



Faculty of Business and Economics

SSRN PAPER SERIES

‘Interrogating the unequal gendered legacy of work in an industrial heritage landscape’.

**Lucy Taksa, PhD
Centre for Workforce Futures
Faculty of Business & Economics
Macquarie University
lucy.taksa@mq.edu.au**

A decade ago, Smith (2008, 159) argued that ‘gender tends to be overlooked in discussions of heritage’ and is often invisible in heritage practices (Smith 2008, 165). More recently, Reading (2015: 401) noted that gendered approaches to heritage have ‘tended to use a simplistic framework in which gender is telescoped into a focus on women’. In her view, consideration of how ‘constructions of masculinity and femininity interact with what is valued and included as heritage’ provides a far ‘more productive way of understanding gender in relation to heritage’. As she put it, we not only ‘need to consider whose identities are being “represented and reinforced”’, but also the consequences of ‘representing a primarily masculine perspective’. This view is particularly significant for our understanding of gender vis-à-vis industrial heritage since masculine perspectives have dominated its treatment and management (Labadi, 2007, 162; Reading 2015, 404; Taksa, 2003).

The aim of this paper is to highlight how this masculine perspective has been transmitted and reinforced over time through different ‘vehicles of memory’ (Confino 1997, 1386). To this end, it first examines the way masculinity has infused assessments of industrial and industrial heritage significance by focusing on the Eveleigh Railway Workshops, which operated in Sydney from the late 1880s until the late 1980s. On this basis it then considers the memories of retired male workers who were employed there during World War Two when the predominantly male workforce was augmented by women munition workers. Finally, it explores how the ‘androcentric assumptions and messages’ (Smith 2008, 167) evident in assessments of significance and the gendered assumptions and values evident in

the male workers' memory narratives have been naturalised and legitimated in proposals for the site's heritage interpretation.

Eveleigh is among Australia's most significant industrial heritage sites yet one where the preservation of its tangible material culture has dominated heritage management activities (Taksa, 2003, 2005b and 2009). While there have been a number of proposals developed for heritage interpretation since Eveleigh's rail operations ended in the late 1980s (Godden Mackay 1996; 3-D Projects Artscape & Only Human 2012; Cooling and Vinton, 2016), none have been implemented. The resulting marginalisation of its intangible cultural heritage has, in my view, reinforced the masculine bias identified by scholars in relation to the nature of work and technology, workplaces, work relations and heritage (Coburn 1983; Cockburn and Ormrod 1993; Collinson and Hearn 1997; Connell 2002; DeVault 1993; Game and Pringle 1983; Shortliffe 2016; Smith, 2008; Taillon 2001; Taksa 2005a; Wajcman 1991). By examining the men's memories of the women who worked at Eveleigh during World War Two, I not only seek to challenge the ostensibly gender neutral representations of the site's significance throughout its operations but also the legitimacy of authorised gendered accounts of its value as industrial heritage.

The memory narratives used in this paper are drawn from interviews undertaken for the Combined Railway Unions Cultural Committee's Oral History and Exhibition Project (1986-87); the Eveleigh Social History Project (1996) undertaken for the government funded Eveleigh Management Plan for Moveable Items and Social History (Godden Mackay, 1996), a group interview of male unionists funded by the New South Wales (NSW) Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (1996); and the 'Work, technology, gender and citizenship at the Eveleigh Railway Workshops precinct' project funded by the Australian Research Council (1997-2000). Other vehicles of memory referred to include articles in journals and newspapers, heritage assessments of significance and proposals for heritage interpretation. In

order to highlight what Confino (1997, 1393) referred to as the ‘politics of memory’, I apply a gendered lens to these sources, which foregrounds gendered discourses and power relations. This approach makes it possible to investigate the way ‘symbolic and cultural acts, utterances and expressions’ (Reading 2015, 407), which privilege masculine gendered roles, values and norms, have been embedded in cultural memory thereby creating ‘[a]n unequal gendered legacy (Reading 2010, 11-12).

