of funding which was sought during this period. Westpac Bank, the TT Line and Flag Hotels sponsored prizes and events at the Colonial Fair, and Tascot Templeton offered to fully carpet the museum once it was completed in 1990 (Mercury 1990: 1 January). The concert series which was designed to attract different tourist segments also sought sponsorship for its 1992 season (Denholm 1991). In 1992 a donation was received from the Australian Cemeteries and Crematoria Association towards continuing restoration on the Isle of the Dead, where the gravestones received a facelift (Mercury 1992a: 4 September). By 1994 corporate sponsorship of special events was an accepted practice, for example, at the Beating of the Retreat parade: “it was impressive to see how many companies lined up with their dollars, and time and expertise, to back the site authority and the defence forces in the presentation” (Bingham 1994).
An increase in the entrance fee in April 1990 was to pay for the conservation of the model prison and the construction of a visitor centre (Sale 1990). Working with local operators to create packages including accommodation and site entry was a way of increasing visitor numbers in the off-season winter months, advertised as offering “Tasmanians the chance of a winter travel bargain” (Bingham 1991), suggesting that the target market was the intrastate tourist seeking a short break.

In 1991 Federal funding allowed Port Arthur to plan for a new visitor centre that was to be constructed over three years. It was to provide

   “interpretation for visitors to comprehend the basic site layout and its facilities, as well as provide for the distribution of literature and shelter for bad weather”
   (Mercury 1991: 14 August).

By August 1991 a marketing promotions officer was employed directly at the Port Arthur site for the first time (Mercury 1991: 14 August). However, many of the events that took place depended on the help of volunteers to make them possible. During 1993 the establishment of a colonial garden which sold its produce, as well as demonstrating the different types of vegetables which the convicts would have eaten, and a nursery which specialised in roses, shrubs and perennials from the colonial and federation eras were opened (Mercury 1993a: 12 April). In 1993 the first military parade of the Beating of the Retreat took place at Port Arthur on Australia Day. The following year the crowd tripled in size and it was suggested that the event become an annual celebration symbolising what it meant to be Australian:

   “we are surely a nation looking for a way of acknowledging our beginnings. Until now the day has meant little more than just another holiday, a cricket match, a race meeting or two; or perhaps that costumed landing somewhere in Sydney” (Bingham 1994: 24 January).

By 1993, David Reed, the general manager of Port Arthur, announced that major developments would take place, including a new visitor centre, moving the car park and entrance and reaffirming the place as a tourist destination in an attempt to draw local tourists to visit. He pointed out that the entrance fee enabled Port Arthur to be independent of both state and federal governments. He also agreed that in the past the
presentation of the site had been confusing and that its interpretation needed work, including tactile elements which let people:

“feel just how heavy the handcuffs are” ... “Port Arthur is a tourist attraction when it is all said and done ... six months ago, I think people were unsure if we were in the architecture, museum or archaeology business” (Turner 1993: 15 May).

Part of the reorganisation a Strategic Management Plan aimed at implementing developments and extensions to the site over a five year period (Mercury 1993b: 5 July). This plan recognised the dual roles of Port Arthur in terms of tourism and conservation and suggested that it should contain separate conservation and interpretation plans.

In 1993, a Consultancy team was appointed to develop a Strategic Management Plan for the Port Arthur Historic Site. The Plan included sub-plans for which specialist consultants were appointed in the fields of Historical Architecture, Conservation, Interpretation and Financial Management (Mazengarb 1993). The aim of the plan was to establish a framework within which the 1985 Historic Site Management Plan could be reviewed, bringing together policies, objectives, strategies and plans in a single document. PAHSMA was responsible for the conservation, interpretation and presentation of the historic buildings and ruins and to ensure that the historic site operated as an effective tourist attraction providing visitor facilities of an international standard (Mazengarb 1993). The balance between conservation and tourism was challenged once again, as conservation work had to be funded from tourism revenue, which the new plan aimed to increase from $1.3 million to $2.2 million within 5 years (Mazengarb 1993). The scope of the new plan was to:

- “Upgrade the Site to provide tourist facilities of a national standard, including the provision of a Visitor Centre, new products and the development of an asset management strategy”
- “Present the Site, and its history, to the public in a lively and entertaining manner within an interactive educational framework.
- “Develop a corporate culture within the organisation which is sensitive to the needs of the market and its customers (Mazengarb 1993).
In June 1995 PAHSMA became subject to the provisions of the Government Business Enterprise Act 1995, which required commercial operations and accountability to the Government (Auditor-General 1997). The aim was that the site would become self-sufficient and self-determining, divorcing it from political intervention (Coombs 1997). A two-pronged approach was adopted in order to balance the requirements of economic sustainability and conservation work. First there was to be an increase in revenue from a new visitor centre and by installing a sound and light show; secondly, corporate sponsorship would be sought for specific conservation projects (Auditor-General 1997). In August 1995 a development strategy was underway for an Interpretation Plan for Port Arthur that aimed to use innovative interpretation techniques; recognised the continuing heritage significance of the historic site and incorporated the Carnarvon period, as well as the pre-convict Aboriginal period of the site. Thematic interpretation techniques were to link the history of the site, the physical remains and the current social issues to create meaningful connections between the site and the visitor. Contemporary technological techniques for communicating cultural significance were considered acceptable whereas role play and costume were only to be used when based on “faithful reconstruction from authentic information” (De Lapp 1994).

The plan identified four areas that were to be addressed in the interpretation of the place including: meeting the special needs of older visitors who formed the higher proportion of the market, and seeking to discover how these needs might be met through a high quality experience; deciding how the experience of children was to be handled due to the ethical questions of interpreting unpleasant history to them; handling the issue of reality versus myth where the aim was to dispel the myth and reinforce the reality; and lastly, the requirement for interpretation which enhanced the perceptions of historical reality and significance, and questioned how this might be achieved through the new visitor centre and the proposed sound and light show (Beckmann & Young 1995). Portentously, the Preliminary Report of the Interpretation Plan suggested that the Authority should raze the Broad Arrow Café, not with any foresight of the events that would take place there within eight months, but because of the quality of their cappuccinos! (Beckmann & Young 1995).
The massacre of 35 people at or near Port Arthur in April 1996 was an enormous catalyst for change resulting in the appointment of a new Board. Much of the initial activity was in the form of crisis management and the event had a momentous impact on every aspect of the place, including its presentation, management processes and social perception. Port Arthur was placed under a spotlight and every aspect of its organisation was scrutinised. In August 1996, the PAHSMA released a draft Management Plan, which was severely criticised in a *Special Investigation into Administrative Processes associated with Preservation and Maintenance of the Port Arthur Historic Site* (Auditor-General 1997).

Money flowed into the heritage site in the wake of the massacre, when the Federal Government provided $2.5 million for the construction of a new visitor centre and the redevelopment of the car park and the entrance (Burgess 1998), both of which were places in which murders had occurred. The fate of the Broad Arrow café was discussed, eventually leading to its partial demolition, and a temporary memorial was erected on the edge of the bay (Coombs 1997; Wells 2010). Many in the community thought that the Federal Government money was for them rather than the historic site, and realisation created some tension (Noye 1998). Dealing with the local community during such a stressful event led to some positive and some negative outcomes. Amongst the positive ones was the organisation of a Family Fun Day a month after the massacre, specifically to encourage local people to return to the site and to be a bonding exercise (Burgess 1998; Noye 1998). Negative responses included the limited numbers of people who could attend the memorial service in St David’s Cathedral in Hobart which meant that some were excluded, resulting in an ‘us’ and ‘them’ division (Coombs 1997), which to some extent still exists today and goes some way to explaining the unresolved issues surrounding any interpretation of the massacre.

The massacre caused economic hardship throughout the Tasman Peninsula as tourism numbers fell, affecting local accommodation and other service suppliers. The historic site was closed for a three-week period during which it was a crime scene followed by a subsequent downturn in tourism (Burgess 1998; Coombs 1997; Wells 2010). To make matters worse, a report of the Special Commissioner for Port Arthur, known as the Doyle Report, was released which was fairly damning; causing several prospective
sponsors to withdraw their funding which meant that the Management Authority was unable to meet its conservation obligations (Auditor-General 1997).

In 1997 a special investigation into the administrative processes associated with the preservation and maintenance of Port Arthur was carried out by the Auditor-General’s office, again shifting the balance between conservation ethos and economic reality. The Auditor-General’s report emphasised the need for conservation and restoration strategies, and the Authority responded by pointing out that the lack of funds was delaying major conservation work (Auditor-General 1997). The Auditor-General’s report noted that the 1985 Management Plan provided that

“the principal direction of management .... will be to conserve the fabric of the settlement .... while providing visitor requirements ... with minimal impact. That is Conservation over Tourism” (Auditor-General 1997 p.37).

### DAMAGE CONTROL

The immediate reaction to the massacre was to spend money as quickly as possible on reorienting the site and changing the experience that visitors had in the place. Although the changes had been under discussion since 1993 (Mazengarb 1993), there had been no funding available and not enough revenue from tourism to carry them through although this changed with the financial input from the Federal Government following the massacre. Reorientation involved moving the car park and entrance that changed the way in which tourists flowed through the site. Managing the way in which the meanings associated with the site changed was also an important factor. As already alluded to, just prior to the massacre the image of the convict was changing and he was portrayed as a craftsman of distinction. The associations with horror were being diluted when

“this horrendous event that’s incredibly violent almost refreshes that notion in a whole other generation ... so what we have is now some significantly emotionally damaged community in charge of a positive interpretive spin and they tend to work against each other a little bit” (Fitzpatrick 2009).

