Author/s:
Pieris, A

Title:
Architectures of the pacific carceral archipelago: Second world war internment and prisoner of war camps

Date:
2016-09-01

Citation:
Pieris, A. (2016). Architectures of the pacific carceral archipelago: Second world war internment and prisoner of war camps. Fabrications, 26 (3), pp.255-285. https://doi.org/10.1080/10331867.2016.1229170.

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/313815

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article "Architectures of the Pacific Carceral Archepelago: Second World War Internment and POW Camps" *Fabrications* 26:3, 255-285, available at https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10331867.2016.1229170

Architectures of the Pacific carceral archipelago: World War II internment and prisoner of war camps

Anoma Pieris

Abstract:

Characterisations of the Pacific Basin as a tropical archipelago essentialise its geo-cultural diversity as an alternative way of envisioning the region and its politics. This paper offers a darker projection of this archipelagic imagination as one forged by imperial competition and wartime violence. It traces its genesis across the history of World War II internment and POW camps. Their spatial proliferation as a carceral geography produces a variety of temporary environments where civil and legal rights are suspended. The roles adopted by captors in their treatment of prisoners reflect the social prejudices of the period, the politics of imperialism and the specific responses of warring nations during various stages of the conflict.

This paper asks how architectural scholarship might address this imperial history. Its innovation is in drawing together diverse models of incarceration related to the Pacific War, acknowledging the different treatment of racially different colonial and national subjects and tracing their passage through multiple spatial configurations of camps. The camps in Australia are contextualised in their wider Pacific geography with special attention to Victoria's Tatura Group.

Anoma Pieris is an Associate Professor at the Melbourne School of Design, The University of Melbourne. Her publications include, *Architecture and Nationalism in Sri Lanka: The trouser under the cloth* (Routledge 2012) and *Hidden Hands and Divided Landscapes: a penal history of Singapore's plural society* (University of Hawaii Press 2009). Anoma is co-author with Janet McGaw of *Assembling the Centre: Architecture for Indigenous Cultures. Australia and Beyond* (Routledge 2014).

Acknowledgements: My special thanks to Lurline and Arthur Knee at the Tatura Irrigation and Wartime Camps Museum and Warwick Finlay and Kay Roberts at the Murchison Historical Society. The research for this paper has been funded by an ARC Future Fellowship FT140100190 (2015-2018).

The period before decolonisation in Asia when imperial boundaries determined local subjectivities offers a different view of the Pacific Basin as a theatre for political contestation associated with extreme levels of violence, distinct from geographic or environmental constructions of the region's heterogeneity. The metaphor of a basin implies a terrestrial circumference, although the Pacific Ocean is not contained in this way; it is a region

comprising continents and islands across several climatic zones. However, Pacific perspectives – the manner in which the Pacific was conceived and is imagined today – are equally shaped by the sensibility of a culturally diverse tropical geography and the postcolonial emergence of independent nation-states after the Pacific War (1941-45).[1] The region's political reconfiguration has its uneasy genesis in the Japanese imperial vision of their unification.[2]

Although Australia countered the Japanese imperial vision as a defender of British imperial interests, war in the Pacific impacted the nation in significant ways.[3] The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor (7 December 1941), Fall of Singapore (15 February 1942) and attack on Darwin (19 February 1942) occurring in close succession, diverted attention from the European theatre of World War II (WWII) to the country's immediate geographic context. Troops reoriented to address the regional threat. Concerns for national safety displaced remote imperial obligations and Australia's defence policy became increasingly dependent on the USA.[4] Locations across Southeast Asia, the West Coast cities of North America, Hawaii, numerous Pacific islands and Japanese cities and ports were familiarised to Australians through military bases, troop movements and the distribution of POW and internment camps. Violent confrontations, including regional battles, reinforced this Pacific geography. Approximately one million Australians fought in WWII against the Axis powers, shifting from early involvement in Europe, North Africa and the Mediterranean to campaigns in the Pacific. The Japanese Imperial Army (JIA) captured 22,000 Australian servicemen including 1500 civilians; some 15,000 of them in Singapore.[5] Approximately 16,000 Australians served in the British Commonwealth Occupation Force in Japan after the war.[6]

The spatial distribution of internment/POW camps and captives of both the Allied forces and JIA converted the Pacific region into a carceral archipelago; a term used by Michel Foucault to describe the social proliferation of power relations through a continuum of disciplinary

spaces; part of the history of modern institutions and transformation of European society through the Enlightenment. The panopticon prison exemplified those models where systems of classification, cellular spaces, daily routines, and continuous surveillance (the new mechanics of coercion) were applied by reformers for normalising delinquents and converting them into docile and governable subjects.[7] At the core of Foucault's thesis on these changing power relations was the shift from oppressive forms of sovereign power to the social technologies by which modern states control and regulate large populations, and human subjects internalise and conform to these regulatory systems.[8] Foucault saw the penal colony as an extreme example of this phenomenon.[9]

As discussed by many scholars both sovereign power and disciplinary reform were evident in the racialised structures of colonial penal governance that acquired degrees of institutional sophistication during the early twentieth century.[10] However, their co-relation was most clearly expressed in Georgio Agamben's work on camp environments where a subject is stripped of political status and reduced to mere biological existence – which he describes as "bare life" and is, in his view, the hidden foundation for sovereign power.[11] He described the camp as such a space of exception. The POW camps of the Pacific War were disciplinary spaces complete with spatial technologies designed to hold the enemy hostage. They were components in the greater military apparatus of contested power relations, but were also spaces of exception where civil and legal rights of non-combatants were suspended to varying degrees – depending on the policies of the holding power. Evidence of riots, shootings and escape attempts reveal how oppression in the form of loyalty tests, impoverishment, disenfranchisement and punitive containment reduced them to bare life. Imperialist negotiation of these two forms of power relations across the carceral archipelago produced a hybrid prenatal environment for postcolonial political formations.

This paper's construction of the Pacific carceral archipelago draws both on interpretations of geographic heterogeneity and contested imperial power relations. At its base is what Paul Carter describes as an emancipatory archipelagic consciousness, where tropical geographies have the potential to transform western epistemologies.[12] Although 'tropical' associations have problematic colonial origins and are too easily used to essentialise the region's heterogeneity, Carter suggests its political potential for challenging what he describes as "continentalist thinking". He writes,

> But suppose that, instead of stretching the envelope of the nation state to an extreme in order to incorporate an archipelagic region, we entertained the possibility that the *scatter* of the archipelago, its nebulous distribution across a region of waters, had a logic of its own.

Carter, drawing on Edouard Glissant's work on the Carribean, [13] among others, argues that the Gulag or nation-centric conception of geography found in continentalist thinking has characterised the archipelago according to its terrestrial attributes and suggests a more poetic interpretation of a decentralised fractal figure.[14] Constructions of the Southeast Asian region that are based on colonial maritime networks capture aspects of this culturally diverse tropical imaginary reproduced across a series of port cities and strengthened by pre-colonial imperial and religious sensibilities based on oceanic and riverine circulation networks.[15] This archipelagic imaginary is not necessarily divorced from operations of power. Border enforcement policies where fluid regional relations meet the hard edges of state sovereignty heighten tensions between these two spatial conceptions where, as discussed by Alison Mountz, migration control through detention on remote islands produces a comparable carceral archipelago.[16] She describes how the physical displacement of island detention sites, their distance and invisibility delay access to judicial processes, relegating interstitial legal categories to displaced and stateless migrant

populations. The turbulent oceanic passages that lead to temporary incarcerations and the opacity of these remote holding places, contrasted with their material deficiency and visual porosity, produce a perverse spatial template for sorting and redistributing populations. Such punitive carceral scatters are familiarised through constructions of national sovereignty against refugee movement. This paper argues that they were historically tested across wartime camp taxonomies; that Pacific war camps for internees/POWs were produced by volatile border conditions and operated as extrajudicial spaces of imperial sovereignty; and that they were presentiments of the national boundaries that hardened post war. They were inscribed by the labouring bodies of prisoners that traversed them – and pathways were carved through the networks and systems that supported their penal redistribution. This carceral geography interpolated the archipelagic imagination that had been appropriated and partitioned by competing imperialisms and prepared the ground for further geo-political fragmentation.