The Eveleigh railway workshops are treated here ‘as a discursive space in which intangible industrial culture and the collective memories of ... “ordinary” people are also embedded’ (Leung and Soyez 2009, 63), and the workers’ memories are viewed ‘as an expression of collective experience’ (Fentress and Wickham 1992, 25) and as a form of interpretation’ (Sturkin 1997, 6). To the extent that these memories are ‘imbued with cultural meaning’ (Sturkin, 1997: 3), they can be said to form part of cultural memory. However, as Brockmeier (2002, 25) pointed out, we not only need to recognise that cultural memory is a social process but also ‘that this process itself is culturally mediated within a symbolic space laid out by a variety of semiotic vehicles and devices’. Such artifacts of cultural memory can include ‘oral and written language, and other systems of communication’, as well as archives, ‘memorials and other architectures and geographies in which memory is embodied and objectified’. According to Brockmeier (2002, 33), narrative provides ‘a major integrating force’ in this symbolic space. Two of the three narrative forms she identifies are pertinent here. The first is what she referred to as ‘a semiotic order’ in which a material structure or monument ‘can be seen, or read, as a narrative text’ (2002, 34). The second is ‘a discursive or performative order’ which foregrounds ‘the narrative event as a site where the social is articulated and its contradictory implications are struggled over’ (Brockmeier 2002, 35).

From this perspective, Eveleigh can be interpreted as a narrative text that encompasses not simply its buildings but also an authorised sexual division of labour and ‘gender pattern of

location', which Cockburn and Ormrod (1993, 6) defined as 'the contemporary practices in which the sexes tend to be differentially positioned' in relation to different activities and technologies. In the context of this material and symbolic space, the workers' memory narratives can be read as a performative negotiation of the challenge posed to masculine culture and identity by the presence of women munitions workers in a traditionally masculine workplace. Here the metaphor of 'paradoxical space' elaborated by Rose (1993, 140-41) is helpful because it focuses attention on women's confinement in space and their location in 'several social spaces simultaneously' at the centre and on the margins. A critical point made by Rose (1993, 152 cited in Mahtani 2001, 299) is that such 'simultaneous occupation of centre and margin can critique the authority of masculinities'. In other words, I will suggest that in the paradoxical space of the Eveleigh Munitions Annexe, which was located in a mezzanine level of the main locomotive workshop building during 1942-43, the women were simultaneously freed to undertake paid industrial work traditionally done by men and yet simultaneously contained (Desbiens 1999, 183) not only physically but also structurally and symbolically.

The paper begins with a brief description of the site's history and representations of its significance. It then outlines how munitions work and women munitions workers were introduced to Eveleigh in 1942. Here the men's memory narratives are reviewed to throw light on how war-time conditions on the home front and the Munitions Annexe in particular, destabilized Eveleigh's masculine culture, the gender order that underpinned it and the gendered pattern of location in the workshops that affirmed traditional gender stereotypes. Finally, approaches to the site's heritage interpretation are examined in order to explore how the failure to address the gendered aspects of Eveleigh's intangible cultural heritage have erased the paradoxical space created by the presence of the women munitions workers from authorised representations of the site's heritage significance.

The Eveleigh Railway Workshops and its workforce

The Eveleigh workshops were constructed between 1880 and 1886 on a 51-hectare site four kilometers south of Sydney's Central Business District to maintain and repair steam locomotives. The Locomotive workshops and Large Erecting Shop occupied the southern side of the site and when railway operations ended in the late 1980s, the Locomotive workshops were transformed into a Technology Park (Brennan 1996) and in 2015 were sold by the NSW Government to Mirvac, one of Australia's largest developers (Mirvac 2015).

During Eveleigh's century of continuous rail related operation, its maintenance, repair and manufacturing operations were performed by skilled and unskilled male blue-collar workers. By 1927 over 6,500 people worked there before the Great Depression caused a substantial reduction. After 1933 employee numbers increased to over 5,000 and remained around this figure until the outbreak of World War Two (Guthrie c.1955, 7; Correspondence: Assistant Chief Mechanical Engineer to F. P. H. Fewtrell, Works Manager 1955, 5). Although this workforce was predominantly composed of men, women were continuously employed there on a wide range of jobs, including as upholstresses, office cleaners and laundresses, clerks and typists. Sixty were employed as process workers involved with munitions work between 1942 and 1943 and seven were employed as industrial nurses after 1946 (NSW Government Gazette Reels and Railway Personal History Cards Government). The latter two groups of women figure most in the memories of the male workers.

