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This paper explores the history of attitudes to European human remains among the settlers and citizens of the Sydney region, focussing particularly on the long-dead. It presents four case studies of burial grounds in the Sydney region which were removed or drastically altered. Together these sites demonstrate the changes and continuities in attitudes to the dead and cemeteries. They trace the ebb and flow of spirituality, modernity, heritage and history over the past 160 years, offering a 'long view' over the historic/cultural context for those working in these areas today.

Burial grounds and attitudes to human remains

The history of burial grounds and those buried in them are convergence points for the tangled strands of memory, history and heritage. They encompass opposed themes: the urges both to hold fast and to banish, commemorate and obliterate. They were sites of emotional intimacy and utter indifference, devotion and repulsion. Meant to endure, they were often refashioned in accordance with constantly shifting beliefs, tastes and quests.

This paper explores the history of attitudes to European human remains among the settlers and citizens of the Sydney region. A key distinction in this history is that between the recently departed and the long-dead. We know that rituals of care, respect and memorialisation for the recent dead were established in the European community by both the convicts and elite and were continuous thereafter. Pat Jailand has established the deep importance of the earthen graves, which were intended to be inviolable, permanent resting-places. But ironically, as in most western cultures, these sensibilities rarely if ever extended to the long-dead. Old burial grounds were usually considered "waste ground", ripe for new development, or eyesores which needed obliteration and refashioning.

To trace this history into the realms of the long-dead, I will explore the histories of four burial grounds in the Sydney region which were removed or radically altered. They are: the Old Sydney Burial Ground, removed in 1869; the Devonshire Street Cemetery in Sydney, removed in 1901; the Point Frederick cemetery near Gosford on the Central Coast, radically altered in 1977; and the Destitute Children's Cemetery at Randwick, removed in 1996. Together these sites demonstrate the changes and continuities in European attitudes to the dead, and they stand for the fates of many other burial grounds in the Sydney region and New South Wales.

Old Sydney Burial Ground: bodies as the conscious unknown 1793-1869

In April 1869 the 'remains of mortality' of some of 2000 dead were dug up from the Old Sydney Burial Ground in a single day. The site was being cleared for a new, ostentatious Town Hall. Among the dead were the colony's earliest white inhabitants (officers, free people, emancipists and convicts), for the burial ground opened in 1793 and closed in 1820. The bones were carted out to Rookwood and buried, jumbled up, in a mass grave. An impressive and elaborate monument was raised over the spot. It reads:

Erected by the Municipal Council of the City of Sydney over the remains removed from St Andrew's Cathedral Close, George and Druitt Streets Sydney used as a cemetery prior to the year 1822. Walter Penny Mayor.

So, while the Council and Mayor are recorded, there are no names of the early Sydney dead here: they are merely 'the remains', a sort of by-product of city progress.

This illustrates pragmatic, rather contemptuous attitudes to the long-dead. Nevertheless, as Lisa Murray shows, there had been considerable debate over the removal, and whether or not it should take place. The speakers were politicians and religious ministers, engineers and mayor. The voices of Sydney's common people were speculated upon, but unheard, and so their feelings on the matter are unknown. Some held traditional views about the dead, arguing that it was sacrilegious and disrespectful to disturb them. By 1867, though, these spiritual concerns had dwindled to vague uneasiness, a residual superstition, which usually collapsed under firmer-like cross-examination by the Reverend John Dunmore Lang.

As Murray also shows, concern over the physical threat the dead might pose to the living ran parallel to this spiritual uneasiness. Would they emit noxious gases if disturbed, would their corrupted flesh release disease and debility? Some were adamant that they would, and told tales of instant deaths which had resulted where medieval cemeteries were shifted for the new railways in London. Others, especially engineers and city boosters, regarded this as a lot of overrated nonsense. These men considered themselves 'practical' and 'scientific', the makers of modern Sydney. 'I have heard it said', blustered the Mayor Charles Moore impatiently (and, as it turned out, ironically), 'you will not find a hatful of bones in the old Burial Ground!'