While such literal interpretations of these terms may seem limiting, they help spatialise the redistribution of imperial violence, largely neglected in Australian architectural histories.[17] There are numerous studies of war-related military establishments, monuments, memorials, cemeteries and prison buildings that are planned by eminent designers, but their aesthetic representations and social sympathies obscure the underlying aggression and human cost.[18] The short duration of camp environments and their inferior materiality has denied them comparable attention, compounded by their hasty erection, prefabrication, and poor regard for design or planning. Their further modification by local labour, or captive populations defers a self-conscious interpretation of their design attributes. Australian camp histories are largely found in personal memoirs or social histories that use ethnographic methods.[19] However, camps are often provisional sites for irresolute strategies of punishment and precursors to

institutionalisation, and as such play an important role in our knowledge of citizenship policies. Their wartime geographical proliferation demonstrates their significance as a form of temporary accommodation.

Pacific camp environments are distinct from those of Europe where the terrestrial spread of Nazi camp taxonomies dominated the conquered landscape. Camps with varied programs of transit, detention, forced labour, concentration or extermination have been enumerated in their thousands, exposing the systematic persecution and genocide of several million Jews.[20] Camps in the Pacific feature very differently, as competing elements in an oceanic theatre for emerging settler imperialisms drawn through military alliances into the colonial contest. They were punitive military environments in which colonial entitlements were provisionally reversed, exposing the weakness of European colonisers to colonised subjects. These socio-spatial inversions proved critical for decolonising colonial subjectivity, whereby the Japanese imperial vision of Asian co-prosperity fed strains of political self-determination, and cultivated anti-colonial resistance groups.[21] The War acted as a catalyst for US military imperialism, Australian spatial decolonisation and independence across Asia underscored by the spectre of Japanese empowerment and defeat. Culturally Japanese subjects, either as victims or perpetrators, were present across all these scenarios. The JIA established camps for the Allied POWs and European and Asian internees they captured across Asia, while Americans of Japanese ancestry were interned *en*mass in the USA, Canada and Peru. Japanese migrants were captured and transported from Asia and islands in the Asia Pacific from British, French and Dutch colonial territories and sent to POW and internment camps in India, Australia and New Zealand.[22]

The architectural methods explored in this paper rely on spatial interpretations of the carceral condition, which will be discussed briefly. It next tests the potential of this framework across the various types of camps occurring in the Pacific region within which an Australian case

study, the Tatura Group of camps in Victoria, is contextualised. Whereas the Pacific Basin has the ocean as its defining element and camps are distributed across islands and continents, at Tatura the camps are isolated spaces around the landlocked Wangara Basin.

Spatialising the carceral condition

Analyses of the physical manifestations of the carceral condition, as illustrated in Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, persists in the subfield of carceral geography, based on the scholarship of Dominique Moran.[23] However, Moran investigates the human experience of physical incarceration more closely, discussing important synergies with criminology and prison sociology, and allowing for a broader interpretation of the 'çarceral' as spatial, emplaced, mobile, embodied and affective.[24] Such human experiences are fundamental to social histories of wartime incarceration gleaned from oral accounts or memoirs, while the incarceration of civilian conscripts or civilians without criminal records further validates this approach. Studies of colonial prisoners as subaltern subjects offer important precedents to these approaches.[25]

Moran's book, *Carceral Geographies* extrapolates these interpretations thematically in relation to the spaces and experiences of incarceration, the systems involved and relationships with an increasingly punitive state. The third theme of social construction offers an imaginative interpretation of a carceral cultural landscape "saturated with and arguablycommunicative of punitive messages"; a reading that resonates with architectural and urban studies.[26] As pointed out by Moran, the connection is made explicit in Mike Davis's use of the term "carceral" in *City of Quartz*, to describe the "security obsessed urbanism" of Los Angeles; where punitive technologies applied to California's penal population (the largest in the nation) spilled over into a wider urban culture of fortification

against growing social disparities.[27] By describing the city as a fortress, Davis domesticated Foucault's carceral continuum as applicable to everyday systems of surveillance in homes, gated communities and shopping malls. This distinction between deliberate strategies of confinement and their cultural manifestations differentiate imprisonment within the criminal justice system from other scenarios – however, as most evident in wartime examples, these boundaries are frequently blurred. Wartime political exigency is used to legitimise the punitive jurisdiction of sovereignty and related suspension of civil rights. Spaces for warehousing internees operate as prisons. An architectural interrogation of this schema is particularly revealing of this ambiguity.

An architectural history of camp environments needs to review their construction, operation, dispersal and commemoration across four temporal periods. The first period covers site selection, preparation, provision of infrastructure, materials and labour in the setting up of camps, including the conversion of extant military or penal facilities or civic institutions, as well as new constructions. Transportation conduits for people and supplies, and the water resources for the incarcerated population are critical site considerations. The planning, design and construction of camp facilities by military, community, or private contractors extends from this to the second operative phase with the arrival and involvement of the POWs/internees. They continue to modify the camp. Facilities include the residential barracks or huts, mess halls and utility buildings; the associated schools, hospitals, stores, community and religious structures; quarters for military or administrative personnel; surveillance structures and fortifications; temporary structures and landscape features and camp-related agricultural areas and industries. This period roughly coincides with the duration of war. The third period of dispersal follows the decommissioning of camps, dismantling, auctioning and repurposing of buildings and building materials, and in some instances the retention of some facilities for use as post war immigrant or military camps. The

fourth period, typically, has a time lag of several decades, when pressure from redress movements or requests by former internee/POW groups prompt the construction of commemorative spaces and structures; officially for interment of those who died during the war and unofficially through the activities of former internees /POWs, their descendents and associated local communities. These take the forms of cemeteries, peace parks, interpretive centres, museum collections and heritage precincts, for example. They are drawn together through tourism networks that spill over from established battlefield tours to Changi, Kokoda, and Hellfire Pass (for example) for Australians. Socio-spatial practices described or recorded at that time or retroactively significantly modify our interpretation of all these physical phenomena.

The emergence, hardening and dissolution of the carceral archipelago and its belated mnemonic reinvention are evident across many examples, although the physical forms may respond to local conditions. Significantly, the approach to camp environments in the USA, Australia and Asia remain distinct. By imagining them as a carceral continuum shaped by wartime exceptions and exigencies, we are alerted to the corrosive power of imperialism even in this most temporary form. Their avoidance by architectural historians has devalued these historic spaces and delayed their recognition as heritage sites. However, there are other social reasons for their neglect.

Histories of these camp environments were barely revealed to the public after the war, and knowledge of the prisoners among them was confined to those members of local communities who supplied the camps, encountered them as labour or were alert to escape attempts. The wartime operation of these military environments remained classified information, compounded by public attitudes to captivity, recounted in the book *Forgotten Captives in Japanese-Occupied Asia*.[28] Tales of valour in action were more appealing and brought tangible rewards. Inaction in captivity, however traumatic, was not comparable to

bravery on the front. Additionally, the experience of camps run by the Allied forces: Japanese-American civilian incarceration in the USA and civilian/POW incarceration in Australia, for example, receded due to societal pressures – of the internees to assimilate, of the communities to erase these histories and of returning soldiers to contrast them to the atrocities suffered under Axis partners; knowledge made public through War Crimes Trials, in the war's immediate aftermath.[29] Prisoners were repatriated during this period, although many internees chose to return. Moratoriums on military records limited public knowledge, while the decommissioning of camp facilities and disposal of structures erased their physical traces.[30] Post-war social upheaval, displacement, migration and economic distress provided a muddled context for sustaining internment/POW histories. Attendant social and psychic traumas further muted individual narratives. In the case of JIA internment/POW camps in Asia, war reparation treaties and the economic recovery of Japan silenced local narratives in the interest of diplomatic and trade partnerships.

The release of WWII records and their digitisation, their increased accessibility in the public domain and related commemorative events and exhibits have established research platforms for this history in recent years. With the passing of the generation who experienced the war, hurtful memories and harmful prejudices have been replaced by multiple versions of historic events. Those who were children or early adolescents during the war are less invested in associated political hostilities. Credit must be given to local communities and their historical societies which, largely animated by the sentiments of former internees and their families, have collected information and memorabilia during these silent decades. They, with the support of local councils, have maintained sites, tours and local collections that are being gradually institutionalised by state heritage bodies.