Masculinity and Eveleigh's Significance

Eveleigh's significance was based on its association with steam-powered technology, its capacity for technological innovation and the grand scale of its buildings, operations and machines. A few years after full operations began an article in *The Illustrated Sydney News* ('The NSW Railway Workshops at Eveleigh', 1891, 11, 13) stressed that Eveleigh's

machinery and appliances had no equal 'in the Southern Hemisphere', nor 'out of England'. It was an undertaking that provided amazement for visitors who gazed at the 'magnitude of the operations', its 'marvellous machinery and ingenious workmanship'. Thirty years later, Hyde (1922, 176, 179) wrote that '[t]he collection of machinery at Eveleigh' was 'magnificent' and extolled the 'excellence of workmanship and artistic craftsmanship'. As employee Stan Jones (1939) put it, Eveleigh was the 'heart of the NSW Transport System'; its 'Row upon row of drab smoke-grimed buildings' pulsed with 'a throbbing energy ... to the accompaniment of the thump, thump, thump of giant presses torturing white-hot steel into servitude', a 'steady drone of high-powered machinery, drilling, boring and turning in every possible fashion ... and the staccato noise of the boilermakers' rattler'.

Decades later, in 1988, it was these buildings and machines and their contribution to the State's history of transport (Don Godden and Associates, 1986) that justified the listing of the entire Eveleigh Railway Workshops complex on the Register of the National Estate as a site of national significance. In 1994, a heritage assessment for the NSW Government reiterated that the 'principal significance of the Eveleigh Precinct' was 'its association with and demonstration of railway history and technological development associated with that industry' (Thorp 1994,17). Similarly, the Statement of Significance included on the NSW State Heritage Register in 1995 stated that the Eveleigh workshops were 'some of the finest historic railway engineering workshops in the world' whose value was 'increased by the fact that it is comprised of assemblages, collections and operational systems' (NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, NSW Heritage Database).

These apparently gender neutral representations of Eveleigh's significance can be viewed as vehicles of memory that have cumulatively constituted an authorized cultural memory. However, if we acknowledge 'the ways in which gender gains expression in technology relations, and technology acquires its meaning in gender relations' (Cockburn and

Ormrod 1993, 7) then we begin to recognize that the narrative surrounding Eveleigh's technological significance is not gender neutral. As Wajcman (1991, 19) pointed out, masculinity has been central to 'the language of technology [and] its symbolism'. As importantly, men's physical capacity, access to, familiarity with and control over machinery has provided an important source of male power that has informed and relied on social practices, as well as on the definition of tasks and the selective design of tools and machines to match men's bodily strength (Cockburn 1986, 93, 97-8). This affinity between technology and men and also between skill and masculinity can, according to Wajcman (1991, 38) be 'seen as integral to the constitution of male gender identity'.

In railway workshops, where steam fitters, blacksmiths, lathe-operators and boilermakers, among others, manufactured, assembled, repaired and maintained steam locomotives, workers shared knowledge of and control over machine technology, and formed bonds with each other, which were reinforced by a range of social practices including practical jokes (Wajcman, 1991; Klein 1994) and which projected and affirmed 'powerful visions of manliness' (Drummond 1995, 79-80). As was the case in other traditional metal shops, 'dirt, noise, danger' and men's 'machine-related skills and physical strength' were all 'suffused with masculine qualities' that provided 'fundamental measures of masculine status and self-esteem' (Wajcman, 1991, 143). According to Taillon (2001, 39), all these characteristics mediated the railway workers' 'sense of themselves as men'. Moreover, these hallmarks of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995, 63, 77) sustained a culture of machismo, that made these workplace cultures unfriendly to women and that relied on construction of women 'at home providing the backdrop' (Wajcman, 1991, 141), that is on the margins in traditionally feminine roles. Eveleigh's masculine culture during the steam era typified this gender order.

Barry Smith (as quoted in Burke, 1995, 243) thought that during ‘the steam days there was great comradeship between the men. We had to look after one another’. Similarly, Vaughan Givillian (1987) said that during the steam era ‘the trades all got together’ because they ‘were all in the same sort of situation ... more or less like a brotherhood’ ... it was a challenge to see this big monstrous thing go by ... and say with self-satisfaction well look I helped to put that thing out there’. For Givillian, the camaraderie was built on day-to-day interactions in the sheds. He therefore stressed that during the steam era, the driver would ‘come in and he’d prepare his engine and oil it and you’d have a yarn with him and you’d know how his wife and kids were’.