An astonishing lack of historical knowledge about the old burial ground was also woven through this discourse. It is striking evidence of the discontinuity of collective memory in the young colony. Witness after witness ruminated, speculated, made bold and incorrect assertions. When had it closed? Were there any living descendant with evidence of the discontinuity of collective memory in the young colony. Witness after witness ruminated, speculated, made bold and incorrect assertions. When had it closed? Were there any living descendant with
Figure 1 Early headstones in Devonshire Street Cemetery, recorded in one of the photographs taken by Mrs A. G. Foster 1901.
(courtesy Royal Australian Historical Society)

The key conclusion by 1867 was that the dead had no place in the modern city; they were part of an increasingly irrelevant past, a hindrance to development; they depressed property prices and should be moved out. If this was done carefully and 'respectfully' there could be no objection. But, as Engineer Edward Bell pointed out, this would be almost impossible: how could the dead be removed carefully, if most of the graves were now unmarked? The entire 7-8 feet of soil would have to be removed. The undertaker Robert Stewart was given the contract to remove the dead, and the operation was neither thorough nor carried out with 'due care'. And for the next 120 years, bones, vaults and coffins continued to be discovered beneath and around the Sydney Town Hall, and unknown numbers still lie there.

Devonshire Street Cemetery 1820-1901: stones, bones and the rise of heritage and the pioneer legend.

What was notably absent from the discourse about the Old Sydney Burial Ground, then, was any consideration of the stone memorials erected to the dead. The focus was entirely on the bodies, a rather threatening unknown quantity. James Bonwick transcribed the inscriptions from 25 surviving stones in 1866, but it did not occur to anyone to insist that connections be maintained between the individual's identity and their remains; nor that the headstones be preserved. Only a few decades had passed, but the people of early Sydney were now strangers, distant, foreign, indistinct figures in a rapidly receding and increasingly distasteful past.

In 1901, the process was repeated when the Devonshire Street Burial Ground was removed to make way for Sydney's Central Railway Station. This burial ground (actually made up of seven cemeteries divided by denomination) was opened in 1820 as the successor to the Old Sydney Burial Ground. The number of burials there was recorded after Rookwood Necropolis was opened in the late 1860s, and Devonshire Street was officially closed in 1886. In their search for a site for a major new railway terminus, engineers lighted on these seemingly unoccupied, abandoned and neglected lands.

Its removal was a massive project, involving 4000 graves with monuments and more than 30,000 bodies. The project was carried out by the mighty Public Works Department of New South Wales. By this time, the discourse and priorities concerning the dead had changed in three ways. First, there was no soul-searching about the spiritual propriety or public health dangers of disturbing the dead which had marked the earlier exhumations. The project was announced and received, it seems, matter-of-factly. Some applauded it as a long-overdue cleanup of the overgrown and rubbish-strewn site, a project that would honour the dead instead of neglecting them. Less reputable papers like the Star ran some sensational and gruesome stories, but these were clearly nonsensical. The exhumations and reburials were not amateur and callous, as the earlier operation at the Old Sydney Burial Ground had been. The Department swung into action, exhumed bodies, railed stones and bones on a specially built railway line to new sites at Rookwood, Bunnerong and elsewhere, and wiped the site clean.

Second, this time the last interment occurred perhaps only twelve years before. These dead were not necessarily strangers: there was a consciousness of extant links with the living. So efforts were made to contact relatives and negotiate the removal at government expense, and it was accepted that body and stone should be moved and reinstated together, and hence the identities of the deceased were preserved, for the time being anyway.

But, third, a change in attitude had occurred with regard to the long-dead: they were now beginning to be conceived as pioneers of the nation. Mr and Mrs A. G. Foster, foundation members of the Royal Australian Historical Society, took upon themselves the extraordinary project of recording the inscriptions on the headstones in meticulous detail, both through transcribing on paper and through Mrs Foster's photography. They worked tirelessly on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays for months, he meticulously drawing the headstones and the words on them in the correct position, and she painstakingly inking in every letter on the stones themselves so that they were crisp and distinct when reinscribed on the photographic glass plates. The Epitaph books and five volumes of photographs were lodged in the Mitchell Library.