This paper is a preliminary study based on few secondary sources and fieldwork, preceding archival investigations, and is limited in its empirical and quantitative data. Its aim is to

spatialise an established social history.[31] The main sources for this paper are the publications, collections and recordings of the Tatura and District Historical Society, and key interview-based studies: *Behind Barbed Wire* by Margaret Bevege, *Walls of Wire* by Joyce Hammond, *Marched in* by Lurline and Arthur Knee and *It wasn't Really Necessary* by Johann Peter Weiss, which largely provide information on former inmates of German descent and their families.[32] *Unwanted Aliens* by Yuriko Nagata, the equivalent resource on Japanese prisoners, covers both their pre-war occupations and their repatriation journeys.[33] Details on Pacific sites were largely gained through research trips to Japan, North America and Singapore.

Oral transcripts, memoirs and military plans and photographs are spatially anchored and made meaningful via extant physical traces. Reading them through these material filters prioritises community histories. It also enables the piecing together of fragmented evidence through what I have described elsewhere as a subaltern material practice, typical of migrants.[34] The subalterneity in such examples is forced through dislocations that deny former colonisers their authority, or ordinary citizens their property, social status and civil and legal rights. Their collective impoverishment and incarceration effaces their personal identities and silences their claims for justice. This process of social degradation is reflected in the poor quality of their physical environment and its deterioration and dispersal after the war. Consequently, residual artefacts, whether ruins of previous camp structures, the repurposed buildings, objects donated by former internees/POWs and their descendents or commemorative structures, such as cemeteries and memorials, become magnets for oral histories, the absence of which severely impacts the sustainability of physical internment heritage. Once these have reverted to private owners or due to inadequate levels of state

funding local historical societies struggle to maintain such sites and collections. These resilient fragments greatly contribute to the reconstruction of a physical geography of camps.

A geography of camps

War in the Pacific and the Japanese successes in Asia altered the scale and significance of incarceration for Australia. These events provoked reciprocal carceral strategies for captured Allied combatants and civilians in Asia and for culturally Japanese civilians and POWs in colonies and nations around the Pacific Basin. Germans and Italian internees/POWs from the European theatre of conflict had already been incarcerated in Britain, North America and Australia since 1939. The meanings associated with penal status would become intimate and socially divisive, mirrored by and constructed against captives of the enemy.

An incomplete map of Japanese Prisoner of War and Internment Camps during WWII has the following figures for Asia: Philippines 33; Indonesian Islands of the Southeast Pacific 119; Singapore 30; Malaya 27; French Indo China 17; India 2; Burma 19; Burma-Thai Railroad work camps 61; Thailand 29; China 89; Korea 14; Formosa (Taiwan) 15; and 180 camps in Japan (Figs 1 & 2).[35] Although inconclusive, these numbers adequately conjecture an expansive carceral geography spreading across Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific Islands with Japan as an intense nodal point. The Japanese military is believed to have destroyed evidence of these Japanese facilities, following WWII, resulting in only approximate data.[36] The POW Research Network notes the capture of some 140,000 Allied military personnel during the Pacific War, detainment of 32,418 POWs on the Japanese mainland and 3,500 deaths during imprisonment there. Figures for civilians are not given, but an estimated 2000 or so from the Allied nations were in Japan in 1941.[37] Significantly, the largess of Meiji period industrialisation through coal mining, iron and steel production, ship

building and armaments manufacture were the foundations of the war industry, and many camps for Allied POWs doubled as prison factories, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention.[38] Starting in 1942, administrative camps were set up in major cities, with branch camps, detached camps and 'despatched' camps, the latter run by the associated commercial corporations, for ship building, mining, iron and steel production, construction and transportation. They were initially located in the Keihin (Tokyo and Yokohama) and Hanshin (Osaka and Kobe) industrial areas, but were moved northward towards the Sea of Japan in 1945 when invasion was imminent. By 1945 there were 130 camps.

Camps were typically established in two-storey wooden structures used as warehouses or company dormitories, and in some cases utilised school buildings. Building interiors were typically remodelled to accommodate rows of two or three storied wooden bunks. The staff quarters, storage and toilet facilities were in a separate administrative building and the whole was surrounded by wooden palings with barbed wire. Naoetsu (No. 4 Branch Tokyo Camp) in Joetsu Prefecture, one of the very few camps for which we have illustrations, was a converted salt warehouse of the Shin-etsu Chemical Company. It gained considerable notoriety due to the harsh treatment of prisoners, leading to the deaths of 60 out of 300 Australian POWs.[39] Prisoners collected from throughout the Asia Pacific were sent via Singapore to labour camps and prison factories converting Changi into the Pacific node for POW labour mobilities. C, G and J forces were formed during captivity and sent from Changi to Japan.[40]

When compared with Japanese factory buildings, camps in tropical Asia were more rudimentary and were for the large part, tents or hastily built structures of timber and *attap*. However, in urban environments, military barrack quarters – sturdy brick and mortar constructions – formed part of the penal complex. Colonial prisons in Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Sarawak, Johor, Penang, Rangoon, and Taiping anchored an ad hoc punitive

landscape of related military structures.[41]The full range of camp environments that serviced this conflict are too vast to document, since in addition to the internment/POW camps, temporary military facilities, hospitals and refugee camps augmented this taxonomy, and in many examples existed in close proximity. Frequently, extant facilities were converted and military, institutional or industrial buildings were requisitioned for camps. This was the case at Changi, Singapore.

The Changi cantonment was developed during the 1920s and 1930s in an effort to further fortify Singapore's seaboard; based on a mistaken presumption on the part of the British command of a Japanese naval attack; a miscalculation that precipitated the fall of the former British colony in February 1942.[42] Expansive military facilities including air bases were built at Sembawang, Seletar and Changi.[43] The British colonial military presence was heightened and camps associated with military housing estates were well-integrated into civilian areas. Neither military nor punitive associations altered the leisurely expression of the colonial aesthetic, which evolved from sprawling Anglo-Malay plantation houses, to stylistically modern variations. Compact two-storey black and white (mock Tudor) bungalows, gave way to stripped down classicism or art deco aesthetics by the early 1940s. Examples of these were found at Tanglin, Alexandra Park, Ridout Road, Adam Park and Ridley Park.[44] Changi Village was surrounded by military facilities planned alongside the 1936 gaol building.

When compared to the timber structures used in Japan's penal factories, Changi Cantonment exemplified the colonial hierarchy in a highly stratified and robust penal environment. The suburban military complex included a range of building types such as married soldier's quarters, messes, coolie lines and barrack complexes.[45] Changi was laid out with road and rail connections, plumbing, sewerage and electrical services, and fortified with gun batteries and sea walls. There were many substantial buildings comprising brick-panelled walls inside

reinforced concrete frames.[46] These were raised on Bakau timber pile foundations and topped with sloping Marseille tile roofs or flat roofs. However, the tents and huts around them that housed vast numbers of POWs were fragile and exposed. When Changi held a peak population of 50,000 Allied troops and around 3000 civilians in 1942, these spaces were overcrowded and poorly resourced. Yet for most of the war, numbers dwindled, due to the departure of forces for labour elsewhere – to Burma and Thailand, to build the Burma-Thai railroad, to build an airstrip at Sandakan and to factories in Japan. Limited supplies and resources forced the JIA in Asia to requisition buildings or make do with extant facilities. In Canada approximately 21,000 aliens and citizens of Japanese descent were uprooted and sent to various forms of accommodation – housing centres set up in silver mining ghost towns, new towns, road work camps, sugar beet fields, and self-supporting projects in the interior.[47] The West Coast state of British Columbia which had the largest concentration of internees had 5 self-supporting projects, 3 road camp projects, and 10 internment camps organised along its Fraser and Columbia rivers.[48] Internment accommodation was largely in tar paper covered shiplap timber cabins (typically approx.4x8.5metres).[49] These various facilities were part of a broader carceral geography including a range of internment and detentions facilities and POW camps for military personnel or those suspected of Axis sympathies.[50] The same was true of the USA.[51] However, whereas distinctions were made between German and Italian nationals and those who were naturalised, those of Japanese ancestry from the Westcoast Military Exclusion Zones were forcibly relocated *enmass*.[52] In the USA, some 118,803 Japanese-Americans were incarcerated passing from seventeen Civilian Assembly Centers to ten War Relocation Centers across seven states.[53] California with fourteen Assembly Centers and two Relocation Centers was most impacted by this process.[54] Manzanar in California on 540 acres of land was among the largest of these camps with 10,000 internees.[55] Its military grid of uniform city blocks, each with approximately

fifteen 6x30.4 metre barrack buildings, was repeated relentlessly in camps throughout the USA. These theatre-of-operation constructions of tarpaper and green lumber were partitioned for residential quarters, doubled up for mess halls or converted for community use. The punitive plan repudiated the alignment of the city grid with US democratic ideals. This was not the case in Australia.