Dealing with dangerous conditions was central to Eveleigh’s workplace culture. In recalling the ‘terrible job’ his father had as a gland packer in the steam locomotive working in the smoke-boxes, John Willis (1996) said this was ‘the dirtiest part you could work in. You would go in with, say, clean overalls on ... and when you came out they couldn’t see you, that’s how black they were’. In those days, ‘safety wasn’t thought of’, there were no gas masks ‘no air flows, nothing’. ‘You can imagine’, Willis added, ‘when they got to something like 240 pound of steam pressure they would sort of blow off and that noise was deafening’. Because ‘it was a very dangerous place to work ... you had to know what you were doing ... You took a lot of chances, a lot of risk’. For John Bruce (1996a) ‘Noise was a great problem’. In the boiler makers’ shop, it was ‘absolutely deafening’.

These memory narratives highlight the ‘patterns of talk and interaction’ through which Eveleigh’s male workers constituted ‘a shared reality’ (DeVault, 1990: 97) about the nature of their work and workplace and through which they sustained their individual and collective identities as men.

Eveleigh at War

Eveleigh was drawn into the war effort in 1939 after Defense Department officials made a request to the Commissioner for the NSW Railways for space to be made available for the manufacture of shells (NSW Government Railways, c1947). On 3 March 1942, in response to labour shortages and the increased demands on the Railways Department for the transport of troops and equipment, the NSW Railways were proclaimed a 'Protected Undertaking' under National Security (Man Power) Regulations and on 23 April previous permissions for rail workers to enlist were cancelled. At the very time when the War had extended to the Pacific and thus closer to Australia, and manliness was being construed in terms of bravery associated with war service and battle (Bolton, 1990, 7-10, 15-16), Eveleigh workers had no choice but to stay at home. It was in this context, that a mezzanine level was built above one of the bays in the locomotive workshop for the Munitions Annexe. This space consisted of a meal room, a change room with lockers and a rest room exclusively for women who began there on work traditionally done exclusively by men in November 1942. In fact, the women's incursion into the workshops was short-lived; the Annexe ceased production on 12 June 1943 (NSW Government Railways c1947, 57; NSW Department of Railways n.d., 1-9, 42-43). Nevertheless, it did affect the wartime experiences of Eveleigh's male workers.

Men's memories and the paradoxical space of the Munitions Annexe

John Bruce (1996a), who joined the Railways in January 1940 recalled, 'There was a gradual build up to a war footing' and the manufacture of the 25 pounder shells' in 'the wartime annexe'. It was all 'a bit hush hush' he said as the area was 'fenced and taboo to the general staff'. Similarly, Bob Matthews (1996), who also started in the locomotive workshop in January 1940, recalled that the influx of the women munitions workers 'dramatically' changed the nature of the 'organisation'. They had what he referred to as 'a separate identity'.

‘They were all fenced off’, he said, ‘and nobody was allowed in’ the Annexe, ‘because security was very tight.’

The Munitions Annexe can be read as a ‘paradoxical space’ in which the women process workers were located in ‘several social spaces simultaneously’, at the centre of pivotal war work and on the margins of Eveleigh’s masculine industrial workplace. On the one hand, the Annexe challenged traditional gendered structures, roles and contemporary practices that differentially positioning men and women in relation to various activities and technologies (Cockburn and Ormrod 1993, 6). On the other, it sustained the separation of men and women in the workplace since it provided a confined space within which the women were physically segregated from the male locomotive workshop employees. John Bruce (1996b) recalled that the women ‘had a different stopping and starting time’ to the men in ‘the general workshop area ... they worked around the clock with shifts. But when the mob of chappies were knocking off at 5 o’clock, the girls’ had ‘already left an hour earlier or an hour later of the changeover of shifts’. However, efforts to isolate the women from the men had mixed results. For instance, John Bruce (1996a) recalled, ‘You could look through the wire to the girls working in there’, although ‘You’d get moved on from perving on the girls’ if caught in the act. This representation of the women munitions workers as objects of masculine desire was one way in which the women’s challenge to traditional gendered assumptions and roles was negotiated. Other ways were also employed to limit the women’s ‘freedom’ to traverse this masculine space. Jeff Aldridge (1999) remembered that:

we used to see the afternoon shift coming in and they used to take a short cut through number 2 blacksmiths’ workshop down to the middle road and along the middle road up into the annexe and it was mainly upstairs - and downstairs I think it was 6 and 7 bays. ... But it used to be funny, most of the girls used to walk through to get on to the 3 o’clock afternoon shift. The smart alocs would put a ten-shilling note tied to a bit of string and they would have it laying on the centre of the floor and sit back in their fliers near the centre of the shop and as the girls come down they’d see the 10 dollar note see? And the blokes would give it a bit of a flick with the string and the girls used to go

trying to catch it till their legs were spent and they'd fall down - and they done the splits to the ground and (laughs) this was done day after day - done for years.

