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Research into public memorials critically informs public deliberation on national and individual identity, cultural meaning, and citizenship. In the sphere of civil society, the police occupy an important place for the expression of collective values concerning morality, orderliness, and security. The public police are the visible embodiment of the power of the state and a key institutional means to the public good of security (Loader & Walker, 2001). So, what we celebrate through the processes of memorialization of police are suggestive of deeper insights into contemporary cultural attitudes to the police specifically, and public security generally. However, research into memorials and memorialization has been dominated by war: either in terms of the study of war memorials and their relationship to individual and collective memory, or in terms of the consequences of war, most noticeably, though not exclusively, the holocaust. In their detailed study of "the politics of memory," Ashplant, Dawson, and Roper (2000, p. 3) argue that war commemoration has been fueled in recent years by cultural and political elements that have been facilitating the memory and commemoration of
war as well as the "proliferation of academic research and critical enquiry—particularly by historians—which has accompanied these developments, reflected upon them, and itself contributed to the widening public interest in the phenomena..." (cf. Moriarty, 1999).

Perhaps it is no surprise that the same cannot be said generally of the study of memorialization of policing, because, after all, we are not talking about the defense of the nation or of an empire, but rather the everyday and mundane practice of internal ordering where sometimes a police officer loses his life. It can be said with confidence that the research literature is almost nonexistent on this topic. Yet, when one looks more closely at the practice of memorializing police deaths, there can be no doubt that the cultural and political elements that pertain to the commemoration of war have of recent years been quite intense in the field of policing.

This chapter is exploratory in nature and derives from the questions and themes developed to guide a larger study into the rise of the police memorial.* The desire is to locate the development of police memorials within a broader "politics of police" (Reiner, 2000) and set out the parameters for the development of systematic studies in policing memorialization. Such themes are then applied to examples drawn across various countries. The approach taken differs significantly from much of the recent research into police legitimacy focused on procedural justice. However, there is much greater literature that has set this issue (legitimacy) as a centerpiece for understanding policing (for a good example of earlier detailed research, see Manning, 1977; for a more general account of the influence of Weber's account of the legitimacy of police authority, see Reiner, 1985). Second, the procedural justice approach seeks to understand legitimacy through large-scale surveys and quantitative analyses of how procedural factors—police adherence to fair procedures—shape the perceptions of the legitimacy of police, which, in turn, is seen to enhance compliance with policing. While this is an interesting pathway to understanding factors shaping police legitimacy, procedural justice is but one means for understanding this. As Herbert comments, "This approach neglects the significance of other paths to police legitimacy" (2006, p. 498). Furthermore, survey-based research is but one means of assessing police legitimacy. Others are equally viable, for instance, Manning's earlier work (1977) tied legitimacy of policing in part to the symbolic displays of their moralized authority.

* This chapter is based on a collaborative research grant with Professor Joan Beaumont, previously Dean of Arts at Deakin University and currently Dean of Education at the Australian National University.
Memory and Culture

Is it the case that police memorials have become organized sites that enable police and the broader community to address something that cannot be experienced without ritual? Police memorials, thus, become the sites at which rituals concerning police sacrifices and their importance to the local, regional, and national physical sovereign state, as well as attendant cultural meanings and reproductions related to that territory, are played out. Yet, at the same time, we also need to take account of the specificities on context, for while, as it will be argued below, police memorialization has a certain global element, there does remain important differences that the broad brush of globalization cannot accommodate. In addition, even within one sovereign territory the variation in forms of memorials and related rituals and practices of collective memory vary considerably.