This research ends at this point as it contends that the effects of the massacre have not yet been resolved. Those affected by the events in 1996 are stakeholders whose
sensitivities dictate the way in which the site is portrayed and which meanings and emotional touchpoints can be used to reflect the heritage story. There is a time lag which will continue until those affected by the massacre cease to be stakeholders at the site.
The analysis considers that an attraction combines both products and processes. The study specifically defines two stages of product; a primary access product and a secondary experience product. A theory which explained how the access product and the experience product interacted during the process of co-production was used to explore how innovation occurs at heritage attractions over a prolonged period. For this study, the primary product was defined as access in physical, emotional, intellectual and virtual forms; and the process as a co-production between operator and visitor which results in the heritage tourist experience product. Because incremental innovation can be so subtle that it is almost invisible (Abernathy & Clark 1985; Abernathy & Utterback 1978), the case study used three successive time periods to facilitate a comparison over a prolonged time which shows how some innovations have been radical in the long term, despite being difficult to identify in the short term. The case study findings were divided according to comparative phases and have been used to inform the discussion in this chapter.

**THE INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENTS**

The environments in which heritage attractions are situated change with time creating opportunities and limitations for innovation which are described as “new combinations of existing resources” (Fagerberg 2003, p. 4). Planned and unplanned events occur in the internal or external environment that can cause disequilibrium leading to creative destruction (Fan, Wall & Mitchell 2007; Huang, Wall & Mitchell 2007; Mitchell, Atkinson & Clark 2001; Schumpeter, JA 1942, 1992). Creative destruction can either refine or improve a product or process (Abernathy & Clark 1985), or make it obsolete (Schumpeter, JA 1992). At heritage attractions both can occur when rejuvenation builds on previous strengths, expanding the attraction; or renewal depends on replacing the old with new ideas, new combinations of raw materials or new organisational processes. Forces within the environment drive and determine the shape of change. However, forces are variable, tied to the current environment and therefore perishable.
The events, which take place in the internal and external environments, affect both products and processes. The forces that drive and determine innovation create environmental conditions that will either encourage or limit innovation. As the internal and external environments change, so does the context in which the attraction is situated. Events affect the significance of places to current generations, changing their values and meanings. The content of heritage attractions also changes as attempts are made to balance supply and demand. Supply may incorporate new episodes in history as they occur; research may discover new knowledge; and objects, once considered to be everyday may be appreciated for their antiquity value (Kjeldbaek 2009; Lowenthal 1998; Wouters 2009). Demand ensures that interpretation is relevant and capable of engaging the current audience.

The different forms of innovation found in this study and previously discussed in chapter two, can broadly be summarised as product, process, position and paradigm innovation. Product innovation encompasses new forms of access to ensure continuing competitive advantage or new types of experience driven by social change and market demand; process innovation stems from the shifting relationship between operators and tourists in the co-production of the heritage tourist experience; position innovation is manifest in changes to marketing in order to target new audiences or endeavouring to reposition as part of a specialised niche segment; and paradigm innovation occurs when an organisational strategy changes direction to focus on completely new goals and outcomes (Bessant & Davies 2007; Bessant & Tidd 2007).

The analysis will first consider how the elements of the products, then the process, have changed over the period of the case study. Some of these innovations are difficult to identify in the short-term, but over a prolonged period it is possible to determine how forces within the internal and external environment have shaped the innovation outcomes.

**THE PRODUCT**

Risk is an inherent element in innovation and control of the level of risk deemed acceptable in creating the product is a requirement before innovation can occur (Kline & Rosenberg 1986; Tether & Howells 2007; Wanhill 2003). In this study the primary
product is access which operators or managers of the heritage site provide. The fundamental premise is that the risks associated with providing access are controllable and the type of innovation implemented can be gauged to suit the level of risk deemed acceptable. This study considers the tourist experience product at heritage attractions to be the outcome of a co-production process which concentrates on what the tourist is perceived to have bought. This study contends that the co-production is outside the control of the operator or manager, due to the variable input of individual tourists. Instead, this study considers that the primary ‘product’ refers to what the organisation sells. The access product, the element over which control can be managed, is a component of the tourist experience product. As noted, the access product combines physical, emotional, intellectual and/or virtual forms.

For most of the case study period, Port Arthur was a township and an accumulation of buildings with heritage value, neither of which required payment of an entrance fee to access. For much of the period 1877-1971 those tasked with managing the heritage fabric did not manage the tourist businesses that took place there. The provision of access was in the hands of private operators, although this changed slowly as the Government started to repurchase the site during the 1940s and 1950s. To a large extent, control of the access product before 1971 was in the hands of private operators, who used the site as a core attraction, but who were not responsible for its maintenance.

Very little revenue was forthcoming towards maintaining or restoring the ruins, and the Boards, whose responsibility it was to manage them, had to depend on funding from the local, state and federal governments. Those operators, who provided access to the ruins in the form of excursions from Hobart also provided emotional and intellectual access through the provision of the museum, and included concessionaires who supplied activities such as the boat trip to the Isle of the Dead. These operators had ownership of the access products they sold and their income depended on using the historic site which was for them, a free resource. After 1985 an entrance fee was charged for all who wished to visit Port Arthur. This fee included the guided tour, which became an integral part of the experience emphasising the heritage values of the site. The different types of access products provided by the operators until 1971 and by the
National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) and the Port Arthur Historic Site Authority (PAHSMA) following 1971, will be considered in the next section.

PHYSICAL ACCESS

Access to the heritage resources in physical terms stimulates emotional and intellectual access through the spatial context that is part of the interpretation. The early excursionists who visited Port Arthur did so by sea; physical access was provided by independent operators and occurred infrequently at first. The boat journey was an unpleasant part of the experience for many, due to seasickness, although for others must have provided excitement. Their excursion was from Hobart back to Hobart, meaning that journey and destination were both important factors in the experience. The distance travelled helped to construct a sense of place and for some a sense of foreboding, emphasising how deserted and remote the site was. These tourists arrived in the same way as those who had been incarcerated, which developed a sense of what it was like to arrive as a convict, placing the experience into both a spatial and temporal context.

Once road access was available in the 1890s, cars and coaches replaced the sea journey and the tourist experience changed. Those operators who had provided sea access had to innovate their business and added accommodation as an alternative revenue stream (The Tasmanian Mail 1883a, p. 3: 24 February). Physical access continued to change over succeeding years, as car travel became part of the everyday. This meant the journey was a less important aspect of the experience and Port Arthur became its focus, changing rather than diminishing the tourist experience. Car access changed the opportunities for tourism in Carnarvon, which continued to develop as a township. Once arrivals were no longer dependent on the provision of sea access, tourists arrived independently and chose how long to stay. The experience shifted from ‘getting there’, to ‘being there’, and although the presence of the ruins was a competitive advantage, the experience sought by many of the visitors was recreational (fishing, shooting, golf and tennis) rather than heritage focused. Competition was from other resorts and destinations which offered similar activities but which did not possess the ruined structures. The perceived value of the site began the debate between those who prioritised tourism based on scenery and recreational activities and others who prioritised the heritage significance of the place. Whether Port Arthur could succeed
without its heritage fabric was emphasised in 1905 when comments were made about the long and arduous journey not being worthwhile if the buildings were dismantled (Mercury 1905: 17 February).

When tourism first began at Port Arthur, private entrepreneurs who recognised the opportunity for a new destination and tourism product provided physical access as soon as the penal settlement became available for tourism, three months following its closure. These tourist operators were scene-makers (Mattson et al 2005), in that they recognised the possibilities for tourism and created the attraction from the elements which were available, but were not responsible for maintaining or managing the core attraction which at this time was the built infrastructure. The entrepreneurs who provided access were therefore innovators, not only because they provided a new excursion package but also because, at Port Arthur, they created a tourist destination by providing physical access to it.

The provision of physical access was the first step towards an innovation system which formed during the succeeding years as other entrepreneurs invested in Port Arthur, providing accommodation and amenities for tourism. Within an innovation system it is important that all components of the attraction are successfully utilised through the collaborative efforts of tourist suppliers and operators in ensuring its viability (Mattsson, Sundbo & Fussing-Jensen 2005). At Port Arthur, this was achieved throughout a period of 108 years as tourism suppliers, including private entrepreneurs, tour operators, boat operators, concessionaires, accommodation providers and others outside the tourism sector worked together to ensure the success of Port Arthur as a destination and a recreational and heritage attraction. During this time the various Government bodies, (including the Scenery Preservation Boards, Port Arthur Board and National Parks and Wildlife Service) tasked with managing and maintaining the ruins were part of the system and encouraged private enterprise, which added value to the attraction through the amenities they provided. The system also meant that operators shared the risk involved in making changes to meet tourist demand as they updated, renewed or rejuvenated their tourist products, as and when necessary, in collaboration with other suppliers, consequently, providing the dynamism necessary to remain relevant. In 1985, when the first Management Plan was adopted, it entailed removing
the concessionaires and private tourism suppliers from the site, destroying the innovation system as it existed and changing the experience for tourists.

VIRTUAL ACCESS

Virtual access is another concept that is part of the product. On a macro-scale it extends the reach of the place to a global audience and consequently has to connect with a diverse cohort of virtual tourists. On a micro-scale virtual access enables new forms of interpretation that connect visitors with place through a range of media. Virtual access has been part of the experience of Port Arthur since before tourism was accessible, when both textual and photographic images were used to emphasise the contrast between the place and its function. The works of Burns, Trollope, and Clarke, plus newspaper commentaries about Port Arthur were all examples of virtual access in the public sphere before the closure of the penal settlement.

The aesthetic elements of the natural environment were largely used as a pull factor for tourism rather than history. This was testament to the types of agency tasked with managing the built infrastructure, i.e. Scenic Preservation Boards or NPWS. At first, scenery and an aesthetic experience seems to be in contrast to the apparent horrors which were perpetrated at Port Arthur, but in reality the environment was complicit in creating a place which was remote and secluded and where nature was the gaoler thereby providing an impenetrable boundary. Another contrast was provided by the homely image of Port Arthur resembling an English village which was promoted before tourism became accessible (Burns, D 1842; Trollope 1875). The image would have been familiar to many who were new migrants to Tasmania, eliciting an emotional connection based on nostalgia.