This practice invoked what Reskin and Padavic (1994, 11) refer to as 'gender displays, which are language or rituals so characteristic of one sex that they mark the workplace as belonging to that sex'. It can also be read as a performative struggle to deal with the contradictions created by this paradoxical space.

In addition, the men downplayed the women's capacity to perform men's work by questioning their stamina for handling the lengthy shifts that accompanied the introduction of 24 hour operations (Bob Matthews, 1996). As Keith Johnson (1996) elaborated:

I used to see the Annexe ... and you'd heard stories ... because they were working so much that they put sand in one of the gear boxes of the lathe to slow it down so that they'd have a bit of time off. They probably got overworked, working so much overtime.

Such stories, as much as their retelling, are suggestive of a struggle to maintain the traditional representation of women as physically weaker than men. At the same time, representations of how the men reacted to increased hours of work, during what Bob Matthews (1996) described as 'that bitter part of the war', highlights the way masculine norms were upheld in line with the ideals of hegemonic masculinity, particularly those related to industrial labour and male bodily stamina. Matthews acknowledged that the men 'were very unhappy' about having to work 'for twelve hours a day, twelve days straight' followed by only 'two days off'. Nevertheless, he said 'we did it for quite a number of years until the war was finished'. In this narrative, the men were able to sustain the additional demands made on them without needing to resort to the sort of subversive evasion allegedly engaged in by the women.

The men's collective experience of the contradictory implications of the women's employment in the Annexe is also manifested in their narratives around the unsuitability of the material and social space of the locomotive workshops for women. For instance, Jeff Aldridge (1999) described Eveleigh as 'a complete workshop of men' and Keith Johnson (1996) explained that

the workshops weren't appropriate for women because when 'You walked into the large erecting shop ... you walked straight in past the urinal'. For Keith Johnson (1996) the women 'had to be protected in such a male dominated area', even though he acknowledged that some of the women 'were quite capable of looking after themselves'. At the same time, he expressed concern for the men by commenting: 'fellows getting dressed at night, I don't know how they got on, when ladies were in the Annexe'.

These narratives illustrate the way the men sought to maintain the cultural ideals of masculinity and femininity and a gendered pattern of location that affirmed sexual differences and traditional gender stereotypes. The men also invoked traditional norms of femininity by depicting the women munitions workers as 'hard cases', who had 'fun with the boys by telling them crude jokes ... much to their embarrassment' (John Lee, 1999). For John Lee, these women were 'a pretty tough lot', 'and a unique pack of women, such as you wouldn't find at a lot of other social outings'. Hence, even though these women were confined in the Annexe most of the time, their presence in the masculine space of the locomotive workshops and their participation in the practises traditionally associated with masculine industrial workplace cultures transgressed acceptable gendered mores and challenged the gendered assumptions that construed the Eveleigh workshops as a site of male power. To all intents and purposes these same norms have informed assessments of Eveleigh's heritage significance and proposals for its interpretation.

Interpreting Eveleigh's Significance

In 1996, an Interpretative Concept was outlined in the Eveleigh Workshops Management Plan for Moveable Items and Social History produced for a range of government authorities. Here the site's gender identity was depicted as 'relentlessly masculine, in its scale, its design, its grittiness, its smells, its particular dirt, its muscular machinery'. The challenge, according to the author, was 'neither to sanitise the site, nor, pun intended, emasculate, it, but rather