The couple then set about researching the lives of pioneers whose graves they had recorded. Eighteen years later, A. G. Foster gave an illustrated talk to the RAHS which presented both the images and history of the vanished cemetery together with a 'ramble' through the lives of the pioneers. "Through this cemetery", he said, "we are about to wend our way. We shall see the graves of the man and women whose services to the colony were so great and whose lives were so full of incident and adventure. There followed a cavalcade of First Fleeters, military men, hardy adventurers and spirited entrepreneurs who had begun to people the historical imagination of Australians in the early years of Federation. The graves were the tangible links through which contact had been re-established. The Fosters expressed feelings of great satisfaction: the camera had permanently preserved what progress had to sweep away."
Point Frederick Cemetery, now Pioneer Park c1840-1977: the body disappears

So the Devonshire Street removal involved the efficient recording, removal and re-inhumation of both bodies and stones. Yet in tandem with this modern, no-nonsense dispersal of the dead, rose the powerful pioneer legend, a legacy of tough, brave men and women who blazed the trail so that people of the new nation might live in ease and plenty. The convict past was obscured, for the Fosters avoided the fact that many of the pioneers were convicts - they were now 'First Fleeters'. And in their focus on the stones and their inscriptions, rather than the bones themselves, lay the seeds of what was to come. 'Heritage' came to be redefined as the material legacy of the past - buildings, artefacts, gravestones - while the real historical people faded correspondingly from view and from consciousness.

William John Nunn, an ex-soldier of Her Majesty's 38th Regiment was 38 when he died. There were already descriptions of the cemetery's neglected and dilapidated state in 1902, although it was also described locally as 'picturesque'. By the 1950s it was overgrown with lantana, many stones had toppled or leaned precariously, though the dreaded scrub, the enemy, may well have protected them and their inscriptions. Small paths wound through the thickets between the headstones. Burial grounds like this provided 'wild places' for local people - places just beyond the pale of rules and regulations where lovers could meet, and kids could roam unsupervised and try a surreptitious cigarette.

Disorder, neglect, untidiness, unsupervised places: no wonder Point Frederick cemetery was abhorred by local, male-only service clubs like Rotary and Apex. They were lobbying Gosford Council to turn the cemetery into a Memorial Park as early as 1953. The Gosford Cemetery Bill was passed by Parliament in 1970 allowing the cemetery to be redeveloped as parkland. Gosford Council then accepted the clubs' enthusiastic offer to assist in the transformation of the old cemetery into a Pioneer Park.

The new scheme, devised by staff at the Royal Botanic Gardens, was a network of curved pathways and gardens in which the best-preserved and most handsome headstones, a total of 75, were removed from their graves and re-erected in 'artistic' little groups. These, however, represented people of some means. The majority of Gosford's people were of humble standing, whose graves were marked only with wooden crosses, mounds or depressions. The other parts of the graves - kerbs and bodystones - were bulldozed into a heap and either carted away or broken up and reused as stepping stones in the gardens. A second area was simply open grassed ground with picnic benches.

A memorial monument was also raised to the pioneers of Gosford. It was designed by local Terrigal artist Alton Mort and was constructed by Kewba Pools Pty Ltd of Erina. Although made of concrete, this memorial represents two trees, symbolising male and female standing together, and was intended as 'a bold expression of timber wrought by the determined spirit of the pioneers'. A bronze bas-relief panel, framed by the profiles of a man and a woman, depicts 'pioneer activities' such as timber-getting, boat-building and sugar-cane growing (though the last was short-lived on the Central Coast). Three more panels list the names of 497 people who were then known to have been buried here. A smaller tablet commemorates the men of Rotary and Apex in their efforts for the community. Pioneer Park was opened and rededicated with much fanfare on 26 February 1977 before an audience of 500 people. The speeches dwelt not on the lives of the pioneers being memorialised, but on the project itself: the voluntary work, the cost, the men involved, the vision. 'Pioneer Park is a combination of many dreams by many people over the past years' concluded Shire President and Rotarian Malcolm Brooks.