Police, Memory, and Memorialization

As Peter Manning has argued in his analysis of police funerals, memorialization is part of the dramatization of police work, communicating the danger and sacrifices made in police work (Manning, 1997, p. 22); emphasizing bravery and commitment of police for the public good and garnering the public support of the silent majority in the face of scandals and misdeeds that foster critique and demands for greater accountability (Mulcahy, 2000, p. 75). Memorialization embodies and shapes the “meanings attached to the idea of policing within [cultural] memory and sensibility [and] the ways in which policing has intersected with forms of social and political change” (Loader & Mulcahy, 2003, p. vii). Our analysis positions these practices in the “politics of memory” within broader “presentational strategies” (Manning, 2006) on the part of police to improve their professional status and distinctiveness, to reinstate a positive image of community policing, and, through invoking the discourse of war and memory, to negotiate a high status position within constructions of national identity.

It is now axiomatic in the extensive international literature on war and memory, which largely defines the research field of memorial studies, that memory operates at a number of levels: ranging from the individual to the collective, be that collective at the level of the local organization or national politics (Ashplant, Dawson, & Roper, 2000). It also is clear that the development of commemorative practices therefore is deeply politicized and inherently contested.

Memories of the past only gain a subjective hold within a community if they engage with wider cultural practices of cultural representation in civil
society and the state. How have police, who are developing memorialization practices, achieved this engagement? Has this process been conscious and deliberate? How does memorialization shape the memories and sensibilities of the wider community toward policing (Loader & Mulcahy, 2003, p. viii)? Policing, it is now widely accepted (Finnane, 1994, p. 6), is a function of social relations and historical conjuncture characterizing those who are being policed. Commemoration of police, it will be argued, has changed considerably in recent years, shaped by and shaping the images and imagination of the "idea of police" (Klockars, 1985).

The larger research program investigates the memorialization of police forces in the United States, Canada, Northern Ireland, Scotland, England, and Australia during the past two decades. This phenomenon is part of a wider global explosion of memory, particularly memory of war and its victims. How, why, and to what effect police forces have appropriated the ritual and commemorative practice of war memory is the central issue to be explored in this chapter.

In general, police memorialization has met with a positive reception in the countries under analysis. The development of police memorials can only be understood as part of, firstly, the global phenomenon of "memory politics" that has occurred over the past two decades; secondly, the manner in which policing had converged, nationally and internationally, in the minds of the public and in public rhetoric with more traditional forms of security; and, finally, changing conceptions in the secular state about death, loss, and the mutual obligations between the citizen and the state.

Police memorialization has been successfully positioned within this wider agenda of war commemoration, though whether this has been a conscious process or not is a matter that will be one of the objects of ongoing research. Police forces have a natural advantage in seeking to appropriate an agenda of war commemoration because militarization has been a feature of police culture and organization since the creation of state-sponsored police forces in the early to mid-19th century. Not only was the introduction of uniforms a critical feature of the creation of police forces in Britain, Northern Ireland, the United States, Canada, and Australia (Monkkonen, 1981), but police organization has traditionally been strongly hierarchical with command structures reflecting those of the military (Finnane, 1994), including the appointment of "military men" as police commissioners up to the mid-20th century. In Australia, particularly, given the convict origins of a number of colonies and its derivation from the Royal Irish Constabulary, policing has had a strongly military character. Police also share with the defense forces a monopoly over the state-sanctioned use of force (though whether they should be constructed as agents of the state, or, in their initial decades, an instrument of its dominant (capitalist) elite is a matter that has engaged police historians) (see Reiner, 2000; Palmer, 1988).
In the literature of war memory, there is an ongoing debate about the degree to which recent commemorative practices have been created "top down" through the agency of the state or military hierarchies or rather have been the manifestations of individual grief. In almost all cases, it would appear that those commemorative practices that acquire public acceptability, and in which the inevitable contestation about memory is minimal, are those that resonate with individual grief, through the listing of the names of the individual dead. Initial examination of police memorials indicates that the practice of lists of individuals is now well entrenched.

Such developments are not limited to Western democracies. For instance, China has developed a national police memorial seeking to locate policing "sacrifices" within the broader cultural and economic rebuilding [I am indebted to Professor Mark Finnane for this point].