exploit its very nature to explore what it once meant to be a man working in such an environment ... what it meant to be a man working in a heavy industrial site such as Eveleigh, where one's status was defined by one's capacity for and ability at physical work' (Godden Mackay 1996, Appendix J, 106-7). The masculine bias evident in this depiction was also reflected in the normative stereotypical gendered categories embedded in the proposed displays. Suggested mini-exhibitions for the 'Tools' display included one on 'Real Blokes' focused on machinery and engineering processes to highlight notions of physical strength, physical skill and associated masculine values that were important for retaining employment in industrial workshops and 'in the daily battle for bread'. Another, on 'Hard Yakka' (Australian vernacular for work), centred on a 'piece of machinery' to examine 'industrial conditions, the process of work itself, the subdivision of labour within the plant'. While the women who 'were brought in for munitions work' during World War Two were mentioned, the focus was limited to how they were 'kicked out after the war ended' (Godden Mackay 1996, Appendix J, 114). The only other reference to women was as part of an exhibit of an 'Eveleigh worker's house - circa pre-War', entitled, 'Hearth and Home' to allow 'the story of the women and the children of the Eveleigh workers' to be told (Godden Mackay 1996, Appendix J, 110- 112). The assumption underpinning these proposals that Eveleigh was no place for women, reproduced the collective memory narratives provided by the men who had worked there. Subsequent Interpretation concepts similarly illustrate how normative representations of masculinity and femininity 'interact with what is valued and included as heritage' (Reading 2015, 401).

The Eveleigh Railway Workshops (ERW) Interpretation Plan & Implementation Strategy produced in 2012 for the Redfern Waterloo Authority noted that:

the primary theme of the ERW site is the place itself - a nineteenth century industrial workshop for the construction and maintenance of NSW's locomotives and rolling stock. It is the preeminent site in NSW in which to explore the various aspects of heavy

industrial work - the trades, the skills, the conditions, the products, the cultural life, workplace relations, the events of ERW, as well as the technology, the site organisation and its wider role in the maintenance and development of NSW railway system (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 7).

Its proposal for interpretation of the social dimensions of the site centred on ‘An installation of portraits of former ERW workers in one bay’ that would draw on ‘historic and contemporary photographs’ in order to ‘reflect something of the diversity of the trades, ethnicity and gender of former employees’ (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 8). This was the only mention of gender contained in the report. More importantly, the treatment of the war period and the Munitions Annexe completely omitted any mention of the women who worked there, let alone their impact on the workshops’ masculine culture (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 20). The site’s significance replicated the Statement on the State Heritage Register mentioned earlier (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 46), while its social significance was related to the fact that Eveleigh was ‘one of the largest employers in Sydney’ and demonstrated ‘the capacity of Australian industry’ and the ‘high level of craft skills’, which provided ‘an important source of pride’ (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 47). Although ‘identity’ and ‘racism/sexism’ were mentioned as possible subthemes (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 48-49), the major Sample Themes centred only on: (i) Place including ‘buildings/operational divisions, structures, layout, logic; (ii) Uses; (iii) Events, including the ‘1917 strike, union meetings, war time production, social events, ERW closure; and (iv) Workshops including ‘machines & workers in action, carriages & locomotives under construction’ (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 51, 53). The centrepiece of this interpretation strategy was a “floating” artefact and audio-visual installation to be located in Bay 2 of the ATP Locomotive Workshops’ entitled ‘Ghosts’ to explore the ‘personal stories and experiences of the place’s past inhabitants’ (3-D Projects and Artscape & Only Human 2012, 8). This

orientation was subsequently replicated in the Heritage Interpretation Strategy produced in 2016 (Cooling and Vinton 2016, 42, 57-62). In effect, all these proposals reinforce the ‘androcentric assumptions and messages’ (Smith 2008, 167) contained in representations of the site’s significance both during its operations and since its transformation into a heritage place.

Conclusion

This paper has considered Eveleigh as a narrative text that encompassed not simply buildings but also an authorised sexual division of labour and ‘gender pattern of location’ (Cockburn and Ormrod 1993, 6). In the context of this material and symbolic space, the workers’ memory narratives have been read as a performative negotiation of the ‘paradoxical space’ created by the Munitions Annexe and the women’s presence in their traditionally male dominated workplace. Through this gendered perspective, we have seen how socially endorsed norms of masculinity and femininity were enacted at Eveleigh through a range of practises. Taken together with the representations of Eveleigh’s significance through articles and heritage reports and assessments, we have seen how various vehicles of memory have contributed to a gendered ‘politics of memory’ (Confino 1997, 1393) that has been naturalised and legitimated in proposals for the site’s heritage interpretation. As Smith (2008, 173) stressed ‘the lack of extended discussion of gender issues in the heritage field helps to reinforce the continued legitimacy of authorised ... accounts of history ... and the uncritical maintenance of received gender identities’ and hierarchical relations between them. As a result, Eveleigh and its ghosts stand out as a beacon of masculinity that has produced ‘[a]n unequal gendered legacy (Reading 2010, 11-12).