Textual and film images were created primarily through the novel For the Term of His Natural Life, serialised from 1870–72 and published as a book in 1874. This fictional book provided graphic accounts of life in a penal settlement, concentrating especially on the more horrific details and provided a catalyst for early visitors to the site.

Although several films have been made of the story, the most controversial, as discussed, was that in 1926 that sparked a debate over the images of Tasmania portrayed to a global audience (albeit mainly Western audiences at that time). Concern focussed on whether the identity of all Tasmanians would be linked to that of convicts,
and was associated with feelings of shame. Although, for many years, the story encapsulated in *For the Term of His Natural Life* had been widely acknowledged as the unofficial interpretation of Port Arthur, once it was turned into film the romantic element changed perceptions. The story ‘reverted’ to fiction and the interpretation at Port Arthur became less sensational and more realistic. It required those involved in the presentation of the attraction to rethink which signs would be used to stimulate symbolic meanings for visitors. For a short time following the release of the film, the attraction of Port Arthur lay in seeing the film location rather than the heritage place, suggesting that short-term appeal which stems from sensational or unusual events will temporarily extend the attraction to a completely new audience.

Other forms of virtual access were provided through guidebooks and from the 1940s through promotional films. Technology was used to determine the image of Tasmania portrayed to a global audience. The images were a form of commodification, as they repackaged the components of the tourist experience, effectively renewing and rejuvenating the existing attraction. Until the 1980s images largely focussed on attracting contemporary tourists using Port Arthur as a scenic backdrop for a family-oriented recreational destination. As previously mentioned, this was in line with the interests of those organisations tasked with managing the ruins. Before 1985 the most popular photographic image appears to have been the Church. Although other ex-prison buildings featured in photographs, little explanation was generally offered about them. After 1985 the Penitentiary appeared to be the most frequently portrayed photographic image and more explanation was offered, mainly in guidebooks. Many of the guidebooks were not commissioned by Port Arthur, but produced by private authors and sold at Port Arthur and other places, which questions who controlled the images being promoted. Images not only portray the place but also the story that is being emphasised, whether they specifically promote the interests of the management organisation or other interested parties. All types of image provide some form of virtual access, and they are a flexible method of renewing or rejuvenating an attraction resulting in a product innovation. New audiences can also be targeted through the use of image which is a form of position innovation.

As mentioned earlier, the product and process intertwine, especially where emotional and intellectual access are concerned. The interpretive triggers are part of the access
product, but their effects are dependent on the reaction of visitors to the interpretation when they add their personal attributes to engage with the site through the co-production process. For this reason, emotional and intellectual access will be included in the section about the process below, despite being part of the access product.

THE PROCESS

The tourist experience product at Port Arthur has changed in several ways since the first excursion in December 1877, when it was contemporary and motivated by curiosity and sensationalism, to a combination of recreation for Tasmanians and sightseeing for interstate and international tourists during the mid twentieth century. By the end of the twentieth century the experience encapsulated the aims of conservation that were incorporated as an additional focus for interpretation.

The factors, which were identified as part of the co-production process at heritage attractions, also identified where innovation could occur. The potential for innovation starts when the raw heritage materials are interpreted by operators as a series of coded signs and symbols which individuals decode as they create their own meaningful experience using their tacit knowledge to produce a unique and customised tourist experience.

HERITAGE RAW MATERIALS

The raw materials include both tangible and intangible elements used to reflect the past and to make sense in the present. Consequently, over time, these raw materials change, providing opportunities for operators to create new signs and symbols associated with different types of meaning. Hence, raw materials are an important ingredient for innovation because they become valued as heritage resources or because they provide new items or stories, for use in renewing or revitalising interpretation. When Port Arthur was first available for tourism, the attraction was based on contemporaneous views and attitudes about convicts and incarceration, rather than heritage as it is understood today.
The built infrastructure was the primary raw material that initially formed the core attraction. Not only did it provide an initial pull factor for tourists, but it also drew them to visit after the buildings became ruins following the devastating bushfires in 1884, 1895 and 1897. These fires had a profound impact and changed some attitudes. They created heritage values rather than placing economic value on the built fabric, as realisation dawned that it was irreplaceable. These were events that completely changed the visual experience and encouraged new meanings to be associated with the site. Following the appointment of the Scenery Preservation Board in 1915 the place was protected as a reserve, although its main values were associated with its natural aesthetic attraction rather than its heritage significance, despite this being part of the remit for the Board.

**Raw materials as signs and symbols**

The ruins provided raw materials that could be used as signs and symbols through which meaning could be constructed as they engaged tourists on multiple levels. The mutable nature of heritage allowed for reinvention, whereas authenticated and recorded history was less flexible as a tool for innovation. The flexible nature of the signs used to tell the story, and the choice of symbols which could be used to trigger an imagined past, also provided the foundations for innovation as new types of interpretation were used to elicit new forms of meaning. The Church was initially deemed to be the most symbolic building after 1877; it was also the most visually impressive due to its size and architectural merit.

As a church it was the only Government building at Port Arthur which had a familiar function for visitors unused to penitentiaries or prisons, meaning that it was a place with which they could engage through an understanding of its ceremonies and rituals and which symbolised security in an unfamiliar and strange landscape. The uncorroborated story, which told how the Church had been designed by a convict who gained his freedom in return for his work, was often repeated as part of its interpretation, both by the guides at Port Arthur and in print in guidebooks. This story humanised the mass of convicts and symbolised the notion that through repentance, salvation could be achieved. When the Church became a ruin, following the bushfire of 1884, its ivy-covered walls came to symbolise renaissance, particularly during the period between the First and Second World Wars. This was at a time when convicts
were considered to have suffered similar hardships to those endured by soldiers during the First World War signalling a change in social attitudes and the perception of convicts as wrongdoers. As a sign, the ruined church marked the passing of time, the end of the convict era and liberation from the colonial past. The Church was also an important symbol for Australian longevity when, in 1935, it reached its centenary. This was especially important in a country that had only become independent 34 years previously and was still in the early stages of formulating its history. The description of Port Arthur as Australia’s “only bona fide ruin” (Brennan 1918) began to appear in marketing materials during the 1930s, suggesting that it was a marker representing the permanence of Australia which had been independent for more than a generation (Nora 1996, Byrne 2001).

Artefacts, relics and other objects were tangible heritage raw materials, but not valued as such by early tourists who helped themselves to items such as bibles which had been left in the chapel when the penal settlement closed (Mercury 1884b, p. 4: 27 December). This action suggests that these items held other types of value for some individuals perhaps because of nostalgia value or because of a wish to preserve part of the place for posterity (Gold & Gold 2007). Others may simply have removed items for their functional value. Alternatively, taking souvenirs could have been prompted by the belief that Port Arthur would soon be demolished and that, because it was owned by the Government, those items which were at risk of destruction belonged to the people who were justified in helping themselves. The action of taking items, presumably to keep or use, was in contrast to other early tourists who inflicted violence on the place as they sought to destroy the tangible evidence and eradicate the memory of Port Arthur (Mercury 1877e, p. 2: 27 December).

Other items gained value once they became part of a collection, particularly when the collections became attractions for tourists (Wouters 2009). Several collections were displayed, including Beattie’s Port Arthur Museum in Hobart and the Old Curiosity Shop at Port Arthur. All collections exhibited a combination of items, which related to the penal era, including implements for restraining and punishing convicts, convict records, and everyday items. When the collections were on display in Hobart they provided a new attraction product, enabling those who could not get to Port Arthur an off-site, or virtual, experience of the place. The concept that these items had collector value
increased their perceived worth in heritage terms, especially once they were considered valuable enough for museum space (Mercury 1927a, p. 8: 24 September 1927). The fact that the two Beattie collections were purchased by museums in Launceston and Hobart is evidence of the changing perspective of public sector organisations during the late 1920s and 1930s. However, by the time the Radcliffe collection was put onto the market in 1974, there were few takers and much of the collection was dismantled and part of it sold as separate lots (Weidenhofer 1990), calling to question the changing value of heritage.

**Images as markers and their sacred impressions**

Following the Second World War, the target market changed and the image and reality of Port Arthur reflected this. The image used to promote Port Arthur was the scenic outdoors which appeared to match the contemporary national image of Australians as recreationalists who enjoyed the natural elements while partaking in sporting and other participatory activities. The continued private development of tourism activities aimed at the family market supports this, as well as the construction of a Rangers House on the historic site in 1947, paid for by the Government.

Much of the marketing at this time was in the form of short promotional films shown at the cinema, and the images of Port Arthur included fishing trips, boating and camping with the ruins as a scenic backdrop (Hurley 1947b). The images attracted tourists to stay for longer periods, helping to maintain the economic sustainability of Port Arthur as a holiday destination. In the 1980s management strategies changed to favour heritage tourists rather than recreational ones as the target market; by removing the amenities and activities the traditional visitor was no longer attracted to the site as it did not provide for their needs or the experience they sought. The conscious decision to target a new type of heritage tourist was a result of position innovation as Port Arthur redefined itself to fit into a niche heritage segment. By appearing to be more exclusive, those managing Port Arthur attempted to attract a different type of demand, and as the recreationalists disappeared with their fishing rods and caravans, the place became symbolic of itself as a sacred reflection of history.

Port Arthur has come to represent sacredness in different ways, for example the reaction in the 1980s to suggestions that the avenue of cedars, planted as a memorial
to those who fell during the First World War, should be cut down. They were planted during the time of Carnarvon and not relevant to the convict era but considered sacred to the memory of those residents who had represented the town in war and lost their lives. This shows that local values were different from those of tourists or of the management which sought to contain the interpretation of Port Arthur to a specific temporal frame within the penal era. The sacred atmosphere which has overwhelmed the site since the massacre and the building of the memorial garden alongside the partially demolished ruins of the cafe is, in some ways, a limitation to innovation as it permeates through the site and will continue to do so while the stakeholders associated with the massacre are still alive. The sacred atmosphere perceptibly stems from the treatment of the memorial as a shrine by those stakeholders involved. Further studies might attempt to discover whether places, which are sacralised because of recent events, lose their shrine-like qualities over time, in some ways akin to iconic churches that have embraced tourism at the risk of losing their religiosity.