The early graves had been arranged roughly in rows on the
rocky slopes, probably facing east, but the new scheme bore no relation to the original cemetery layout. The curving paths echo suburban subdivision patterns favoured in the 1970s. The wild place vanished and in its place was a showpiece of tidy municipal and suburban taste, with lighting to deter nefarious activities, a wisteria-covered entrance pergola and parking bays made of poles painted mission brown. Untidy waste ground had been turned into something useful. And as the paths, gardens, picnic ground are all built over the dead, we now stroll, sit and eat over their unmarked graves. School students sent by their teachers to study Pioneer Park do not realise this: in their projects they refer to the headstones as ‘graves’.22

This simple unawareness points to what is striking about the transformation of Point Frederick Pioneer Park, and so many others like it.23 The dead were left in situ, their presence was ignored altogether and they were visually lost. While the worthies of the 1840s and 1860s had worried over the capacity of the dead to harm the living, and the Public Works Department in 1901 scrupulously shifted every bone onto the railway cars which rattled them off to their new resting places, by the 1970s the dead were strangely absent. They were never mentioned, let alone considered, in the remaking of the cemetery.

This was, I think, a result of the merging of the broader culture of death-avoidance with twentieth-century modernism that eschewed sentiment, mystery and spirit in favour of hard-edged functionality and ‘rationality’. In ‘Memoral’ and ‘Pioneer’ parks like this one, the headstones took the place of the dead themselves; the stones were now revered objects in their own right, untethered from personal history, the body, the grave. There was some protest from locals when the work was actually undertaken, but the objections were to the ‘disgraceful desecration of some of these headstones’, not to the pioneer park transformation itself.24 Heritage, as Graeme Davison points out, was by now understood as the material inheritance, rather than the historic-cultural one.25

And the pioneer legend had been transformed too. While the Fosters had anchored their pioneers in real life stories, albeit delicately leaving out some of the details, by the 1970s the legend was an abstract, general and stereotyped concept, rather than the remembrance of real historical individuals. Perhaps this is inevitable: after all, just as real convicts are difficult to transform into brave pioneers, many of Gosford’s people were rough, heavy-drinking working folk: timber getters, bullock drivers and the like. Reverend Giennie frankly despairs of the souls of many of them.

**Destitute Children’s Cemetery at Randwick:** science, culture and the rediscovery of the body

In 1996, another Sydney cemetery was transformed, through exhumation and reinterment. The site was the Destitute Children’s Cemetery at Randwick, now in the grounds of the Prince of Wales Hospital. It had stood at the far end of the Asylum grounds, and between 1863 and 1861 it received the bodies of 174 children, mostly orphans and most between the ages of four and six, who died at the Asylum. Unlike the other three cemeteries, with their lolling stones and unseemly tangled overgrowth, this one had slipped almost entirely from collective consciousness. There were no surviving grave markers, if there ever had been any, and the children were obscure, they never grew up to make their mark. There is only one written description, from 1890, a glimpse, though vivid: ‘far away to the back of the grounds we saw a prettily-planted, shady-looking plot, railed off’.26

The cemetery did not fare well. From 1915 it was part of a military hospital which in 1953 became the Prince of Wales Hospital and there was no visible trace of it on the ground. Some of the children’s remains had been removed by the Public Works Department, probably in 1918, to make way for wards, but there is no record of what happened to them. The timber and corrugated iron huts built over the burial ground were finally demolished in 1993/1994 to make way for massive new hospital developments. The area was cleared, a gas line was installed through it, and the northern section of the site was subject to a sand extraction program. In 1994, skeletal material, which had been disturbed by the demolition of the old huts, was noticed and collected by archaeologists. These mute, small things resulted in a major archaeological investigation of the site beginning with the preparation of a Statement of Significance and a Conservation Policy.27 By this time, these were standard documents for heritage sites, manifestations of the more professionalised, standardised and bureaucratised heritage system of the 1990s.28

This Conservation Policy concluded that the site had considerable ‘Social Significance’, but that did not mean it could not be excavated. Indeed, the document argued that archaeological excavation would realise the ‘scientific potential’ of the site, or, more specifically, the bodies. In effect this gave the go-ahead for the cemetery to be removed and the site to be redeveloped. It is striking for two reasons: first, for the idea that the dead had ‘scientific value’, as well other kinds of significance, when only 30 years before they were left out of the discourse of heritage entirely.