References

- Anon. 1891. "The NSW Railway Workshops at Eveleigh. A State Enterprise." *The Illustrated Sydney News*, 18 July: 11-13.
- Brennan, Walter. (1996) "On the Track of New Technology: Redfern Railway Shed Hosts Info Superhighway." *Sunday Telegraph*, June 30: 50.
- Brockmeier Jens. 2002. "Remembering and Forgetting: Narrative as Cultural Memory." *Culture Psychology* 8(1): 15-43.
- Bolton, G. 1990. *The Oxford History of Australia, Volume 5, 1942-1988*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, David. 1995. *Making the Railways*. Sydney: State Library of New South Wales Press.
- Cockburn, C. 1983. *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto Press.
- Cockburn, C. 1986. "The Material of Male Power." in *Waged Work: A Reader*, edited by Feminist Review, 93-113. London: Virago.
- Cockburn, C. and Ormrod, S. (1993) *Gender and Technology in the Making*. London: Sage.
- Collinson, D. and Hearn, J. 1997. "'Men' at 'work': multiple masculinities/multiple workplaces." in *Understanding Masculinities: Social Relations and Cultural Arenas*, edited by Mairtin Mac an Ghaill, 61-76. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Confino A. 1997. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *American Historical Review* 102 (5): 1386-1403.
- Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, Raewyn. (2002) *Gender*. Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Desbiens, C. 1999. "Feminism 'in' geography. Elsewhere beyond and the politics of paradoxical space." *Gender, Place and Culture* 6: 179-85.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. 1990. "Talking and Listening from Women's Standpoint: Feminist Strategies for Interviewing and Analysis." *Social Problems* 37 (1): 82-101.
- Drummond, Diane K. 1995. *Crewe: Railway Town, Company and People, 1840-1914*. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
- Fentress, James and Wickham, Chris (1992) *Social Memory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Game, Anne and Pringle, Rosemary (1983) *Gender at Work*. North Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

- Hyde, Hamilton. 1922. "The Australian Engineer: Splendid Work at Eveleigh Workshops." *Sea, Land and Air* 1 June: 176- 179.
- Jones, Stan. 1939. 'Eveleigh - The Heart Of The Transport System', *Daily News: Feature for Transport Workers* 19 January: n.p.
- Klein, Maury. 1994. *Unfinished Business: The Railroad in American Life*. Hanover NH: University Press of New England.
- Labadi, Sophia. 2007. "Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 7 (2): 47–170.
- Leung, Maggi W.H. and Soye, Dietrich. 2009. "Industrial Heritage: Valorising the Spatial–Temporal Dynamics of Another Hong Kong Story." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 15 (1): 57–75.
- Mahtani, M. 2001. "Racial ReMappings: the potential of paradoxical space.", *Gender, Place and Culture* 8 (3): 299–305.
- Reading, Anna. 2015. "Making feminist heritage work: gender and heritage." in *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary heritage research*, edited by Waterton, Emma and Watson, Steve, 397-410. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Reading, A. 2010. "Gender and the right to memory." *Media Development* 57 (2): 11-15.
- Reskin, Barbera and Padavic, Irene. 1994. *Women and Men at Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rose, G. 1993. *Feminism and Geography: the limits of geographical knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shortliffe, Sarah Ellen. 2016. "Gender and (World) Heritage: The myth of a Gender Neutral Heritage." in *World Heritage, Tourism and Identity: Inscription and Co-production*, edited by Laurent Bourdeau, Maria Gravari-Barbas, 107-120. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2008. "Heritage, Gender and Identity." in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*, edited by Graham, Brian and Howard, Peter Farnham, 159–79. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sturken, Marita. 1997. *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Taillon, Paul Michel. 2001. "'To Make Men out of Crude Material': Work Culture, Manhood, and Unionism in the Railroad Running Trades, c.1870-1900.", in *Boys and Their Toys? Masculinity, Technology and Class in America*, edited by Horowitz, Roger, 33-54. New York: Routledge.