**INTERPRETATION: EMOTIONAL AND INTELLECTUAL ACCESS**

The second element in the co-production process is interpretation, which is a flexible resource for renewing or revitalising the meanings associated with objects and places as heritage values change. Interpretation has been presented using different types of media, the most constant delivery mode being guided tours. The guided tour is only as innovative as the individual guide decides to make it. The exception to this is during the first years of tourism when entrepreneurial ex-convicts, in their endeavours to make a living, created props to provide context for their stories and used their skill at storytelling and drama to entertain their audience. At first the props included the implements of horror such as manacles and whips, many of which had been specifically manufactured for demonstration purposes – and for sale, becoming a non-authentic raw material and souvenir. Although these implements were not usually authentic they allowed tourists to experience their weight and feel, creating a participatory experience that offered both intellectual and emotional access as well as entertainment value. Although some authentic objects were available on the site, many of the ex-convict guides preferred to make their own as they could exaggerate the weights used making them much heavier than the originals (Weidenhofer 1981). Alternatively, because the ‘new’ objects were made by ex-convicts there is some question as to whether they
could be considered as authentic. Further enquiry in a different study could attempt to discover whether the reforming nature of the punishment these ex-convicts had received affected their moral conviction about picking up objects that they did not own for sale to tourists, as well as questioning the values associated with ownership of these objects.

The guides’ successors knew the stories and some had their own childhood memories of the penal era, but as generations passed a first-hand account of Port Arthur as a penal settlement passed out of living memory. Succeeding guides started to relate history rather than their own recollections; consequently their talks became drier and more factual providing intellectual access for those who were interested enough to pay for the tour.

Guided tours have existed throughout the period Port Arthur has been available for tourism. Since the 1980s these have been supplemented by those in the evening which use the ambience of the place to provide an atmosphere appropriate for Ghost Tours. The development of the ghost tour was in contrast to the day-time interpretation during the 1980s, which concentrated on portraying the convict as a craftsman of distinction, and the purpose of Port Arthur as reforming rather than punishment. The ghost tours however concentrated on darkness, fear, horror and all the elements which the original tours had possessed and which the daytime interpretation sought to overturn. The use of intangible heritage resources such as ambience and atmosphere to support the stories of ghosts, which were not included during the daytime tours, provided a popular product that was innovative in that it combined existing resources in a new way to provide an alternative type of access. The Ghost Tours do not replace the daytime tours, but create an additional product that extends the hours during which revenue for the site can be raised, hence supporting the economic sustainability of the site.

By the 1970s and 1980s independent concessionaires attempted to introduce other experiential forms of interpretation such as a convict ship in the bay and horse drawn carriages to take tourists around the site, neither of which were approved. After the massacre in 1996 a new visitor centre was built which holds an interpretation display but does not contain any authentic artefacts. It is purely used to tell the story of the place and attempts to draw tourists into a participatory engagement. Each tourist is
given the identity of a convict and invited to follow them through their time at Port
Arthur. The building is notably separate from the historic site, modern in design and
hidden from view when in the ruins, drawing a line between the designed tourist
experience and the ‘authentic’ heritage place. The interpretation centre has created
some controversy, it is not a museum or a theme park, and has been described as using
the “new to represent the old, the fake to interpret the real” (Strange 2000). It does
include some of the interpretation techniques used in museums both to draw visitors in
and engage them in a dialogue with the past and could be an innovation when the
centre first opened.

Interpretation and tourist attributes work together to create the heritage experience,
consequently the content included in the story of Port Arthur has changed over time, to
reflect the expectations of different generations. The story has ranged from
commandants as heroes and convicts as an amorphous mass of wrongdoers; to a pitiful
image of the convict as a victim of a justified legal system; to a romanticised image
associated with the book and film For the Term of His Natural Life. This was followed by
the convict as pioneer; the convict as the talented craftsman; and then Port Arthur as a
place of reform and opportunity for convicts to learn a trade and improve their
chances. Alongside the changing story, a re-evaluation led to contemplation that many
convicts might possibly have been innocent, or that their crimes had been
‘understandable’ or inevitable as a result of an inequitable British society.

TOURIST ATTRIBUTES

The tourist market at Port Arthur is heterogeneous, including not only those who are
motivated by heritage interests, but also those with personal, non-heritage motivations
(Nuryanti 1996; Poria, Butler & Airey 2003; Voase 2002). This is important if heritage
places are to be sustainable because they need to ensure that they attract as broad a
market as feasible, particularly at a time when competition is from an abundance of
other activities and material goods (Leask, Fyall & Garrod 2002). For most of the period
in this case study, both heritage tourists and recreationalists were attracted to visit Port
Arthur. Those from the mainland and overseas tended to be attracted by the heritage
values of the place, whereas those from Tasmania visited for the recreational activities.
New markets for tourism emerged over time due to generational change and new
demands for heritage and other types of experiences.
At Port Arthur, contemporary tourists were the original audience, but within two generations, living memory of convicts and the time when Port Arthur was a penal settlement was no longer part of the everyday knowledge of those who visited. Succeeding generations created their own versions of the imagined past based on hearsay and myth. The potential tourist market changed further because of the demographic shift through the post-war arrival of non-British migrants in Australia who were not necessarily interested in the colonial past with which they had no connection. Change occurred again when the migrants’ children, who were born in Australia, were old enough to value the heritage of their natal country. This change was manifest in the story of Port Arthur, and how it changed over time from the pre-Federation story of a British colony and its convicts to the history of colonial Australia and its early inhabitants.

Tasmanian marketing was the remit of Government tourist authorities from 1893 and was supplemented by motoring organisations which described touring routes and the places on them (Tasmanian Motor News 1963), and by tour operators such as Colourline which included Port Arthur in their itinerary. After 1985, marketing for Port Arthur became place specific rather than part of a larger Tasmanian product. This was a targeted strategy aimed at positioning Port Arthur as the premier heritage site in Australia and was in line with the changing value of heritage linked to a conservation ethos. The shift in organisational paradigm towards conservation was a major innovation coupled with position innovation as new target markets were identified and activities developed to attract them.

THE TOURIST EXPERIENCE

The tourist experience product is the outcome of the co-production process. In summary, experiences are described as entertaining, educational, aesthetic and escapist (Pine & Gilmore 1999b); they are also participatory, based on how much the tourist is willing to invest of themselves into the activity of having an experience. Tourism has always been experiential due to its embodied nature and the way in which tourists are encouraged to interact with the resources provided. Although tourism has been characterised primarily as a visual activity it is experiential as it involves being there (Urry 1990). Gazing upon a scene or collecting signs which represent a place or an event is a unique experience, which the tourist co-produces to satisfy their individual
needs. In this sense, the experience lies in the activity of being a tourist and engaging with the interpretation, rather than in the experience of place that is beyond the reach of tourists who are spatially and temporally limited by their tourist status. Although the co-production process leads to the tourist experience product, triggers for meaning, which stimulate emotional and intellectual access, are fundamental to the tourist experience; hence the operator supplied access product is a component of the secondary tourist experience product.

Tourism is a hedonistic experience. Hedonism is manifest in multisensory, fantasy and emotive factors (Hirschman & Holbrook 1982). Hedonistic motivations attracted many early visitors to Port Arthur by the anticipation of thrills, speculation to spark their imagination and sensational experiences (Mercury 1877e, p. 2: 27 December). To provide the hedonistic experience, a combination of sensory triggers can be developed such as those provided in interactive interpretation. Alternatively, they may be organic, subtle and uncontrolled, for example, through the elements provided by place or climate.

Sensory experiences can be shared across time. The engagement between the tourist and place provides the strongest form of access, where emotions and intellect become tightly bound with physical access and being in place. At Port Arthur, tourists touch the same stones and bricks that the convicts did, they feel the same sensations as they run their fingers over the surface. They experience some of the same smells and tastes, such as the brine in the air blowing off the sea; they hear the same wind in the trees and they see the same topography; where the hills lie, where the sun comes up, which is the most sheltered spot to wait out the rain; and they measure the size and dimension of place against their own bodies. Sensory experience allows tourists to understand the place in a way that would be impossible without being there. The experience gained through the senses overcomes time, creating a level of engagement that is not possible in any other way. An example of the temporal and sensory experience is described by Anna Brennan on Armistace Day in 1918 when she links the sound of the clock striking midnight and marking the end of the First World War, with the same sound from the same clock heard by convicts eighty years previously as it slowly marked the end of each day and the passing of their sentence (Brennan 1918). The sensory experience opens a door to the past providing a unique form of temporal
access (Pocock 2008). On a different dimension, the sensory experience is in contrast to the sensory deprivation that the convicts underwent while incarcerated in the Model Prison, where silence was the rule and communication between convicts was forbidden. In numerous commentaries about Port Arthur this is considered the harshest punishment that convicts had to endure. Experiencing the closed world of the Model Prison by being shut in the punishment cell, which is not only silent but completely dark, being entombed behind 4 doors; has been part of the experience of Port Arthur since tourists first visited. Being shut in the cell, even for an extremely short period, provides engagement on a sensory level that connects directly to the experience of the convicts, which can still impart a terrifying insight.