The second, broader point, then, is that the propriety of exhumation, of disturbing the dead, was considered at all, and had to be justified in this way, for it was an issue which hadn’t
been seriously considered since the 1840s, in most cases where new development takes place, cemeteries have simply been removed, with little or no debate. Interestingly, one of the reasons offered for the site's social and community importance was that it had no formal 'landscape or monuments' - the standard markers of cemetery heritage. In the absence of signs, the bodies themselves were considered the default heritage elements of the cemetery - a reversal of what had happened in the Pioneer Parks, and an indication of the priorities of modern cemetery heritage generally.

It followed that the removal and transformation of old cemeteries could no longer be left in the hands of government departments and local service groups. Now it was the archaeologists' job to raise the dead. The firms Godden Mackay Logan and Austral Archaeology were jointly appointed to carry out the cemetery removal as an archaeological project. An excavation team was assembled, comprising 35 professionals, from archaeologists and historians to forensic anatomists and administrators.

But before the excavation began, elaborate protocols were formulated and extensive consultation carried out. The Management Committee alone included fifteen people representing various interested groups. Public meetings were held to 'identify stakeholders'. The relatives of the children known to have been buried in the cemetery were located and contacted, asked if they would share any information they might have, kept informed, and invited to attend ceremonies. There was a possibility that Aboriginal children were among the dead, so the La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council was also involved. Media interest was extraordinary high, but sensationalist publicity was avoided by organising regular press conferences and carefully controlling the release of information. Before the excavation began, an ecumenical service was held at the site, conducted by the hospital chaplains, followed by an Aboriginal smoking ceremony. It was also determined that any human remains found were to be treated 'with the degree of respect that would be afforded a recently deceased and cherished person in our society' (my emphasis). These protocols applied to the work of the on-site personnel and those involved in the forensic investigation later.

The protocols and strategies appear to have been, at least in part, responses to issues raised in the public meetings. The meeting held in April 1995, for example, was a forum for conflicting views and strongly held feelings about the site. Current concerns over child welfare and child abuse appear to have sharpened sensitivities over the site, the vulnerability of its dead and its importance as a place. Some voiced concern over the 'rights of the buried children, at least some of whom appear to have been mistreated during their lives, and a desire that they not be disturbed further'. Those interested in the scientific study of the children's bones (the site's 'scientific potential') countered, arguing that the excavation was a rare, perhaps unique, opportunity to learn about such things as the race, age, sex, stature, disease, nutrition, environmental stress and genetic relationships; they might provide an 'Australian type-set' of nineteenth-century children. Others again objected strongly to this, pointing out that much of this type of data was already available in documentary sources, that the argument for scientific research was merely a pretext to clear the site for what was in the end only ancillary infrastructure (a carpark), and that disturbing these dead required better reasons. In these early and often passionate debates was a faint echo of the struggle, two hundred years before, between science and popular beliefs about the dead.

Then came the painstaking process of research, testing and excavating the site. The archaeologists dug, sowed, trowelled each square of their grid, drawing, mapping and photographing every detail as the proceeded. Their success was remarkable, especially considering the lack of historical evidence and the disturbed (and disturbing) nature of the site. Sixty-five in situ burials were located, together with the fragments and shadows of plain cedar coffins, the buttons and pins which had held the shirts in which the children had been dressed, fragments of rosary beads. A further 216 individual skeletal elements from dispersed burials were also retrieved. The remains, once located, were treated reverently. Where in situ burials were found, what remained of body and coffin was excavated intact, carefully eased onto perspex sheets, lifted and carried to the site lab. Through documentary and physical research, 39 of the long-lost children could be identified with reasonable certainty - names could be restored to them.