Taksa, Lucy. 2003. "Machines and Ghosts: Politics, industrial heritage and the history of working life at the New South Wales Eveleigh Railway Workshops." *Labour History* 85: 65-88.

Taksa, Lucy. 2005a. "'About as popular as a dose of clap': steam, diesel and masculinity at the New South Wales Eveleigh Railway Workshops." *Journal of Transport History* 26 (2): 79-97.

Taksa, Lucy. 2005b. "The Material Culture of an Industrial Artifact: Interpreting Control, Defiance and Everyday Resistance at the New South Wales Eveleigh Railway Workshops." *Historical Archaeology* 34 (3): 8-27.

Taksa, Lucy. 2009. "Labor History and Public History in Australia: Allies or Uneasy Bedfellows?" *International Labor and Working Class History* 76: 1-23.

Wajcman, Judy. 1991. *Feminism Confronts Technology*. North Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Archives and Unpublished Reports

Cooling, Sam and Natalie Vinton (2016) Interpretation Strategy for Australian Technology Park: Prepared for Mirvac, Sydney: Curio Projects.

Don Godden & Associates (1986) *A Heritage Study of Eveleigh Railway Workshops*, Sydney.

Godden Mackay (1996) Eveleigh Workshops Management Plan for Moveable Items and Social History, Sydney.

Mr. Guthrie, 'History of Eveleigh Workshops', Unpublished Notes, c.1955, NSW State Archives and Records Series, NRS 17514 (originally A88/44 - Box 3, State Rail Authority Archives Sydney).

Correspondence: Assistant Chief Mechanical Engineers to F. P. H. Fewtrell, Works Manager, 14 April, 1955, in State Rail Reference publications, monographs, pamphlets and papers, NSW State Archives and Records Series, NRS 17514 (originally A88/44 - Box 3, State Rail Authority Archives Sydney)

Mirvac (2015) 'Mirvac Successful Tenderer for Acquisition and Renewal of Iconic Australian Technology Park, 2015,' Release for the Australian Stock Exchange (ASX) 12 November, <http://www.mirvac.com/About/News/Mirvac-Successful-Tenderer-for-Acquisition-and-Renewal-of-Iconic-Australian-Technology-Park/> (accessed January 6, 2018)

NSW Government Gazette Reels and Railway Personal History Cards NRS 12922, <https://www.records.nsw.gov.au/series/12922> (accessed in hard copy from 1999)

NSW Government Railways (c.1947) *Railway At War: A Record of the Activities of the NSW Government Railways in the Second World War*, Sydney: NSW Government Railways held at NSW State Archives and Records Series, NRS 20017 item A92-4/11

NSW Department of Railways, History of the War Effort, Mechanical Branch, and September 1939 - December 1942, typewritten manuscript, State Rail Authority Archives, M143

NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, NSW Heritage Database: Eveleigh Railway Workshops,
<http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/heritageapp/ViewHeritageItemDetails.aspx?id=5045103> ,
accessed 1 April 2018).

Thorp, Wendy (1994) Heritage Assessment: Archaeological Resources, ATP Master Plan Site Eveleigh. Report for City West Development Corporation, Sydney.

3-D Projects Artscape & Only Human (2012) Eveleigh Railway Workshops Interpretation Plan & Implementation Strategy, Sydney: Redfern Waterloo Authority.

Oral History

Aldridge, Jeff: interview conducted by Lucy Taksa on 16th March, 1999 for the Work, technology, gender and citizenship at the Eveleigh Railway Workshops Precinct Project.

Bruce, John Robert (a): interview conducted by Joan Kent on 25 March 1996 for the Eveleigh Social History Project.

Bruce, John Robert (b): Group Interview conducted by Lucy Taksa on 17 November 1996 for the NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning funded video on Eveleigh unionists.

Johnson, Keith: interview conducted by Joan Kent on 23 February, 1996 for the Eveleigh Social History Project.

Lee, John: interview conducted by Lucy Taksa on 5th March, 1999 for the Work, technology, gender and citizenship at the Eveleigh Railway Workshops Precinct Project.

Matthews, Bob: interview conducted by Joan Kent on 20 February 1996 for the Eveleigh Social History Project.

Givillian, Vaughan: interview conducted by Russ Herman in 1987 for the Combined Railway Unions Cultural Committee Oral History Project.

Willis, John: interview conducted by Lucy Taksa on 5 February 1996 for the Eveleigh Social History Project.