Finally, we should not ignore the politics of memory. No better case study for this can be found than the intense political contestation over the nature of commemoration at the World Trade Center site. The planned International Freedom Center (2005), now abandoned, was described in the Wall Street Journal as "The Great Ground Zero Heist" (Burlingame, 2005) in reference to the proposed "multimedia tutorial about man's inhumanity to man... a history all should know and learn, but dispensing it over the ashes of Ground Zero is like creating a Museum of Tolerance over the sunken graves of the USS Arizona" (in reference to a U.S. Navy ship bombed by the Japanese in Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941). The Internet activities of groups such as 9/11 Families for Safe & Strong America (http://www.911familiesforamerica.org/) and Take Back the Memorial (http://takebackthememorial.org/) helped shape a discourse in opposition to "a Who's Who of the human rights, Guantanamo-obsessed world" (Burlingame, 2005).

**Memorial Locations**

The location of police memorials raises questions of the relation between police and other institutions of the state. National memorials to police officers have been erected in the United States (1991), Canada (initially in 1978 and then expanded significantly in 1994 and after the introduction of the National Memorial Day in 1998), the RCMP National Memorial at Fort Calgary in September 2005, Northern Ireland (2003), Scotland (2004), and England (2005). The U.S. police memorial is located in Judiciary Square, in Washington D.C., "The seat of our nation's judicial branch of government" (http://www.nleomf.com). The Canadian national police memorial is located "along the perimeter wall on Parliament Hill overlooking the Ottawa River and the Supreme Court of Canada." (http://www.cacp.ca/english/memorial/english/default.htm). On the other hand, the the U.K. National Police
Memorial is in London on the corner of The Mall and Horse Guards (http://www.policememorial.org.uk/Police_Memorial_Trust/NPM.htm).

There is also a proposal in United Kingdom for the National Memorial Aboretum to “erect a single memorial where the names of all fallen members of the British Police Forces police” are located, a campaign organized by the Care of Police Survivors (emphasis original, www.ukcops.org). Similarly, there are also proposals for a new memorial in New Zealand and a “national” garden memorial. Memorials to police also have proliferated at the local level: in at least 34 states of the United States and nearly 30 locations in the United Kingdom. Other memorials have emerged or are being planned outside the Western developed countries (e.g., in New Delhi and Beijing), indicating more the “global” than merely “western” spread of national police memorials. In this chapter, we limit the analysis to the national memorials in the six Western countries identified.

Memorials to police who died while on duty have proliferated in Australia in recent years. In 1999, New South Wales established a police Wall of Remembrance in the Domain, Sydney, and it has become a key site for commemorative activities on the Australian National Police Remembrance Day. Victoria followed in August 2003 with a more substantial police memorial on St. Kilda Road (possibly not coincidentally) in the vicinity of the major war memorial, the Shrine of Remembrance. Western Australia and Tasmania followed suit with memorial gardens in 2004 and 2005, respectively: the former on the grounds of the new Police Academy and adjoining the Wall of Remembrance in the police chapel; in the case of the latter (Tasmania), a “new remembrance memorial was commissioned” in 2005 and located “on permanent display in the foyer at the Tasmania Police Academy” (http://www.police.tas.gov.au/about-us/remembrance). Commemoration moved to the national level in 2006 when an Australian National Police Memorial Opening Ceremony was conducted. These memorials were preceded by the introduction in 1989 of the Australian National Police Remembrance Day on September 29, the Feast of Archangel St. Michael, who was always fighting evil (http://www.police.qld.gov.au/). The Australian National day has since spread beyond Australia to the South Pacific Regional Annual Police Remembrance Day Service also held on September 29.

In each instance, police memorials are located in sites that connect either the security of sovereign authority and security of the state and/or “lawmaking”—courts, parliaments—and law enforcement (police). In 2005, the New Zealand Police held the Australasian and South Pacific Regional Annual Police Remembrance Day Service on September 29, with the cover of the formal brochure consisting of a full-page reproduction of Pietro Perugina’s (1469–1523) painting *The Archangel Michael*, referred to as the Patron Saint of Police Officers.
How do we explain this phenomenon and how do we account for this rapid globalization of national police memorials? In order to explore the three central hypotheses outlined above—(a) the impact of the global phenomenon of "memory politics," (b) the effort within police forces to enhance their professional status and legitimacy in the face of sustained critique, and (c) the effects of the convergence of policing with national security—we pose four broad questions and tentative responses.