Islands in the landscape

Camps in Australia were often relegated to remote locations, where their isolation and containment converted them to temporary islands in the landscape.[56] Spatial legacies of the country's colonial convict heritage, their twentieth century manifestations were largely related to wartime incarceration and post-war migration, the most distinctive mid-twentieth century pathways into Australian citizenship. The practice was initiated in WW I with camps in each of the Australian states, where the largest, Holsworthy in New South Wales (NSW), held up to 6000 internees.[57] During WWII the geography of internment was dominated by camps in the most populous south-eastern states, which also provided large numbers of service men for the North African and Pacific theatre of WWII.[58] In 1942, at their peak, these camps held over 12,000 internees and POWs.[59] Approximately 25,720 POWs and 7000 internees passed through these camps across the duration of the conflict.[60] Local internees included some 4,754 Italians, 2,013 Germans, 1,141 Japanese, 232 Chinese, 39 Portuguese, 702 Javanese and 40 others, while overseas internees included 3,753 Germans, 425 Italians, 3,160 Japanese and 539 others.[61] Queensland would intern the highest percentage of its ethnic population – around forty three per cent – and send them to Victoria for confinement.[62] Captives included seamen, naturalised Australians of Italian or German extraction (From the

Barossa and Goulburn Valleys, and from Queensland's cane plantations), those from countries occupied by Axis powers (small numbers of Finns, Jews, Austrians, Romanians, Hungarians and Bulgarians), Germans from Palestine, the United Kingdom, New Guinea and the Torres Straits. New Zealand followed suit confining some 183 German, Italian and Japanese male internees at Somes Island (Matiu) near Wellington, and later at Pahiatua in the Hawkes Bay Region.[63] Several camps erected for WWI were re-mobilised, [64] however, once Britain requested that Commonwealth Countries receive up to 50,000 prisoners on terms accepted by Australia on 3 July 1940, camps had to be purpose-built.[65] The estimated cost recoverable from Great Britain was £480,000.[66] Each cluster of camps had its administrative head quarters often manned by WWI veterans or soldiers unfit for duty in the front, a fully equipped hospital, guard's quarters and related service buildings. There were gardens and farms in which internees (mainly the Italians) worked and wood camps in forest areas. Families were not always included, and in cases where they were separated, due to internment of fathers and husbands, the family's livelihood became insecure. Although the location of and information on the camps were classified, local communities were well aware of the facilities in their midst, and were involved as contractors, suppliers or as professionals – doctors, dentists, nurses – providing services to the camps. However, despite their scale and populations, very little regarding these camp environments was documented at the time (Tables 1 and 2).

A critical consideration in site selection was an adequate water source, reliance on which would not disadvantage supply-dependent townships. Locations in semi arid environments, or bush land areas exacerbated this need. Loveday, near Barmera in South Australia (SA) for example, had access to a complex irrigation network, which piped water from the Murray River throughout the Riverland. In Victoria, this relationship with water, clearly depicted in

the 1946 State Aerial Survey, shows the Internment /POW camps clustered around the Waranga Basin, a man-made reservoir of 416,750 mega litres and 160 kilometres of shoreline (Fig.3).[67] The Tatura Group comprised Dhurrungile Mansion and Camp Nos. 1,2,3,4, and 13 (numbered in order of their construction) and the Greytown and Myrtleford (No. 5) Wood camps further afield. This terrestrial archipelago became a testing site for camp design as numbers increased and military engineers grew more adventurous, and new spatial configurations were devised to accommodate and segregate the multi-ethnic population. Articles of the Geneva Convention, which Australia adhered to closely, unwittingly reinforced many latent carceral characteristics.[68] The protection of prisoners from public curiosity and removal outside the fighting zone ensured their isolation. Accommodation equivalent to garrison troops placed them in barrack facilities. These were neither hygienic nor salubrious as determined by the convention and replicated the austerities afforded the troops. In contravention of the convention, many were deprived of personal possessions and could not maintain their professional skills, due to their displacement and arrest. The compartmentalisation of camps into several segregated compounds responded to the requirement to separate nationalities. Religious freedom was respected and undue violence was not used, except under provocation, as in the much regretted suicidal escape attempt of Japanese POWs at Cowra on 4 August 1944.[69] The exclusion of Asiatics, reinforced after Federation, underscored their complete segregation.[70]

For many internees and POWs the path to Tatura began in a transit camp in Europe, from where they boarded a ship, like the infamous Dunera, and disembarked at Port Melbourne or Sydney. Accounts of 2,732 German and Italian internees/POWs and Jewish refugees onboard the Dunera describe a hellish journey, under terrible conditions, with the destruction of their property and ill-treatment by guards.[71] Some 445 were sent to Tatura and the remainder to

Hay, although they would later join the Tatura group. Local Italian, German or Asian internees were often held in goal buildings or army camps, hastily repurposed for accommodating them at the outbreak of war. Initial internment was in regional or city gaols, such as Bathurst, Darlinghurst or Long Bay in NSW, gaols in Alice Springs and Fremantle, Gladstone Prison, and Rottnest Island. From there prisoners would be moved to canvas tent accommodation in army camps – like Liverpool/Holsworthy in NSW or Ennogera/Gaythorne in Queensland, and Kreswick in SA and temporarily to the Northam, Orange and Adelaide show grounds, while awaiting the construction of camps.[72] In Melbourne they stayed overnight at Worth's Circus near Princess Bridge.[73]

As with the Changi Gaol and surrounding camp, the Victorian camps were anchored in their rural geography by a permanent architectural artefact, although at Tatura this was not a prison but a luxurious stately home. The Dhurrungile Mansion located outside the town had been built in 1875 by the prominent pastoralist (squatter) James Winter for £30,000 (Fig 4).[74] The 68-room, two-storey, red-brick mansion on a 1,680 hectare estate was designed by architects Frederick Wyatt and Lloyd Tayler in the late Victorian (neoclassical) boom style sporting quoining, trim and columns in a lighter colour, and came with four underground rooms, a grand staircase leading to a platform with a pipe organ and a four storey tower.[75] Its elaborate plan included stables, manager's quarters and associated out-buildings and the property's shearing shed was reputed to be the largest in Victoria.[76] Sold by the Winter family in 1906, it had passed through several owners before purchase by an Vincent Vernon Hart in 1925. Since Hart was an absentee owner, the property was available for rental by the Commonwealth Government at the outbreak of war. The Department of the Interior held 47 German internees there from October 1939 to January 1940, following which they were moved to purpose-built facilities at Tatura and Rushworth. The army housed 150 German

POWs captured in the Middle East and a further 50 Officers at Dhurringile from August 1941- July 1945.

The passage of prisoners through radically different facilities, in terms of their material density, is noteworthy. The impressive permanent structures of an earlier generation of prison buildings were designed to punish and reform criminals, presumably from low social classes. They had expressive aesthetic qualities and sophisticated plans modelled on the panoptic penitentiary.[77] Their punitive function was communicated to the wartime internees who passed through them on their way to camps. In contrast, the wartime prison barracks for internees and POWs were visible through their barbed wire fencing. Although isolated due to their remote location these containments were relatively porous. Camp buildings were constructed with inferior materials, were temporary and aesthetically non-descript – a means of stripping resident aliens or captive combatants of the privileges appropriate to their social station. They were demoted to subaltern subjects.