During the planning stages in the 1970s and 1980s many comments from stakeholders included concerns about how the tourist experience would be affected if changes were made in a range of areas including site-orientation and an interpretation centre. By the early 1970s, recreational tourists had been using Port Arthur for activities that had little to do with heritage for nearly 100 years and it had been a place where private enterprise had been encouraged to provide a range of experiences. At the same time, those interested in heritage had been able to enjoy a heritage experience with guides and exhibits. The management strategy that changed the experience of being a tourist at Port Arthur was the development of the 1985 Management Plan. Hindsight provides a view of its long-reaching effects and shows the changes implemented by the plan to be innovative, changing the raison d’etre of the place from a tourist attraction business to a heritage site. Driven by interstate consultants who were professionals in heritage rather than tourism, the plan aimed to change the profile of the target market from the recreationalist to the heritage tourist and concomitantly, changed the experience of being a tourist at Port Arthur.

To summarise, the product and the process are intertwined concepts. The primary access product combines physical, virtual, emotional and intellectual access each of which can be subject to innovation when the product needs renewal or rejuvenation. The access product is managed and innovation is gauged and limited by the level of risk deemed appropriate for the proposed return. If tourist attractions are to be economically and socially sustainable, they need to renew and rejuvenate through innovation to remain relevant to their potential audience and significant to the broader
community. The co-production process occurs during the transformation of the raw heritage materials into the tourist experience product. The tourist experience product does not exist without the presence of tourists. The access product is tightly linked to interpretation and combines with individual tourist attributes to customise the experience, making it personally relevant and unique. The co-production process describes how the tourist experience is constructed, but as this takes place within the organisational framework of the tourist attraction it can be prone to external and internal environments that may shift the focus and purpose of the heritage site between conservation and tourism as a priority. The next section will consider the way in which the organisational paradigm alters innovation capability at heritage attractions.

ORGANISATIONAL PARADIGMS

At Port Arthur there have been recurrent shifts in paradigm as tourism interests, heritage conservation and the natural environment vie for primacy. Initially the support for conservation was based on protecting Port Arthur as a scenic reserve and tourist attraction that would bring revenue to Tasmania. This was particularly pertinent during the 1930s when the Great Depression was being experienced and the aims of tourism and conservation appeared to converge. It was also at this stage that the innovative decision was taken, to repurchase the historic buildings at Port Arthur, based on the economic value of tourism to the state.

Tourism was considered as the primary purpose of Port Arthur until the constitution of the Burra Charter in 1979 when a conservation ethic began to emerge. Apart from comments concerning the cleanliness and general state of disrepair at Port Arthur, it was not until the 1980s that tourism was seen in a negative light as damaging the fragile built infrastructure. This was evident in the draft management plan of 1981, which criticised the activities of recreational tourists and was designed to dissuade them from visiting. The 1985 Management Plan was an uneasy balance between the primacy of conservation and the needs of tourism. This was evident in the comparison between the draft plan and the actual plan that softened the conservation requirements of the draft to acknowledge the economic necessity of tourists.
As mentioned previously, the discord centred on the tourist experiences which took place at Port Arthur and was based on contrasting values associated with the place by visitors. International and interstate visitors were attracted by the heritage associations, whereas Tasmanians tended to be attracted for reasons associated with recreation and around which family traditions had grown, including picnics, camping and fishing (Bolt 1981). Prior to the bicentenary of Australia in 1988 many Tasmanians preferred not to acknowledge if they had convict ancestors and they valued Port Arthur as a destination to visit on public holidays. For those from interstate and overseas Port Arthur did not have the same level of personal connection and their interest stemmed from the history of Australia and Tasmania’s part in that story.

Preservation of the buildings had been discussed since the early 1900s, but little action had been possible due to continual economic constraints. Following the signing of the Burra Charter in 1979, the Federal Government provided $9 million funding towards the Port Arthur Conservation and Development Project (the Project) with the result that conservation became the primary function and organisational strategy of the site (Woollan 1986: 21 November). The Project was a major innovation as it was the first time in Australia that an entire heritage site had been conserved as an entity, rather than as individual buildings. Benefits included coordinated research and development as well as planning and maximizing technical specialist skills across a range of buildings. The conservation efforts were directed at buildings, ruins and artefacts, effectively stopping degradation. When funding ceased in 1986 the Project came to an end. During the Project, conservation work had become part of the interpretation and tourists could see the specialists and their work displayed as part of the attraction, although this contemporary dimension may have been at odds with those visitors specifically interested in heritage. Conservation also locked the ruins into a specific temporal frame once deterioration had been halted.

**SELF-SUFFICIENCY - PROBLEM AND SOLUTION**

Despite the conservation aims of the new Management Plan, by 1986 the Government was unwilling to provide additional financial support and once again management strategy at Port Arthur shifted to concentrate on tourism as an economic necessity. A fence was built around the historic site for the first time – even during the penal era there had never been walls around the site, only nature. An entrance fee was charged
and events such as military parades and heritage craft displays were organized to attract both locals and tourists in an attempt to raise revenue. During this time, self-sufficiency was a requirement and if Port Arthur was to be sustainable it was necessary to constantly create events to draw not only heritage visitors, at whom the site was targeted, but also locals and other non-tourists, again creating an alternative audience and positioning the site as a place for entertainment.

During the bicentennial celebration, a Beating of the Retreat event was performed at Port Arthur which resulted in suggestions that it should become an annual tradition. The perception of having convict ancestors changed slowly and following the bicentennial, it was evident that they were no longer seen as shameful, but as pioneers. Those who could claim convict lineage gained status as long-standing Australians rather than migrants from a later period (Goc 2002; Tranter & Donoghue 2003). Weaver (2000) corroborates the notion that commemorations and other periodic events that have ‘sacred’ associations can change attitudes at the same time as ensuring mythological and economic sustainability. Events of this type can also be considered innovative when they create new combinations of existing products to attract more, or different, visitors.

Sponsorship and other types of partnerships were sought after 1987, as an alternative economic opportunity and a force that drove some innovative packaging of tourism products. There is a risk associated with dependence on sponsorship and other forms of revenue-raising which combine marketing, business and social goodwill, because when the environment changes and the social benefit no longer exists, the sponsorship is withdrawn, as happened following the massacre in 1996. This event created another shift in paradigm based on the sacralisation of the site which took on a shrine-like quality. The on-going sensitivities of stakeholders, and of management towards those stakeholders, including survivors, victims’ families, and those who were traumatized has acted as a limitation to some innovative suggestions for new types of interpretation which were seen as trivializing the sacred nature of the site. The effect of the massacre created a range of parameters which did not previously exist, but which dictate much of the development potential of the site.

The swing between tourism and conservation as primary aims appears to depend largely on the management body in control of Port Arthur, plus the willingness of either
State or Commonwealth Government to offer financial assistance. Several innovative actions have been tied to changes in heritage values, whether those values are aligned with economic, social or environmental interests.

NATIONAL IDENTITY AND THE OWNERSHIP OF HERITAGE

National identity has political overtones and economic assistance has historically only been forthcoming when a national image, heritage significance or some other distinguishing feature can be reflected by Port Arthur. The buy-back of the buildings that began in 1939 and was carried through following the Second World War resulted in public ownership of the heritage site and the buildings it contained. The national identity, reflected by Port Arthur as a holiday destination, was that of a forward thinking population who enjoyed enough leisure to partake in recreational pastimes and family holidays. This linked to the post Second World War demographic shift when non-British migrants arrived in Australia, attracted by the promise of full employment and a good quality of life. At Port Arthur, it meant that the Government was again responsible for the maintenance of the heritage site, and for providing access through the auspices of the Port Arthur Scenic Reserves Board, to be replaced once more by the Scenery Preservation Board in 1950.

The purchase and management of the entire site was an innovative move, as Tasmania became the first state in Australia to make this decision. Rather than purchasing individual buildings, it laid the foundations for future innovation. The drive for the buy-back was the economic value of tourism to the State following the Depression that lasted in Tasmania until the start of the Second World War. Following the war the value of heritage was a focus due to the devastating loss of heritage fabric suffered in European countries through the war, reflected in a move to protect the limited number of colonial heritage remains that existed in Australia. It also transpired that control of the image of Tasmania might also have been a driver for the Government to own and control the historic site at Port Arthur.

This was at a time, following the Second World War, when competition between Australian states was aimed at attracting migrants. The images of Tasmania developed during this period were shown throughout Australia and overseas as a film diary and other media in which it was portrayed as a hard-working state where migrants would
find opportunities based on hydro-electricity and modern industry including paper manufacture and mining as well as farming hops and apples (Mercury 1949a: 19 February) Port Arthur was included in the film because of its historic significance. When suggestions were made that the history associated with Port Arthur should not be promoted to potential migrants the response was that a debt of gratitude should be paid to the unfortunate men who had designed bridges, roads and buildings, (Mercury 1949b: 8 April) acknowledging the role convicts had played in the formation of Tasmania and situating them as pioneers in the development of the state.

Different types of innovation seem to have been fairly constant during the period under observation in this study. Financial support appears to have been a major factor in innovation capability, which was provided by state or federal Government or through private management and entrepreneurial skill. The aims of innovation tended to differ according to those in control of how the historic site was used. Process innovations occurred as different types of raw materials were used in the co-production to reflect new types of experience demanded by generational change or more experienced tourists. Position innovation was implemented through the identification and targeting of new and previously untapped markets in terms of tourist segmentation and of niche tourism typologies. Paradigm innovation was also identified as organisational aims fluctuated between the primacy of tourism and that of conservation. How and why the pattern of innovation fluctuates over time will be discussed in the following section.

THE PATTERN OF INNOVATION – THE INNOVATION WAVE

As has been illustrated, innovations of multiple types have been implemented at Port Arthur as the heritage resources and place attributes developed over time. Although development has been continuous, the periods of innovation have not. There are several models in the fields of tourism and economics that posit that development either occurs in stages or in cycles (Baum 1998; Butler, RW 1980; Hovinen 2001; Schumpeter, J 1939; Weaver 2000). This study suggests that neither stages nor cycles are suitable metaphors, as each stage must be completed before the next begins and time is not cyclical, it does not continually repeat itself. Consequently, this study uses waves as a metaphor for describing the pattern of innovation at heritage attractions, as
illustrated in Figure 5 below., but unlike previous models, this suggests that the wave pattern is arbitrary unlike the cyclical patterns of Schumpeter and Kondratiev (Schumpeter 1939).