Question 1

*Why have police memorials and commemorative practices emerged at this historical moment in each of the national settings under analysis?*

The causes for what might now be called an explosion of interest in memory and memorialization are complex and the subject of considerable debate within the burgeoning international literature. In increasingly pluralized and fragmented societies, the mobilization of collective memories is used to shape founding myths, assert new minority identities, provide social cohesion, and reinvigorate, to adapt Beck's (2002, p. 203) phrase, "zombie institutions"—institutions having ongoing political and cultural force, but whose original purposes are all but dead. The "war memory boom" was also encouraged globally by a *fin de siècle* (end of a century, especially the 19th) mood: a need, as not only the 20th century, but also the millennium closed, to make sense of that immensely violent century. In Australia, this mood coincided with two major national celebrations—the bicentennial of white settlement in 1988 and the centenary of federation in 2001—which governments of both political parties capitalized upon to enhance their constructions of nationalism and national identity. The 1980s and 1990s were a period of war memorial building, in Australia and on foreign battlefields, unrivalled since the 1920s. In 1983, there were two memorials on Anzac Parade, Canberra, the heart of national memorials; in 2006, there were 11.

Police memorialization in Australia has been positioned within this wider agenda of war commemoration, though whether this has been a conscious process or not is a matter that will be one of the foci of our research. Preliminary research of the Australian police memorials reveals appropriation of the use language of Anzac (members of armed services in Australia and New Zealand) in police commemoration, even when officers have died in traffic accidents. How has war commemorative practice informed the development of police memorials in North America and the United Kingdom?

Police memorials also must be positioned within the changing sensitivities to death within postmodern Western society. The concurrent birth of roadside memorials to traffic accident victims (often called "shrines") is indicative of a need to celebrate traumatic death and to give private grief a visible and enduring public expression. More specific to policing, we seek
to interrogate the relationship between police deaths and memorialization. Preliminary analysis indicates a complex relationship between police deaths and memorials. For instance, in the United States, the historical peak in police deaths occurred in the 1970s, though did increase again in the late 1980s prior to the introduction of the memorial. Information obtained on Australia is instructive in suggesting that it is “signal events” in police deaths that might be connected to memorialization. Two incidences led to the Victorian lobbying for a national memorial day: the “Walsh street” shooting murders of two police officers (October 12, 1998) and the death of police constable Angela Taylor when the police headquarters on Russell Street was bombed (March 27, 1986). Victorian Police proposed to the Commissioners Conference that the national memorial day to be held on the anniversary of the Russell Street bombing.

Police memorialization can be explored as well as a response to the challenges of legitimacy facing police forces in late 20th and early 21st centuries. Firstly, policing is increasingly under pressure from diverse and competing social groups. These make police claims that they are responsive to some homogeneous “public” difficult to sustain and increasing the possibilities for conflict toward, and “delegitimation” of the police. The police find it difficult to “stand as the embodiment of a common moral and political community” (Loader & Mulcahy, 2003, p. 16). As Mulcahy argues, in the case of Royal Ulster Constabulary in Northern Ireland, the dramatization of deaths through memorials has been used as “moral appeals emphasizing issues of sacrifice, bravery, and commitment” (2000, p. 75); a strategy intended internally to shape the solidarity and commitment of police, and externally as part of a “strategy of legitimation” (p. 69). Is this valid for the other countries under study?