Lack of professional planning was clearly evident in January 1940 when farm lands in the Tatura area were requisitioned and local farmers were employed in constructing Camp No. 1 for one thousand men. John B. Noonan, James Henry Ewan and E.A Coyle were each deprived of uncultivated portions of their land for the construction of Camp Nos. 1, 2 and 3 respectively; land dispossessed from the Ngurai-illam peoples, the traditional owners of the Goulbourn Valley.[78] Farmers treated the fencing exercise very differently to the military, avoiding obstacles and skirting hard ground, thus producing a misshapen rectangular figure for the nation's first camp. The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission depot near the Tatura railway station provided building materials.

William Pargeter describes the mobilisation of farmers, neighbours, and even strays and strangers and their ploughs, trucks and tractors for laying phone cables, digging post holes, erecting fences and laying water pipes.[79] There were timber framed huts with corrugated iron walls designed to accommodate twenty four persons, dormitory fashion, ventilated by a twenty centimetre width run of chicken wire under the eaves. The external cladding and roofing were either galvanized iron or corrugated asbestos sheets. In addition to the sleeping quarters there were ablution blocks and mess halls. The key feature that distinguished this camp environment from military or labour camps was the fortification of the property. Camp No.1 comprised two compounds surrounded by two layers of barbed wire fencing, a garrison quarters and six guard towers (Fig.5).[80] A sports ground with a single layer of high fencing was attached. Each compound was entered through a wire cage with wooden gates.

Knee and Knee attribute the high numbers of guard towers to the poor design of Camp No.1.[81] In fact, the rationalisation of camp design is evident across the six examples associated with the Tatura Group. Camp No.2 for 1000 officers was shaped like an uneven pentagon, its location near the Wangara Basin providing opportunities for recreation and scenic views. Both these early camp designs were poorly rationalised for segregation, surveillance or fire protection. Camp Nos 3 & 4 at Rushworth, designed for holding family groups, took the form of imperfect hexagons – where the short sides of the figure acted as entries into the central firebreak/circulation zone. They were each divided internally into four separate compounds and, along with Camp No.1, held 3,157 internees in 1942 (Fig. 6).

The geometry of Camp No.13, on the Hammond brothers' land of 2.5 sq. kilometres, relegated to POWs maintained its pure geometry: a dodecagon, internally quartered by access way and fire break, controllable by only four guard towers.[82] It housed 4000 captives; four

times as many as in the other camps. The dodecagon would be repeated at POW Camp No.12 at Cowra, New South Wales, and for Camp No.14 at Loveday, also for POWs. The plan inverted the panopticon, familiarised in the Separate Prison at Port Arthur (but also in the radial plans of Long Bay, Bathurst, and Darlinghurst prisons) by orienting the buildings radially and placing surveillance at the perimeter.[83] Surveillance was further amplified by search lights throughout the night; the camps glowed like urban islands in their remote rural environs, their illumination intensified due to black-out laws in nearby towns.[84] The evolution of this plan type from the fortified outward hostility of the medieval ideal city (with protection for freemen within the walls) to the inward scrutiny of the panoptic penitentiary (the carceral model associated with European enlightenment, described by Foucault) says much about the elevation of modern citizenship against the criminalisation of subjects. The inward focus of peripheral guard towers with guns trained on the prison city suggests the coalescing of these two models, both the criminalisation of difference and marking the enemy within. Penal technologies of classification, tagging, temporal regimes, and menial forms of labour were added to the linear uniformity of accommodation. Evidence of resistance, belligerence and escape efforts among the POW groups held at Tatura and elsewhere, political divisions within POW and internee groups, but also their political ambivalence suggests the fallacy of a uniform policy for their containment. Moreover, the use of punitive environments to test civilian loyalties sanctioned a grave injustice, by containing dispossessed Jewish internees with a spectre of the Holocaust.

A plan of Camp No.13 at Murchison displayed by the Murchison historical society details the huts, their dimensions and their use. The majority of the sleeping huts were 18.4x5.6 metre and partitioned for family groups. Recreation huts were more generous at 28.9-30.4x10.5 metre. Bunks were typically 18.4 x.8 metre and bedding consisted of palliasses stuffed with

straw (although women and children were provided with mattresses and bed linen).[85] The remaining service spaces: kitchen, mess halls, canteen, and utility spaces such as cold showers, ablution areas, hot showers and laundry, urinals and latrines were of varied dimensions. An isolation ward, as well as church and Padre's hut, recreation halls, library, several barbers shops, tennis courts and stores fulfilled the range of functions typical of a small town. Subtle variations in the various sizes of buildings suggest their adaptation of the military template, the objective of the Australian camps being rehabilitation – not punishment.

The social constructions of camp life – the carceral cultural landscape described by Moran – materialised through everyday activities painstakingly documented by captives, since paper was scarce.[86] Means for alleviating their boredom were largely developed through sports, theatricals, musical evenings, lectures and educational programs and cafes for education, entertainment and recreation. Camp No. 4 for example had a nine-hole golf course and three sports grounds, but its most redeeming feature was a hut allocated as a Grand Cafe with an outdoor terrace.[87] Despite such variations, suggesting a lax regime, the environment remained carceral, evidence of the underlying punitive intent. The boundary was unyielding: a forbidding 2 metre fence of four-prong knotted wire one and three quarter metre in width with needle sharp barbs eight to ten centimetres apart.[88] Two fences, usually parallel and half a metre apart enclosed the penal geometry with rolled barbed wire spanning the gap. Hammond describes "the barbed wire disease", a neurosis caused by internment, as producing depression and restlessness in captive persons where "the barbed wire winds like a thread through the mental process of the prisoner".[89] The wire is a constant presence in internee artworks and is described by both Weiss and Nagata as commented on by former internees.[90] The fence signified their collective predicament and source of their trauma in

terms of the isolation, uncertain duration of captivity and irregularity of communication with home.[91]Monotony, regulations, limited space and lack of sexual activity augmented the related psychoses, observes Hammond, sentiments expressed in many of the interviews.

The surfeit of material culture produced with available scrap materials is common to all camp environments, signs of the ingenuity with which prisoners maintain their civility as a measure of their sanity. The recycled treasures of prisoners – notes on toilet paper, potato block prints, camp newspapers, lead melted into gifts and toys, furniture and musical instruments built from packing cases – desperately simulated and rehearsed material resilience.[92] Army uniforms dyed to a burgundy shade – the only colour that would hold on Khaki had to be worn whenever internees left the camp environs for farm work.[93] An important difference, when compared with JIA camps was the regular food supply (despite wartime rations), supplemented from vegetables grown in camp gardens. Internees were able to replicate familiar diets – and internee cooks would prepare camp meals. Hammond describes a typical Friday menu as containing "breakfast: cereals and braised beef, bread, jam and tea. Lunch consisting of meat pudding and kidneys, tomato sauce, potatoes, radishes, apples(raw), bread, butter, jam and tea. Dinner: Scotch soup, roast beef, potatoes, pumpkin, rice flan, bread, butter, jam and tea."[94] For children, the relative freedom from parental authority and multiple opportunities for friendship and play were exceptional; a situation often detrimental to maintaining family cohesion in camp. As evident in interview-based research, this younger generation interpreted their confinement very differently to their parents.[95]

Whereas the captives relieved their boredom through sheer ingenuity, their labour was more immediate, both in supplementing diets and gentling the military environment through garden design. At Tatura as at Changi and Manzanar, occupants cultivated and beautified the camps.

Camp No.1 had fourteen acres of garden; and there were twelve, six and two acres, each, of garden at the subsequent camps. Twenty five further acres were acquired for Camp No. 4, eight kilometres distant from the camp, and water was pumped there from the reservoir.[96] However, notes Hammmond, only 123 of some 3,157 internees worked daily in the gardens while a further sixty three were employed in land clearance and gathering fire wood.[97] The age, health, and mental state of prisoners affected their ability to participate in manual labour, while women were fully occupied with caring for their families. Each camp had workshops, and tools were allocated for sewing, tailoring, shoe repair, and carpentry. This labour was also recreational, producing monuments and models, for example Camp No.13 residents built a castle, a windmill and an aerodrome.[98] When the height of the flower beds increased noticeably, a search revealed a tunnel at Camp No.13, and blankets were surreptitiously altered for escapee clothing.[99]

The discussion of the Tatura Group of camps, so far, has been constructed through accounts of European (mainly German and Jewish) prisoners found in secondary sources. Their paths were linear – tracking a route from Europe, North Africa or Palestine to Australia, and in the case of some there was an interim stop in Singapore until Japan entered the war.[100] There is a comparative lack of information on Italian and Japanese residents, despite the Mediterranean influences and proximity to Asia that have shape contemporary Australian culture. In the case of Italians this is largely related to reservations in the local community, and the lack of concerted diplomatic efforts.[101] The White Australia Policy maintained border hostilities towards Asians up to the 1970s, delaying research into this area, and limiting knowledge and access to Japanese-language records. New interest has been created due to stronger diplomatic relations, but more significantly through diasporic and Japanese scholarship. It enables a greater understanding of Australia's role in Pacific carceral histories.