Although similar events or occurrences may occur, they are not repetitions as they mark change (Lynch, K 1972). Waves are therefore an appropriate description for the alternating bursts of activity and periods of inertia as they are arbitrary, occur at different times for different lengths of time and are sometimes overlapping. Figure 5 illustrates how development progresses through waves which alternate between periods of innovation and periods of inertia. The periods of inertia are equally as important as those when innovative activity is taking place.

**FIGURE 5: THE PATTERN OF INNOVATION: WAVES OF ACTIVITY AND INERTIA**

The challenge for heritage attractions is to recognise when the period of inertia is at an end and innovation is needed to bring the attraction into line with current perception, interests, expectations and needs. In addition, they must also recognise when inertia is acceptable, understanding that the previous innovation has not yet run its course. The periods of inertia encompass a time-lag which is necessary for society to absorb the effects of events in the internal or external environment, before including, or excluding them, from the imaginary past in the creation of heritage. The model (Figure 5) is simplistic as it only shows one pattern of waves. In reality there may be overlapping
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waves and waves may be of longer or shorter duration or have different heights of peak and depths of trough. Periods of activity and inertia are represented by alternating curves. The wave pattern is formed through the fluctuations between the periods of active innovation and the periods of inertia.

Innovation waves at Port Arthur have tended to occur for two reasons. First if an event impacts directly and suddenly on the heritage place it sets off an immediate wave reaction as a result of crisis management. This can have an innovative outcome; examples from the case study include the new interpretation centre and the reorientation of the heritage site following the massacre. The second, more usual wave occurs when the event is a slow and incremental process which is caused by generational change. New demands are the result of changing perceptions and attitudes by contemporary generations of tourists who seek their own relevance in heritage and its stories. When events act as catalysts for innovation in order to maintain relevance, the forces that exist in the internal and external environment drive and determine the shape and form which innovation takes. These forces are described in detail in the following section.

A FRAMEWORK TO EXPLAIN THE DRIVERS AND DETERMINANTS OF INNOVATION

The preceding sections considered the types of innovative activity that created changes in the product and process. As discussed in the literature review, innovation capability depends on the internal and external environments, which contain the forces that drive and determine the type and pattern of innovation. The model developed by Sundbo & Gallouj (2000), which was presented as a framework in the literature review (Figure 4), has been adapted specifically to identify the types of forces that drive and determine innovation at heritage tourist attractions, based on the case study in this research. The adapted model is illustrated in Figure 6.

As described earlier the external environment contains trajectories that are ideas and actors who are individuals, networks, organisations or Government bodies who facilitate innovation, all of which combine as forces that shape innovation. Different environmental forces exist at different times leading to a variety of types of innovation.
activity and outcomes. Within the internal environment innovation is driven by management strategy; research and development; and employees.

FIGURE 6: THE DRIVING FORCES BEHIND INNOVATION AT HERITAGE TOURIST ATTRACTIONS

(adapted from The Driving Forces behind Service Innovation Model (Sundbo & Gallouj 2000).)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trajectories</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage regulators and institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and media</td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional codes of ethics – heritage, conservation and tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism service suppliers: accommodation; transport; concessionaires; guides; activities, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNAL DRIVERS AND DETERMINANTS

Internal Management

The first of the internal forces for driving innovation includes the management of the site and encompasses the development of several draft plans during the 1970s and 1980s, culminating in the 1985 Management Plan. These plans were innovative in that they set out a management strategy for the first time, identified the strengths and weaknesses of the business and made suggestions about future actions. The management focus at Port Arthur between 1916 and 1985 was based largely on the scenic and natural values rather than heritage values of the site, except when public outcry demanded that maintenance of the ruins be carried out. During this period, the responsibilities of management rested only with maintenance of the ruins to ensure that they did not deteriorate into a dangerous state. When the Parks and Wildlife Service took control in 1971 they were charged with managing the entire site for the first time. Their remit incorporated both heritage values and the tourist attraction, albeit through the concessionaires who continued to run their own businesses on the site. In 1987 when PAHSMA took control, the concessionaires were removed and the conservation and preservation of the site, as well as the tourism interests, came into their remit.

Research and Development

At Port Arthur very little research or development was carried out until the Conservation Project in 1979. The Project involved the work of archaeologists, architects, engineers, conservators, surveyors, historians, recorders and craftsmen (Woollan 1986, p. 6: 12 November) who were tasked with preserving the built fabric and discovering as much as possible about the historic development of the site. Other research was carried out as part of the development of the interpretation centre, which uses true accounts of convict’s lives to engage tourists. In addition, the first of the Interpretation Plans in 1995 incorporated historic research and market research. New information about Port Arthur was able to change the meanings associated with the place and provides a new stock of interpretive triggers that can either be used, or recorded for later use, in the design of the co-production process. Market research is a tool for managing the positioning of the historic site within the broad tourism sector.
and for targeting new tourist markets; consequently it can be used for position innovation.

**Employees**

The employees of the various government agencies tasked with managing the ruins at Port Arthur have had a profound effect on the innovation capability of the site. During the years that these agencies focussed on scenic preservation, those employees in positions which were senior enough to influence the strategies undertaken, tended to be most interested in natural attractions and scenery. Consequently, when paired with the lack of available funding during this time, the employees tended to restrain any opportunity for innovation. In 1986 Port Arthur had to strategise to become self-sufficient. Those tasked with managing the site came from the private sector and were used to being driven by economic necessity. They understood that in order to remain attractive, relevant and significant to a broad audience, they had to introduce new forms of access to the site and its story through the development of new events and attractions. In the years between 1987 and 1996 the visitor numbers at Port Arthur rose from 117,157 to 207,488, an increase of 90,331 (PAHMSA 2008). This was during the time that events and re-enactments were taking place, including the Beating of the Retreat and bicentennial celebrations, mentioned earlier, and was immediately following the introduction of the entry fee. Those managing the site recognised the importance of attracting locals as well as tourists to visit and provided events which would generate tourism revenue accordingly.

**EXTERNAL DRIVERS AND DETERMINANTS**

| TRAJECTORIES |

**Heritage Regulators and Institutions**

The first trajectory involves heritage regulators and institutions, which, at Port Arthur incorporated The Burra Charter (1979). This acted as a catalyst for a reassessment of heritage values in Australia and led to the Conservation Project (1979–1986) shifting the organisational focus towards conservation. Other regulations and institutions included the Australian Heritage Commission, which provided an instrument through which the
heritage values of Port Arthur could be listed, formalising the site as a heritage place. The heritage list is a usable measure of significance and has played a role in the global recognition of Port Arthur in terms of Australian as well as Tasmanian heritage.

**Technology and Media**

The second trajectory includes technology and media, both of which have been drivers for innovative activity in many guises at Port Arthur. Innovation based on technology at Port Arthur has been instrumental in providing contemporary forms of access. Physical access was provided once Port Arthur could be reached by road and the motorcar became affordable. The result was a constant stream of tourists arriving at the destination rather than the restrictions of travelling on an organised excursion by sea. This changed the experience of visiting Port Arthur and encouraged further investment from entrepreneurs who saw business opportunities in the destination. Virtual access was also provided through technology and new media, especially following the 1926 film of *For the Term of His Natural Life*. This film changed perceptions among Tasmanians about how their image was presented to a global community, with the realisation that they had to control that image. Shortly after this film was released the first of the government agency Tourism Bureaux was started, which was tasked with selling tourism in Tasmania based on its scenery and climate. This image was considered by Tasmanians to be their competitive advantage. The film also provided a different level of emotional and intellectual access to Port Arthur resulting in changing the meanings associated with the place. Prior to the 1926 film, the story had been accepted as the unofficial history of Port Arthur, but this changed following the film, which exaggerated the romantic elements of the story and did not match the emotional responses of fear and horror which had previously had the strongest association to Port Arthur. Intellectually, those who had visited Port Arthur knew that the story was only fiction, which as text gave licence to personal imagination. However, when new forms of media and technology meant the story could be turned into image, its plausibility was in doubt and it reverted to fiction rather than being accepted as fact.

**Professional codes of ethics**

The third trajectory includes the professional codes of ethics, particularly those of conservation professionals evident in the Conservation Project. This was an innovative
enterprise; being the first project of its kind it was associated with a level of risk, based on the continuing values of conservation and heritage. The Burra Charter provided guidelines (mentioned above), which could be justifiably implemented by those professions who adopted the charter as an authority on conservation ethics. However, these ethics could also be considered as limitations to innovation as conservation, restoration and reconstruction measures, recommended by the charter, locked the ruins into a temporal frame, changing as much as necessary, but as little as possible (ICOMOS 1999). Conversely, the innovation which occurred at Port Arthur changed as much as possible in terms of stabilising the ruins; especially through the use of techniques which meant much of the work was invisible, in order to have a minimal impact on the visual experience of the site.

Other professionals who drove and determined the shape of innovation included the consultants tasked with creating the initial draft management plan in 1981, which was later to be revised and implemented as the 1985 Management Plan. These consultants focussed on conservation, as mentioned previously, and away from tourism, which completely altered the organisational paradigm. Their actions were innovative in that they targeted a new and exclusive tourist market at the same time as positioning the attraction into a niche segment.