Secondly, the monopolistic claim of national and state police forces to be the protector of domestic social order has become an increasingly contested field. The “rebirth of private policing” (Johnston, 1992); the “multilateralization” or even “Balkanization” of policing providers (Bayley & Shearing, 2001; Zedner, 2006); and the mix of military and paramilitary policing in the war on terror has decentered state police. It has reduced them from being the dominant form of “primary definers” (Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Roberts, 1978) to but one (albeit still significant) voice amongst many in the discourses on law and order, security, and, indeed, the condition of the nation and world. For instance, London Metropolitan Police Commissioner Ian Blair commented during his 2005 BBC Dimbleby Lecture that, in recent times, police have become an agency of “social cohesion” and “healing” while recognizing that “policing is becoming not only central to our understanding of citizenship, it is becoming a contestable political issue as never before” (Blair, 2005). In another example of but one of his many commentaries on the state of the nation, Australian Federal Police Commissioner Mick Keelty recently
stated, "The balance between security and freedoms is a delicate one... This involves weighing up the developments, imperatives, and dangers that confront our society, against the added safeguards that have come with greater public scrutiny and accountability requirements [of police]" (Keelty, 2004).

At the same time, police forces have, in the case of Australia notably, become projected onto the global security environment, being deployed in peacekeeping operations and in "failed states." This further erodes the boundaries between policing and more traditional military security at a time when terrorism has brought war into the domestic national realm, making trains, airports, and civilians explicitly the object of attack, more so than other wars on crime. The military rhetoric deployed in these earlier wars also had material effects on policing. In these earlier wars, police agencies increasingly resorted to, or more accurately, returned to paramilitary policing, again led by the U.S. introduction of SWAT teams across the country from the 1970s and Special Operations units in Australia and the United Kingdom during the 1980s (of course, the RUC (Royal Ulster Constabulary) was seen to be a fundamentally paramilitary policing agency). The RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) in Canada similarly increased the use of paramilitary policing in this period, albeit checked by the MacDonald Commission and subsequent loss of its security function to a new agency (Beare, 2004).

Memorialization therefore can be seen as an important means of negotiating these changing social and political conditions through the recasting of the individual loss of police into public loss, dramatizing police bravery and sacrifice (Mulcahy, 2000), and thereby enhancing the power and authority of the police and its unique status as the "thin blue line" between social order and a Hobbesian dystopia. Just how much this is so in the case of the memorial sites under study can only be established through the detailed analysis proposed in this chapter.

Question 2

How are police memorials developed and through what particular "agents of memory?"

The history of policing suggests cultural linkages between military commemoration and police commemorative practices. We seek to analyze police commemorative practices through the introduction of memorials that dramatize the sacrifices of individual police (Manning, 1997) by researching the question of agency. As Otwin Marenin (2005, pp. 102-103) states, "Symbolism matters to policing because policing is a form of social ordering that seeks to promote, objectively, conditions of safety, and, subjectively, perceptions that justice is being done." Who organizes the memorials? What motivates these "agents of memory?" Who contributes to the planning of the memorialization of state police? How are these practices financed? What
physical forms, and cultural associations, are invoked in memorials to police deaths? What is the interface in these processes between individual police memory, their local force, and state agencies?