Prisoners from the Pacific

Although Australia acted as a prison for Great Britain during WWII, its more urgent purpose was to safeguard the home front against regional belligerence once Japan entered the war, and to this end it acquired a new group of Asian captives: Koreans, Formosans and Indonesians from Japanese occupied colonies, Japanese civilians working in Cane Fields in Queensland or Pearl fisheries up North and those from the surrounding Pacific Islands and French and Dutch colonial territories – including New Caledonia, New Guinea, New Hebrides, the Solomon Islands, and from Netherland East Indies and New Zealand. Some 5,637 Japanese combatants were captured in the region and placed at Cowra and Hay.[102] Japanese civilians including women and children were channelled via the Enogerra camp in Queensland to the Tatura camps. They were held in Camp No. 14 at Loveday and Camp No. 4 at Tatura under a female warden, initially alongside other European and Jewish refugee compounds. Following the Cowra breakout in 1944, Japanese POWs were moved to Hay and Tatura's Camp No. 13. By the end of the war, Camp No. 4 was entirely devoted to Asiatic families, a total population of 3,184 persons.[103] Although far less is known of their activities – when compared with the Europeans – Nagata advises that they were entertained by Japanese acrobats from the Ueno Circus who had been travelling in Australia and confined in Tatura.[104] Six sewing machines were provided, and the women and two tailors were employed in dressmaking, shoemaking and tailoring for the camp, and in adjusting the military coats and charity clothing delivered to them.[105]

By the end of the war the Tatura Group resembled an archipelago; its varied camp geometries expanding to better segregate different nationalities. For a brief period the prisoners who

were incarcerated against their will made Australia home in defiance of immigrant policy as alien subjects. This home, however, was isolated from the surrounding community, a mark of their cultural difference and perceived threat to Australian values. Asians could not remain in those communities after the war. Unlike the Italian and German internees who could opt for naturalisation on the assurance of employment within one year of their release, Asiatics – even those who had lived and worked in Australia – were forcibly repatriated. White Australia's post-war borders closed against them.

Conversely, the post-war repatriation of Japanese POWs prolonged camp histories in the Pacific as Australian forces in the region took charge of the surrendering Japanese. Extensive war-damage in Japan delayed their repatriation. New Guinea, which was the site of several Japanese bases and POW camps, saw the confinement of surrendering Japanese forces after the war (from October 1945 – October 1946).[106] Hiromi Tanaka notes that at the end of the war a population close to 100,000 Japanese soldiers and military civilians and a further 40,000 on neighbouring islands had to be accommodated in camps.[107] Eleven camps and the camp headquarters were clustered on the northeastern edge of the Gazelle Peninsula of New Britain just south of the neck of land between Blanche and Talili bays. Their relationship to water was the inverse of that at Tatura, the landmass projected out into the South Pacific. The numbers incarcerated in Rabaul were more than five times that interned on the Australian mainland for the entire duration of the war, yet we have little if any information on these camp environments. We learn from Japanese sources that since the Australians lacked the capacity and manpower to provide for them, the captive Japanese had to build their own camps and maintain wartime levels of self sufficiency through agricultural production. Camps were converted to places for education and vocational training, thus realising their

role as incipient institutional sites. Tanaka describes this pedagogical process as a form of rehabilitation in preparation for the post-war reconstruction of Japan.

Conclusion

The paths of culturally Japanese soldiers and civilians through camp environments connect the JIA camps in Asia and the camps in Allied nations such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the USA, whilst their physical bodies as captives and captors form a network of human displacements with its epicentre in Japan. Camp spaces are similarly dotted across the regional geography like puncture points on the geo-bodies of former colonies clustered around the Pacific Basin.[108]They offer fleeting but forceful evidence of how temporary military architecture is instrumentalised for carceral purposes.

In gathering this evidence across isolated national stories of wartime incarceration, this paper applied a spatial metaphor used to describe culturally and physically heterogeneous geographic regions. It discussed the conversion of a neglected architectural type into a complex carceral facility, highlighting its role in a broader history of imperial institutions. This interpretation bears many of the attributes of archipelagic thinking, tested first through Pacific camp scenarios and next through a discussion of the Tatura Group in Victoria. However, despite the powerful cartographic image conjectured in this discussion, the uneven physical record hampers the connective alignment of these fragmented material conditions. We are forced to conjecture camp environments through the detritus of former sites, lives and histories in which social memorabilia and commemorative spaces are fragile material counterparts. In the absence of architect involvement, either as designers or as prisoners, and

despite the many illustrious individuals who outlived their experience in the camps, such evidence provides a subaltern subtext to military and monumental architectures of the war. Dignifying this material against the force of normative historiography is as difficult as retaining its physical traces.

[1] The war in Asia commenced against China in 1937, but war with the Western powers commenced in 1941.

[2] Japanese imperial (and military) ambitions for internationalisation announced in 1940, were of uniting Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia and Oceana under the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

[3] Australia entered the war in September 1939 on behalf of Britain, focusing on the Asian region when Japan entered the war in 1941.

[4] James Wood, "The Australian Military Contribution to the occupation of Japan, 1945-52," Australian War Memorial, accessed May, 29, 2016, https://www.awm.gov.au/sites/default/files/BCOF_history.pdf., 1.

[5] Australia's War, 1939-1945; Australian Prisoners of War 1940-1945, accessed May 31, 2016, http://www.ww2australia.gov.au/behindwire/.

[6] British Commonwealth Occupation Force, 1942-45; Australian War Memorial, accessed 28 May 28, 2016, https://www.awm.gov.au/atwar/bcof/.

[7] Michele Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), Part Four: Prison, Chap. 3, "The carceral", 297, 307. See also "Docile bodies",138, and "The panopticon," 204-205.

[8] Foucault's ideas on these social technologies which he described as 'biopower' were first discussed in Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Part I, The Will to Knowledge* (Pantheon Books, New York, NY, 1978), "Part Five: The Right of Death and Power over Life,"140-145.

[9] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 293.

[10] See Frank Dikotter and Ian Brown eds., *Cultures of Confinement: A History of the Prison in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (London: Hurst & Co. Ltd, 2007).

[11] See "The Camp as Nomos of the Modern", trans. D. Heller-Roazen, in H. de Vries & S. Weber (eds), *Violence, Identity and Self-Determination* (Palo Alto, CA.: Stanford University Press 1997), 106–118; Agamben, *Homo Sacer: sovereign power and bare life* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[12] Paul Carter, "Tropical Knowledge: Archipelagic Consciousness and the Governance of Excess," *etropic* 12.2 (2013), Refereed Proceedings of the Tropics of the Imagination Conference, 4-5 July 2013, The Cairns Institute, James Cook University. 79-95, p.79, accessed May 30, 2016. http://etropic.jcu.edu.au/pgcontents.htm.

[13] Eduard Glissant describes the Carribean in terms of its cultural plurality. See J. Michael Dash, *Eduard Glissent* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 23. Glissant depicts the world as made up of archipelagos of culture exemplified in the creative global chaos of the Caribbean.

[14] Carter, "Tropical Knowledge," 90.

[15] Luis Filipe F.R. Thomaz, "The image of the archipelago in Portuguese cartography of the 16th and early 17th centuries", Chap.2, 42-88, in *South East Asia, Colonial History: Imperialism before 1800,* ed. Paul Krakotska, (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

[16] Alison Mountz, "The enforcement archipelago: Detention, haunting, and asylum on islands," *Political Geography* 30 (2011): 118-128, 121.