Management

As a force for innovation the management of Port Arthur was severely limited by their organisation as a government agency tasked with preserving scenic reserves. Despite the frequent change in the name of the agencies responsible for Port Arthur, their profile did not change radically until 1987, although a step in this direction was made with the appointment of the National Parks and Wildlife Service as managers in 1971. In general, scenic reserves were identified and reserved until industrial interests caused their removal from preservation. At Port Arthur the industrial interests were associated with attracting tourists to the state and consequently remained within the reserve. Management at Port Arthur valued the ruins as a folly and part of the background for the tourist destination. Consequently, their dilapidated state was not a cause for concern but part of their story. Concern was restricted to the likelihood that tourists might be injured if part of the structure fell on them. To stop this from happening, the worst affected buildings were fenced to stop access during the 1950s and 1960s. As the
ruins were considered to be a scenic backdrop this did not perceptibly affect their aesthetic value and only minimal funding was provided to maintain the ruins.

Social

The fifth trajectory is social attitudes and perceptions which is an important driver and determinant of innovation at Port Arthur as customer demand depends on the expectations of potential and actual tourists. Social perception dictates whether Port Arthur is relevant or significant to a contemporary generation, and as generations constantly evolve, this factor needs continual monitoring. Society drives change and incremental innovations have been implemented into the interpretation of the story in order to engage contemporary visitors both through content and through the mode of delivery used. The social trajectory is prone to the effects of events that change social values, affecting attitudes about heritage interpretation. Examples at Port Arthur include the response of visitors to the bushfires in 1897; the effects of the First and Second World Wars; the changing Australian demographic due to the increase in non-Anglo migration; and Australian Bicentenary.

ACTORS

Competition

The actors who existed in the external environment and whose participation drove innovation included a range of competitors. Competition in the early years came from other events that occurred on the same day (usually Boxing Day) as Port Arthur excursions, including trips to the New Norfolk Regatta or the Brighton Races, all of which offered alternative types of experience. Another form of competition in the 1930s was from newly opened theme parks on the mainland such as Luna Park (opened 1935) which supplied the thrills and excitement the early tourists had found at Port Arthur through anticipation and speculation. By the 1950s other recreational resorts were opening in competition, they possessed a range of experiences which contrasted with those of Port Arthur such as sunshine, beaches and surf. Consequently, much of the competition for tourist visitation was within the recreational sector during the middle of the twentieth century and Port Arthur found it increasingly difficult to compete with the breadth of activities that other places could offer. Increasingly, the heritage values of Port Arthur became its competitive advantage, based on rarity value
and lack of duplication. Competition along with the emerging conservation ethos therefore provided a driver for innovation as the focus at Port Arthur swung from recreational to heritage tourism in the late 1970s and 1980s.

**Customers**

A second group of external actors were customers, which included both locals and tourists. As mentioned previously, customer demand influenced the tourist product and the form of access that was provided. This was particularly evident during the years leading up to the 1980s when the differences between the needs of local Tasmanian tourists and those from interstate or overseas were most obvious, as already discussed. Additionally, as tourism became more of an everyday activity, more international travel took place. Those who had travelled overseas looked critically on experiences at home, and compared them to other places. International tourists who visited Port Arthur after the 1930s (and continue today) provided a new tourism market, but required an additional layer of interpretation to understand the historic linkages in the heritage story, making a new range of demands and forcing innovative solutions.

**Public Sector**

The public sector is the third group of actors. As mentioned earlier, they were an important driver of innovation at Port Arthur, through their provision of funding, mainly for conservation purposes, after 1979. The public sector also drove innovation by not providing funding on other occasions, forcing management to use private enterprise, new partnership agreements, and sponsorship and networking arrangements in innovative collaborations, as mentioned above. One of the driving factors for innovation, as mentioned earlier, is the level of risk which operators or managers are willing to undertake while implementing their innovations. The public sector has been unusually willing to accept a considerable level of risk at Port Arthur, first with the buy-back of the heritage fabric and secondly with the funding of the Conservation Project; both of which were ground-breaking strategies which resulted in the long-term ability to manage the heritage and conservation values of the site in a way which would not have been possible if it had not been a single entity.
Other Stakeholders

Other stakeholders are the fourth group of actors who have driven and determined how innovation will or will not take place at Port Arthur. Stakeholders provide an extra group of actors not included in the original Sundbo & Gallouj (2000) model. Although the actors mentioned above, plus the management and employees of the site can be described as stakeholders, this group includes a wide range of people who do not fit within the categories already mentioned. Other stakeholders, in this model, include tourists as well as locals and all those who feel they have a vested interest in Port Arthur for professional, personal or business reasons. Other stakeholders are responsible for much of the discussion as to the benefits and disadvantages of maintaining such a tangible memory of the convict era. As time passed stakeholders included recreationalists as well as those with heritage interests, and the local inhabitants of Port Arthur as well as those whose private enterprise depended on the tourist business attracted by the site. In more recent times the stakeholders have included those involved in the massacre and its aftermath.

Tourism Service Suppliers

The fifth group of actors is the tourism service suppliers who provide ancillary services without which the heritage attraction would not be sustainable as attraction businesses. Tourism service suppliers can drive and determine the shape of innovation as operators who include or exclude the attraction from their itinerary. These suppliers also package their own products and can create alternative forms of access with different meanings and associations for tourists, which can change the level of risk for innovations implemented by heritage site managers. Private enterprise was almost wholly responsible for establishing Port Arthur as a tourist destination. Hobart and Port Arthur based businesses worked together to package tourism which included transport, accommodation, a museum, guiding services and various recreational activities, as already explained, this was a form of innovation system.

Each of the forces included in the model under discussion (Figure 6) can drive or determine the way in which innovation will occur. They do not all exist at the same time, but in different combinations, which affects the innovation implemented and its outcome. As mentioned earlier, the pattern of innovation fluctuates between periods of
activity and inertia depending on customer demand, the existence of actors willing (or not) to drive innovation and the length of time since the last wave of innovation. The theories discussed throughout this chapter have been encapsulated in a model (Figure 7), below. Figure 7 explains how and why innovation takes place at heritage attractions.

THE MODEL OF INNOVATION AT HERITAGE ATTRACTIONS

The case of Port Arthur has been used to develop a model (Figure 7), which brings together the factors considered in this study and to illustrate how innovation can occur at heritage attractions. The parameters for this model were stipulated by the heritage context. The main elements include events in the internal and external environment; place, which incorporates the intrinsic heritage resources; a time-lag; meaning; the forces which determine and drive innovation; and the tourist experience which is the outcome of the process.

EVENTS – SELF AND PLACE

Events have a direct impact on place and its history as they provide new episodes in the story and can directly affect the appeal of an attraction to tourists, hence its ability to remain sustainable in business terms. Absorbing the events into the interpretation of place maintains relevance for contemporary audiences and promotes longevity. Different types of events take place all the time, some of which have a direct impact on the heritage attraction and others that have an impact on society. Because heritage is widely defined as an interpretation of the past for the present (Ashworth 1994; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1995; Lowenthal 1998) it suggests that the dynamic nature of heritage continually evolves through a pattern of innovative activity and inertia as explained. The model (Figure 7), below incorporates the dynamism of events, which cause change to the heritage resource, and the effects of time and meaning in the innovative renewal of the heritage experience.

Events can be sudden or occur over long periods and they can be obvious or almost impossible to detect while they take place, but they lay the foundations for innovation creating momentum for future activity. They can also bring periods of inertia to an end when the effect of an event changes the values and meanings associated with a
heritage place or its resources, forcing a new interpretation that might match or alter current perceptions. The effect of events can be radical or incremental but viewed over time they have a profound effect on place, changing how it reflects the past and how it fits into the present. Heritage sites exist in a state of disequilibrium as places seek to deal with and manage change wrought by events which are described here as self-events or place-events.

**FIGURE 7: THE INNOVATION SYSTEM AT HERITAGE TOURIST ATTRACTIONS**

- Place & history
- Events – perceptions of place
- Events – perceptions of self
- Meaning – signs interpretation triggers
- Meaning – symbolic identity
- Innovation driven by internal and external forces
- Heritage Experience
Perceptions of Place

Events, which change perceptions of place, include those unplanned and unexpected occurrences, which change the visual or mental image of the heritage attraction. They affect its symbolic meaning and the type of experience the tourist will have in the place. This type of event causes shifts in how society perceives the place and what it represents. These events can elicit new presentation and interpretation of heritage values for a contemporary audience. An example from the case study would be the fires at Port Arthur between 1884 and 1897, which turned the ex-prison buildings to ruins. The event changed the visual image, softening the harsh prison walls to ivy-strewn ruins reflecting the end of the penal system and distancing it in time from the contemporary viewer. At the same time the ruins provided a foundation for future interpretation as the ruins came to symbolise repentance, suffering and reform.

Perceptions of Self

Perceptions about the self effect the co-production of the tourist experience. Events that change perceptions also change the level of engagement that is possible between place, in the form of interpretive triggers, and tourist. When events have a severe effect on the perception of self, personal needs and expectations change and alter the individual tourist experience, which is the result of the co-production process. Some events may take place slowly, such as those which are linked to generational change resulting in new attitudes which need to be accommodated if audiences are to consider the heritage story to be significant. Other events might be traumatic and occur within a single generation. An example of an event which changed individual perceptions was the more sympathetic view of convicts, adopted after the First World War which reflected a level of understanding about suffering which had not been evident before. Both types of events can occur at any time and before the effects of a single event can be absorbed a different event may occur, changing the outcome and causing further disequilibrium.

THE TIME LAG

A time lag exists between events and their inclusion into, or omission from, the tourist experience. For some events the time lag appears short and the affect on the tourist experience may be almost simultaneous. However, the immediate effects and those
over a longer term will not necessarily be the same. The time lag enables the micro view of recent history and living memory to slowly evolve into the macro view accorded by hindsight. The time lag is often the period of inertia, explained above, where the previous interpretation slowly becomes distanced from the contemporary audience who require additional information once links with existing knowledge fade. The time lag enables the operators of the attraction to decide which heritage resource will be pertinent for the next wave in the process of designing strategies to reinvent and renew the product or process. Once sufficient time has passed internal and external forces enable innovative activity resulting in new interpretation, which can either precipitate, or reflect, the shifting meanings and values associated with the site. The innovations, which are implemented following the time lag, depend on which forces are in place to drive and determine choice and scope at the time when a period of activity starts.