From prior research, we can identify that Australian State Police memorials have emerged at a time when police agencies were under considerable strain, criticized variously for the level of force used by police (police shootings in Victoria) and police corruption (all jurisdictions, but particularly New South Wales and Western Australia). In broader terms, the memorials are part of an organized response to the "desacralization" of state police; the loss of faith in the competence of the police over the past three decades (Loader & Mulcahey, 2003, p. 3) as various incidences and inquiries have contributed to a public sense of the "loss of innocence" through police malpractice and corruption. Our preliminary analysis is suggestive of a temporal link between memorialization and substantive critique of policing. For instance, the Fitzgerald Inquiry (1987–1989) in Queensland identifying systemic corruption in that state (though having a national impact) overlaps with the introduction of the Australian national Memorial Day in 1989. In the United States, the national memorial was introduced soon after the internationally reported beating of Rodney King in March 1991. In England, the police memorial followed severe criticism of police culture in the Macpherson report (1999), a report that further undermined British policing following a series of miscarriages of justice findings. Macpherson was also followed by a number of Home Office publications heavily critical of police (Miller, 2003), which immediately predated the 2005 memorial. In Canada, the McDonald Commission (1977–1981) investigated and reported on a series of RCMP crimes (thefts, arson, and break and enter, for instance) and a general culture of breaking the law, which it labeled institutionalized wrongdoings. This report overlapped with the introduction of the first minimal memorial. In 1994, the memorial was made significantly more substantial. In the leadup to the new memorial, the Oppal inquiry into problems of policing in British Columbia (1992–1994) was being concluded. This inquiry had national consequences as the RCMP provided BC provincial policing services. This was a period that Paul Palango (1994) describes as the RCMP being "Above the Law" and a "Crisis in the RCMP... and in Canada" (1998). National Memorial Day was introduced in 1998, just a few years after the new national memorial and the Oppal inquiry presented competing narratives of Canadian policing.

But to what degree have those initiating the building of police memorials consciously responded to these issues? The associations establishing the memorials, though often drawn from key police or e-police personnel, can vary in membership, indicating that we need to ask whether there has been a broader community sensibility, beyond police representatives, which is concerned with a general malaise in public attitudes to the sacrifices of police
work. In the case of two memorials in the United States (1991) and Canada (1994), the memorial organizing group included stakeholders beyond the police themselves. In part, this has been due to both memorials covering more than state police—"law enforcement officers" in the United States, and "peace officers in Canada.

However, in terms of the introduction of the memorials, we can identify that the development of various forms of police executive officer groups formalized into lobbying agencies has had an important role in shaping the memorialization of police. In Australia, the Australasian Commissioners of Police Conference developed into a significant lobby group in the late 1980s, seeking to shape the national agenda on policing reform. This group worked through the Australasian Police Ministers' Council (1980) to establish the police memorial with significant additional impetus by the introduction of the Police Federation of Australia (formed in 1998, but moved to establishing itself as a Canberra-based lobby group in 2003). In the United Kingdom, the Association of Chiefs of Police forum (England and Wales are in one ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) grouping, Scotland is on its own) developed significant political power during the 1990s. The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police has been instrumental in the development of the police memorial. In the United States, there are several executive organizations that have been involved in shaping the development of the national memorial, including influential research organizations, such as the Police Foundation, the Police Executive Research Foundation, various forms of police industrial associations, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Indeed, this latter organization points to an additional dimension to the development of police memorials—the possibility that in increasingly transnational policing networks, police memorials are a new form of "policy transfer" overlooked in the standard accounts of criminal justice policy transfer (see Newburn, 2005).

Through interviews and the review of contemporary documentation, this chapter will identify how organizing committees for each of the memorials under study were established and the insights that can be gained from committee composition into the processes and control of "memory formation"? How did these agents of memory construct their memorializing activities? Did they, for example, articulate and position their activities within contexts, such as desacralization and legitimation? How deliberately responsive were they to the political, cultural, and social contexts within which they were situated?

Northern Ireland is instructive as a memorial garden was introduced in 2003, after the RUC was disbanded and replaced by the Police Service of Northern Ireland in November 2001. Is this then an attempt to rewrite history? Scotland is equally intriguing as memorialization of Scottish police coincides with a period of resurgent Scottish nationalism, wherein greater devolution of authority from London and Scottish political and cultural
autonomy is sought. In Australia, the national police memorial has been significantly influenced by the introduction of the Police Federation of Australia (January 1, 1998). This builds upon earlier efforts seeking national recognition of police sacrifice though gaining political support for a national memorial precisely at a time when “national policing” was increasing dramatically post September 11, 2005, through the Australian Federal Police operations at national and transnational levels.

Finally, there is the question of the interface between the memory of organizations and those of individuals. War memorials, historically, have often had their origins in the grief of bereaved families. It was their need to give public expression to private mourning that initiated fundraising and memorial building, even if this might have been ultimately taken over by government agencies. Very commonly, this interface between private and public grief was accompanied by conflict and contest over the purpose and form of the commemoration process. Is a similar process evident in police memorials?