[17] The two major sources on penal architecture in Austtralia, James Semple Kerr, *Out of sight, out of mind: Australia's Places of Confinement, 1788-1988* (Sydney: S.H. Ervin Gallery in association with the Australian Bicentennial Authority); and *Australian convict sites: world heritage nomination* (Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, 2008) focus on convict sites.

[18] Perhaps the most significant example is Ken Inglis, *Sacred places: war memorials in the Australian landscape* (Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Publishing, 2008) which argues for the centrality of these monuments to the Australian social memoryscape.

[19] Paul Hasluck, *The government and the people, 1939-1941, Australia in the War of 1939-1945*, Volume 1 (Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 1965). Appendix 4 – The wartime treatment of aliens, available at: www.awm.gov.au/collection/records/awmohww2/civil/vol1/awmohww2-civil-vol1-app4.pdf; Bill Bunbury, *Rabbits & spaghetti : captives and comrades, Australians, Italians and the war, 1939-1945* (Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 1995); Margaret Bevege, *Behind barbed wire: internment in Australia during World War II* (University of Queensland Press, 1993); Yuriko Nagata, *Unwanted aliens: Japanese internment in Australia* (University of Queensland Press, 1996); Klaus Neumann, *In the interest of national security: civilian internment*

in Australia during World War II (National Archives of Australia, 2006); Cyril Pearl, *The Dunera Scandal: Deported by Mistake* (London; Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1983).

[20] Dan Stone, *The Liberation of the Camps: The End of the Holocaust and its Aftermath* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015).

[21] The most prominent among these was the Indian National Army led by Subash Chandra Bosh.

[22] There is a vast literature on this topic. An example that combines material on the USA and Australia is Kay Saunders and Roger Daniels, *Alien Justice: Wartime Internment in Australia and North America* (St Lucia, QLD: The University of Queensland Press, 2000).

[23] Dominique Moran, *Carceral geography: spaces and practices of incarceration* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2015); D. Conlon, N. Gill, D. Moran eds., *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2013).

[24] Moran, *Carceral geography*, 1-3.

[25] David Arnold, "The Colonial Prison: Power Knowledge and Penology in 19th Century India," in *A Subaltern Studies Reader*, ed. Ranajit Guha, (Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1992), 140-178.

[26] Moran, *Carceral geography*, 4.

[27] Mike Davis, *City of quartz: excavating the future in Los Angeles* (London: Pimlico, 1998).

[28] Karl Hack and Kevin Blackburn, *Forgotten captives in Japanese-occupied Asia* (London; New York: Routledge, 2008);

[29] Trials of Japanese nationals and their Asian allies were held in Tokyo, the USA and various parts of the Pacific from 1945-51.

[30] The Data Protection Act of 1998, UK (blanket exemption for sensitive materials); The Privacy Act 1988, Australia (intelligence agencies are exempt from this Act). See 34. Intelligence and Defence Intelligence Agencies, accessed March 10, 2016, http://www.alrc.gov.au/publications/34.%20Intelligence%20and%20Defence%20Intelligence%20Agencies/defence-and-defence-intelligence-age (accessed 10 March 2016).

[31] The key archival source consulted is the Report on Directorate of Prisoners of War and Internees (Australian Army Headquarters, Directorate of Prisoners of War and Internees), 1939-1951, Australian War Memorial Research Centre, AWM ORMF0024.

[32] Tatura District and Historical Society, " "Collar the Lot" World War 2 Internment Camps, Tatura", Unedited Interviews, 1997; Margaret Bevege, *Behind Barbed Wire*; Joyce Hammond, *Walls of Wire*; Knee and Knee, *Marched in*; Johann Peter Weiss, *It Wasn't Really Necessary*. Other sources include, Cate Elkner, Ilma O'Brien, Gaetano Rando and Anthony Cappello eds., *Enemy Aliens* (Bacchus Marsh, Vic.: 2005); Alan Fitzgerald, *The Italian Farming Soldiers* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1991); Paul Bartrop and Gabrielle Eisen, *The Dunera Affair* (Melbourne: The Jewish Museum of Australia, 1990).

[33] Nagata, *Unwanted Aliens*.

[34] Anoma Pieris, "Editorial: Inbetween Spaces for border thinking", *Fabrications* 25, no.3 (2015): 301-304.

[35] "Japanese Prisoner of War and Internment Camps during World War II," published in January 1980 by the Medical Research Committee of American Ex-Prisoners of War, Inc. Research and proof of authenticity by Frances Worthington Lipe., CC BY-SA 3.0, https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?curid=5540008.

[36] POW Camps in Japan Proper, POW Research Network, Japan, accessed February 29, 2016, http://www.powresearch.jp/en/archive/camplist/index.html#seikatsu.

[37] POW Camps in Japan Proper.

[38] Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining, UNESCO World Heritage List, accessed February 29, 2016, http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1484.

[39] Tokyo No.4 B, Naoetsu, Center for Research, Allied POWs under the Japanese. Available at: http://www.mansell.com/pow-index.html; Diary of Signaller Don Fraser, Prisoners of War of the Japanese 1942-1945, Research and articles by Lt.Col. Peter Winstanley, accessed February 29, 2016, http://www.pows-of-japan.net/articles/34a.htm. There were approximately 3000 Australian POWs in Japan.

[40] Australian War Memorial, General information about Australian prisoners of the Japanese. Available at: https://www.awm.gov.au/encyclopedia/pow/general_info/.

[41] War Office records, WO 357/5, 1946-48, The National Archives, UK. The section on Changi in this paper was discussed at length by me in Anoma Pieris, "Changi: A Penal Genealogy across the Pacific War," *Fabrications*, 26, no.1 (2016): 50-71.

[42] Report of the Gillman Commission in Construction and defence of Singapore naval base, 1927, CO273/538 PRO, The National Archives, Kew; L.N. Malan, "Singapore: The Founding of the New Defences", *Royal Engineers Journal*, 52 (1938): 213-35. Pieris, "Changi: A Penal Genealogy across the Pacific War," 57-58.

[43] See Malcolm H. Murfett, John Miksic, Brian Farell, Chiang Ming Shun eds., *Between Two Oceans: A Military History of Singapore from First Settlement to Final British Withdrawal* (Singapore: Times Academic Press, 1999).

[44] Julian Davidson and Luca Invernizzi, *Black and White: The Singapore House, 1898-1941* (Singapore: Talisman, 2006), 109-131. Pieris, "Changi: A Penal Genealogy across the Pacific War," 59.

[45] Report of the Gillman Commission in Construction and defence of Singapore naval base, 1927, CO273/538 PRO, The National Archives, Kew; L.N. Malan, "Singapore: The Founding of the New Defences", *Royal Engineers Journal*, 52 (1938): 213-35.

[46] Henry Probert, *The history of Changi* (Singapore: Changi Prison Press, 1965; reprinted Singapore: Changi University Press 2006), 18, 23; J.F.F., "Changi cantonment 1933-37", *Royal Engineers Journal*, 51(1937): 355-62, 357-362.

[47] Geoffrey S. Smith, "The Japanese Canadians in World War II", 93-113 in Saunders and Daniels, *Alien Justice*, 106. An important source on Canadian internment is Greg Robinson, *A Tragedy of Democracy: Japanese Confinement in North America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 171-175.

[48] Roy Miki and Cassandra Kobayashi, *Justice in Our Time: The Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement* (Vancouver: Talon Books, 1991), 30.

[49] Henry Shimizu, *Images of Internment: Life in the New Denver Internment Camp 1942-1946* (Toronto: Ti-Jean Press, 2008). Based on measurements taken at New Denver Nikkei Internment Musuem.

[50] In the USA they also included included Assembly Centers, Relocation Centers, Isolation Centres, Justice Department Camps, and Temporary Camps.

[51] Arnold Krammer, *Nazi Prisoners of War in America* (New York: Stein and Day, 1979); Ruth Beaumont Cook, *Guests Behind the Barbed Wire: German POWs in America: a True Story of Hope and Friendship* (Birmingham, AL: Crane Hill Publishers, 2007). Numbers given in these books vary from 371 000 to 425000 POWs.