The bones were taken to the Shellshear Museum of Anatomy at the University of Sydney for conservation and study, but they did not remain there. A new cemetery in the Prince of Wales Hospital grounds received the remains in 2000. They were laid in small white boxes, each with a plaque this time, some bearing names of known individuals, and placed in a vault. Neat gardens were 'pretty-planted' and more plaques and signs record names and explain the story of the cemetery's vanishment and reclamation. Here is order, neatness, a place for reflection and remembrance.

This extraordinary care and sensitivity, the outburst of powerful feelings and debates, and the pro-active management style of this project are anomalous. They contrast utterly with the way European people in Sydney have largely regarded the long-dead: with ambivalence, fear, disdain, utter pragmatism, or obliviousness. Why this reverence? Why now? The change seems more fundamental than simply being an elaborate response to early criticisms, or reflecting modern heritage systems, or the fact that the dead were children. These may all have played a role, but the underlying shift may relate more to another significant development in attitudes to the dead in Australia.

For three decades now, Aboriginal people have been demanding the return of the bones of their kin and ancestors from the vaults and laboratories of museums world-wide. Many of these bones had been ruthlessly stolen, hunted and collected in much the same way as botanical or mineral specimens, with no thought for the feelings of kin or descendants. Many campaigns were successful, and the remains made their long journeys back to their people and country, a process bespeaking de-colonisation, re-inscription of country and laying to rest through reburial. Aboriginal people insist that these are never just nameless bones, or specimens, no matter how old; they are always kin. They see no difference between the recently dead and the long-dead. Aboriginal people were involved in the Children's Cemetery project from the beginning, and archaeology is probably the discipline and profession most keenly aware of this discourse, and has experienced its impact most profoundly. In museums, too, as Sharon Sullivan points out 'human remains in general are treated with a great deal more respect and circumspection than formerly' as a result of the campaigns for repatriation.
What thus seems to have occurred here is a transmission, in part at least, Aboriginal cultural sensibilities and beliefs have flowed into the non-Aboriginal cultural arena. While the bones of the asylum children were, in the end, exhumed, studied and tested, this was carried out with the acknowledgement of the long-dead as people, and their reverent reburial as right and fitting.

Epilogue

We have seen that attitudes to the long-dead have shifted remarkably — from the conscious and fearful unknown, to pragmatic and unsentimental acknowledgement, to total oblivion; and thence to the realm of cherished and quasi-sacred remains. These recent developments raise some interesting questions about the future. Will the excavation of the Children’s cemetery be a precedent or remain an anomaly? Will these attitudes to the long-dead spread outwards to touch and envelop the wider community, and permanently reshape our attitudes to the long-dead and the places they are buried?

As Lisa Murray also concludes, the long view tells us that all of the burial grounds, no matter how neat or well-planned initially, eventually become neglected. It is only in relatively recent years, through the heritage and family history movements, that some have been preserved or restored. But how will they survive in the long term? For example, will the new Children’s Cemetery really fare better than the old? Are there hundred-year management plans for this place and places like it?

Even at Point Frederick Pioneer Park, the fiendish asparagus fern, cassia and privet threaten to ‘take over’ once more; the fixtures look neglected and are showing their age. What should become of our many pioneer parks, the legacy of the 1960s and 1970s? The modern heritage practitioner may dismiss them out of hand, but that would be to judge them by today’s standards, and to disregard history. They are, after all, eloquent artefacts of their time, windows onto contemporary attitudes to the dead, heritage and pioneers. At Point Frederick, there is also current social significance, for the park is regarded locally as a ‘good’ outcome for the old cemetery and a special, beautiful, tranquil place. The veterans of Gosford Rotary Club are still intensely proud of it — and its deteriorating state has prompted proposals for restoration work. But they have requested advice for this project, as managers, trustees and community groups of other ageing pioneer parks are likely to do in the future.

So, poised as we all are between history and heritage, vanishment and rediscovery, the acknowledgement yet apprehension of time, the question is: how would we advise them?
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