**MEANING**

In order for the heritage attraction to maintain its significance, the interpretation must be meaningful. There are two types of meaning in this model which combine as a competitive advantage and work towards the co-production of the tourist experience. The first type of meaning is manifest in interpretation and what it signifies. Signs include the raw materials, location, knowledge and the place as a repository of stories and provide the meaningful triggers that may be designed to engage the audience, or may be intrinsic to the place supplying integral connection points, such as views and atmosphere. The malleable qualities of the signs facilitate using interpretation as an innovative tool through which new meanings are communicated to new audiences. Meaningful triggers are provided by operators - they not only include the choice of artefacts, but the knowledge they contain, the mode of delivery, and the display. Interpretation, which engages its audience, creates a meaningful dialogue between place and visitor (Hirschman 1982; Lovelock, Patterson & Walker 1998; Strange 2000; Wanhill 2003).

The second type of meaning lies in the symbolic associations that link place and person in terms of identity, perspective and connections that are unique and personal. These meanings are not interpreted as overtly as the signs because they can be abstract and are associated with the iconic values inherent in the place and the personal bonds that are significant to individuals. This is particularly the case with those places, which are
associated with national and collective identities, and other types of identity that are significant at attractions. Symbolic meaning may therefore be personal and unique. Innovation occurs when links with identities are reinvented or renewed in order to maintain relevance to the current audience. The combination of the signs interpreted to engage the tourist and the symbolic meanings associated with the heritage place, work with each individual to co-produce the unique and personal heritage tourist experience. As mentioned before, Pine and Gilmore (1999) suggest that experience is entertaining, educational, aesthetic and escapist, this research contends that it is all of these, but also a co-production (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004) which makes all experiences participatory as visitors engage through emotional and intellectual access to the place on their own terms.

CONCLUSION

This study began with an observation that heritage places change over time, that observation was the catalyst for the following questions.

◊ Why and how do heritage attractions innovate?
◊ What form does innovation take within the heritage context?
◊ What are the forces that drive and determine the shape of innovation?
◊ What is the role of meaning in the process of innovation at heritage attractions?

The reason why heritage attractions need to innovate is to survive as economically sustainable attractions. Survival depends on the continuous perception of importance for heritage sites and it is this factor which creates the need to innovate. Consequently, although iconic heritage attractions risk losing their value for contemporary generations if they fail to innovate, innovation is dependent on operators to drive the next stage of evolution. Innovation is within the control of the operators who use their resources to support the heritage attraction. As has been suggested, the link between heritage and what is inherited needs to be maintained if attractions are to be sustainable (Garrod & Fyall 2000). To remain relevant, places have to be significant to each generation and therefore their meaningful attributes need to be flexible enough to engage with changing attitudes and perceptions. If they lose their relevance to their audience, or they cease to be significant to the broader community, then they cease to be
meaningful and will no longer attract visitors. They may also potentially lose funding from both tourism and governments to conserve and manage their heritage values. This marks the difference between heritage places that do not need tourism and heritage attractions that need to attract tourists to be sustainable in economic terms. Attractions that no longer attract tourists may become heritage places outside the realm of tourism. The study encapsulated this notion of flexibility over time as it traced how Port Arthur changed the emphasis of its story, the artefacts and built infrastructure used as signs and symbols and the strategic focus of its business. Change occurred in small incremental steps, which when considered over the prolonged period of the case study can be identified as radical innovations.

Several types of innovation were identified, providing answers about how innovation is implemented at iconic heritage attractions. The study found that innovation was employed for multiple outcomes. The pattern of innovation demonstrated alternating waves of activity and inertia each of which was mutually dependent. The study identified product, process, position and paradigm innovations (Bessant & Davies 207) and found examples of each throughout the period under review. A contribution this study made to the field was to consider risk as an integral requirement for innovation at heritage attractions. In order to identify innovation it was necessary to develop new definitions of the products and processes involved at heritage attractions. Two types of product were identified, one supplied by the operator, which has been identified in this study as the primary access product; and the other which is the outcome of the co-production process between the operator and the visitor, which is referred to as a secondary experience product. Product innovation was implemented through access based on physical, virtual, emotional and intellectual forms which changed over time. Process innovation was based on changes to the co-production of the tourist experience product, driven by a combination of customer demand and the provision of new resources, including raw materials. Over the distance of time the meanings associated with artefacts, built fabric and other resources which could be used as signs and symbols for interpretation changed. Position innovation occurred as the heritage attraction attempted to compete in an increasingly satiated market place. Repositioning as a niche heritage attraction and seeking to attract more specialised tourists made the site more exclusive and specialised for those interested in the heritage values of the place. At the same time, the attraction had to supply experience triggers for a broader
and more generic audience in order to ensure economic sustainability. This was achieved through the development of new forms of interpretation through re-enactments, special events and increased forms of interactivity between place and visitor, enabling additional points of access in physical, emotional, intellectual and virtual forms. Paradigm innovation was evident in the changing strategic focus of the organisation, driven by changes in attitude towards heritage values and the emergence of a conservation ethic. Sustainability no longer solely rested on economic returns, but also on the social and environmental elements of the site and its preservation for future generations.

Having identified the pattern of innovation and the forms it took, the next question addresses the forces which drove and determined the shape of innovation over time. This was provided by the adapted model (Figure 6), which considered the effects of disequilibrium in the internal and external environments and how these affected the heritage attraction. The forces for innovation are conditioned by time and circumstance as each iteration provides different parameters which drive and determine the shape of the innovation which will be implemented, and the type of problem the innovation is designed to overcome.

The role of meaning at heritage tourist attractions is paramount. It is integral throughout the formation and continued development of the attraction and provides the fundamental essence for significance and, by association, relevance of the place as a heritage attraction. Without meaning the heritage values associated with the place beyond the attraction of tourists would be diminished or cease altogether. In this study, meaning is multi-layered in that it is a raw material for heritage, it is also a tool for interpretation and it is an outcome of the heritage experience providing the take-home constituent.

In order to bring the theories that emerged from this study together, a model (Figure 7), of the innovation system at heritage attractions was developed. This includes events that have a profound effect on heritage sites, activating the process of change. Events represent the disequilibrium in the external environment, which acts as a catalyst for changing perceptions. The absorption of the event and its effects on the tourist experience takes place over a time-lag as living memory and personal knowledge give way to myth and storytelling and the macro-view of events emerges through hindsight.
Once the event becomes a heritage resource it can be incorporated into the interpretation through a series of signs. The choice of tangible and intangible raw materials used as signs depends on which forces are currently active in the external or internal environments to shape innovation. Forces are various but, in combination, they determine the design of the interpretation, its content, context and strategy. Through engagement with the meaningful signs and symbols provided as interpretive triggers tourists and others are able to co-produce their personal and unique experiences of being in place.

This study made several contributions to the areas of innovation, heritage and tourism. Within innovation studies, research which previously considered tourism tended to do so in generic terms or in connection with hospitality and how adapted or adopted technologies were implemented. In this study, heritage tourism has been identified as a separate sector within the tourism realm displaying different criteria, including the inclusion of tangible artefacts, relics and built fabric; as well as the intangible components of myth, storytelling and the imagined past. How these components are part of the innovation process has not been considered in previous studies. They contribute to the notion of innovation from within an organisation, using resources that are already part of the internal environment as a form of inside-out innovation. This is an area of study that is slowly and currently emerging within the innovation field.

The mutable nature of heritage resources provides a wealth of uses, not yet discovered, within existing attractions. Also, the notion of heritage as constantly changing and developing has been strengthened by this study. The contribution to the study of tourism, particularly heritage tourism, is a new definition of the product and process used at heritage attractions. This is supplemented by an alternative way of thinking about exactly what the operator controls as well as the tourist experience as a co-production, which is largely outside the control of the operator. A model which brings the theory together and includes time as a crucial factor in innovation is also a contribution to this field.
FUTURE RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS

The theory that access is a product at heritage tourist attractions provides opportunities for further study. Different forms of access within the control of the operator are worthy of more exploration, as is the idea that access, is a component of the heritage tourist attraction rather than its end result. Consideration of the role of business risk and innovation within the heritage tourism sector is another area that has not been included as the focus of previous studies. Risk has tended to be associated with the risks to heritage rather than consideration of the risks taken by the business in all of its capacities (as curator as well as tourist operator) when innovation is implemented.

The fact that marketing has provided the basic theory for much of the research into attraction products needs to be questioned. The difference between what is bought by the tourist, and what is sold by the organisation has not been considered previously, hence providing an opportunity for further research which may have applications beyond the realm of tourism. This study may also identify new and previously untapped resources for innovation which exist within the sector but which have been dismissed as fixed rather than flexible. Research encompassing a wider view of the past may provide alternative stories and offer opportunities for operators to add even more flexibility into their access products.

Experiences are a popular area of research at the moment, however very little research considers the multiple depths of experience which tourists undergo, considering the tourist experience to be the product and therefore generic and relatively shallow. When access is the product and the experience is a co-production, the depths to which tourists, as individuals, are willing to engage with the site and making their own meanings is an area in which more research could usefully be done.

This research provides a new view of the heritage attraction, and the role of the operator as the provider of access may have value for those engaged in managing heritage tourist attractions. Those involved in designing interpretation may be encouraged to change their tactics if they consider the outcome of their work as triggers for personal experiences rather than the creation of generic experiences. Change might be manifest in the application of meaning if tourists, as individuals, are included as part of the co-production rather than the target of preordained messages.
This type of interpretation could provide a broader spectrum of engagement and open different types of connections for individuals, rather than restricting the interpretation to narrow targeted themes.
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