[52] Population numbers of naturalised Italians and Germans were too great (several million) to make their detention feasible, so the numbers detained were fewer and more specialised.

[53] Tetsuden Kashima, *Judgement Without Trial: Japanese American Internment during World War II* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 136. See Jeffery Burton, Mary M. Farrell, Florence B. Lord and Richard W. Lord eds., *Confinement and Ethnicity: An overview of World War II Japanese American Relocation Sites* (Tucson, Arizona: National Parks Service Publications in Anthropology, 1999).

[54] President Franklin D. Roosevelt authorized the internment with Executive Order 9066, issued 19 February 1942. See *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997, 2000); Greg Robinson, *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2001); Roger Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971).

[55] Harlan D. Unrau, *The Evacuation and Relocation of Persons of Japanese Ancestry During World War II: A Historical Study of the Manzanar War Relocation Center* (US Department of the Interior, National Parks Service 1996).

[56] There were two island camps: Peat Island, NSW; Rottnest Island, WA.

[57] Berrima, Bourke, Trial Bay and Holsworthy, in NSW , Molonglo in ACT, Enoggera in QLD, Langwarrin in Victoria, Rottnest and Garden Islands in WA, Torrens Island and Fort Larges in SA, and Bruny Island, Tasmania. See Gerhard Fischer, *Enemy aliens : internment and the homefront experience in Australia, 1914-1920* (University of Queensland Press, 1989); Nadine Helmi and Gerard Fischer, *The enemy at home: German internees in World War I Australia* (UNSW Press, 2011)

[58] Camps were established at Cowra, Hay, Holsworthy, Bathhurst, Long Bay, Orange, in NSW; Tatura (including Rushworth and Dhurringile) in Victoria and Loveday in South Australia.

[59] Wartime internment camps in Australia, National Archives of Australia (online resource), http://www.naa.gov.au/collection/snapshots/internment-camps/index.aspx. Some 7,103 aliens, naturalised British subjects and those natural born of enemy parents were apprehended and 1,875 were released. Some 7,862 overseas national aliens were shipped to Australia, 6,110 POWs and at its peak in 1942, 10,731 local and overseas internees were held in Australia. Weiss, "It Wasn't Really Necessary", 239-240.

[60] Joyce Hammond, *Walls of Wire: Tatura, Rushworth, Murchison* (Tatura: Joyce Hammond, 1990), 9. Following the National Security **(**Aliens Control**)** Regulations of 1939.

[61] Report on Directorate of Prisoners of War and Internees (Australian Army Headquarters, Directorate of Prisoners of War and Internees), 1939-1951 ORMF0024 (Official Record), 91.

[62] Matt Young and Charis Chang, "The forgotten history of Australia's prisoner of war camps", *The Herald Sun*, April 25, 2014, http://www.heraldsun.com.au/anzac-centenary/the-forgotten-history-of-australias-prisoner-of-war-camps/story-fnmeodwa-1226895841822.

[63] Judith Bennett, "Japanese wartime internees in New Zealand,"*The Journal of Pacific History*, 44, no. 1 (2009): 64 and 70. Some 803 Japanese POWs were held at the site of the Featherstone military camp.

[64] Holsworthy, Enoggera and Rottnest Island

[65] War Cabinet Agendum 157/1940, supplement No. 1. New Zealand did not agree to accept prisoners on behalf of Britain.

[66] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 22

[67] State Library of Victoria, Australia, 1:31,680 state aerial survey Victoria: standard 2 inches to 1 mile series topographic map. 799 A, Murchison A [cartographic material] prepared by the Department of Crown Lands and Survey, Victoria and Aerial Survey of Victoria, Photo-map of Victoria, Australia, 799 A1-4 Murchison [cartographic material]; Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 67.

[68] Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Geneva, 27 July 1929. International Committee of the Red Cross, https://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/52d68d14de6160e0c12563da005fdb1b/eb1571b00daec90ec125641e00402aa6.

[69] National Archives of Australia, "Cowra Breakout Fact Sheet", http://www.naa.gov.au/collection/fact-sheets/fs198.aspx. Some 108 Japanese POWs were wounded and 231 met their death.

[70] The Immigration Act No. 17 of 1901 placed restrictions on Immigration and provided for the removal from the Commonwealth of prohibited Immigrants. It was preceded by the Influx of Chinese Restriction Act of 1881.

[71] Weiss, *It wasn't really necessary*, 197-202; Knee and Knee, *Marched in*, 36-41. The Dunera story has been discussed at length in Cyril Pearl, *The Dunera Scandal*.

[72] Weiss, *It wasn't really necessary,* 80.

[73] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 31.

[74] Victorian Heritage Register, Dhurringile, http://vhd.heritage.vic.gov.au/places/result_detail/863, registered in 1998. Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 34. The name is believed to be crouching Emu in the local Aboriginal language in reference to the shape of the hill.

[75] Warwick Finlay, *Winter Irving* (Murchison and District Historical Society), purchased 2016, undated. It is believed that Wyatt rather than Tayler was responsible for the design.

[76] Knee and Knee, *Marched in*, 7-8.

[77] Early examples of this were the following Mill Bank Prison in London or the Cherry Hill Prison in Philadelphia.

[78] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 66. Ian D. Clark, *Goulburn River Aboriginal Protectorate* (Ballarat, Vic.: Ballarat Heritage Services, 2013).

[79] William Pargeter, quoted in Knee and Knee, *Marched In: Seven Internment and Prisoner of War Camps in the Tartura area during World War 2* (Tatura, Vic.: Tatura and District Historical Society, 2008), 13 and 19. The description of the camp is taken from this book.

[80] Knee and Knee, *Marched In*, 20.

[81] Knee and Knee, *Marched In*, 20.

[82] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 66.

[83] The twelve sides are equally reminiscent of the original panopticon Millbank in London, although there the four quarters protrude as separate blocks from a cruciform structure. The built to unbuilt relationship is an inversion of the Separate Prison at Port Arthur, Tasmania, Australia.

[84] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 68

[85] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 22.

[86] Moran, *Carceral geography*, 4.

[87] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 117, 119.

[88] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 27.

[89] Hammond is referring the findings of the psychologist Dr. Vischer who studied prisoners of WWI.

[90] See "Behind Barbed Wire", exhibition at the Duldig Gallery, Malvern in 2016, where the work of Karl Duldig is on display. Tatura Historical Society, "Collar the Lot", 2. Interview with Eva Duldig; Weiss, *It Wasn't Really Necessary,* 354, 428; Yuriko Nagata, " "A Little Colony on Our Own": Australia's Camps in World War II ," in *Alien Justice*, ed. Saunders and Daniels, 185-204, 186.

[91] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 27.

[92] Many examples of these are displayed in the Tatura Irrigation and Wartime Camps Museum.

[93] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 136.

[94] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 144.

[95] This study is not based on interviews, largely because many of the internees with clear memories of the period are now deceased, however, this difference is mentioned by many of the local historians I have interviewed regarding their sources.

[96] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 68.

[97] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 68.

[98] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 136

[99] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 136, 142.

[100] Knee and Knee, *Marched in*, 42-51.

[101] Knee and Knee, *Marched in*, 117.

[102] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 9.

[103] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 120.

[104] Nagata, *Unwanted Aliens*, 66.

[105] Hammond, *Walls of Wire*, 128.

[106] The JIA camps in mainland New Guinea mentioned in online sources include the Wewak Camp and Tunnel Hill Camp, and camps for Chinese civilians and Indian POWs. The territory including German New Guinea, the Bismark Archipelago and Nauru (the eastern half of the mainland) was assigned to Australia after WWI and was the site of major battles between the Allies and the Japanese. The Japanese occupied New Guinea from 1942-45. It was returned to civil administration under Australia in 1945. It has been the independent nation of Papua New Guinea since 1975.

[107] HiromiTanaka, "Japanese forces in post-surrender Rabaul," 137-153 in *From a hostile shore: Australia and Japan at war in New Guinea*, ed. Steven Bullard and Tamura Keiko, (Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 2004, 140, 142. Tanaka mentions the AWM82 collection as one of the rare examples of records from this period.

[108] The term geo body is used by Thongchai Winichakul in *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994). He describes the way in which the image of a territory becomes recognisable to people through maps.