Question 3

How and to what extent have police memorials managed to develop a subjective hold on police, political, and popular consciousness?

Preliminary analysis indicates that police memorialization has met with a positive reception in the countries under analysis. However, more research is necessary given that, in some instances, police memorials initially struggled to generate the necessary support (political, popular, and administrative). The time between proposal and implementation of the memorial was over 15 years in the case of the Australian memorial (1989–2006). In the United States, the key agency behind the U.S. National Police Memorial (the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund) had to lobby and raise funds over 7 years. Moreover, the memorial was built some 30 years after President John F. Kennedy designated May 15 as National Peace Officers Memorial Day in 1962. In Canada, there was a considerable gap between the introduction of a specific memorial service in 1978 and the larger memorial pavilion built in 1994 (this was further expanded in 1998). In England, the gap was also considerable, either 21 years or 13 years depending on which account is accepted; the former is the formation of the Police Memorial Trust with a general interest in a memorial, the latter is when the Trust began to campaign for the national memorial. In the case of the other two memorials, the gap between establishing a planning committee and the dedication of the memorial was considerably shorter: in Scotland 18 months, in Northern Ireland 2 years. We seek to understand the process involved in gaining political and financial support for these memorials, and how these are illustrative of the “subjective hold” of police memorialization on governments and popular consciousness. Has this changed in recent years as memorials
increasingly become a standard accoutrement to both Western policing and Western democracies?

The cultural form that police memorials take, and the discourse invoked in police commemoration, provides another entrée into the difficult question of “subjective hold.” In Australia, our research has revealed that the language employed on police memorials is unequivocally the hegemonic discourse of long established war commemoration. This is manifest not only in the use of “high diction” (to use the term of Paul Fussell (1975) so common in war commemorations throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, but also in the invocation of nationalistic rhetoric). Police officers are described as having died “in the line of duty.” They are routinely referred to as being “slain” or “fallen” even when their deaths have not resulted from deliberate acts of violence. Deceased officers are portrayed as having made the “ultimate sacrifice.”

Anzac is now so hegemonic a discourse that it provides the natural language of public commemoration. Police are construed as being protectors of basic freedoms and the embodiment of national identity. A Victorian police officer, Anthony Hogarth-Clarke, who was recently shot after a routine traffic stop was described as an Anzac by the presiding police chaplain: “Policing is one of the ways our hard won freedoms are protected. Officers who sacrifice their lives do so in the spirit of Anzac, protecting what was fought for and won by others. It is about being Australian,” (Victoria Police Association News, 2005). Paul Gilroy (1987, p. 74) remarked that police appear to have the “capacity to show a nation to itself.”

Is the invoking of this language a conscious attempt on the part of police forces to present themselves as warriors through mobilizing the tested and proven war commemoration practices? Or, is it the case (as state police are continually found by public inquiries to be wanting as exemplars and arbiters of the moral authority of the state) that considerably more symbolic work is needed to reaffirm the “traditional values of patriotism, honor, duty, and commitment” (Manning, 1997, p. 20) both within the police and beyond?

Our initial research into the international experience suggests that the appropriation of war ritual by police is a wider phenomenon than just in Australia. For instance, in his Patrons message for the opening of the RUC memorial, HRH Prince Charles commented on the “remarkable heroism [of] those who have given their lives in the line of duty,” that we should “acknowledge their sacrifice” and that the “commemoration is a way for the nation to recognize the best of all human qualities—selfless and devoted courage.” In addition, the Queen posthumously awarded the RUC a collective George Cross in recognition of the sacrifice and bravery of its members (The Daily Telegraph, 2003). The Arkansas (U.S.) police memorial invokes the classic text from the gospel of Luke that is central to the Anglo-Saxon tradition of war commemoration, “Greater Love hath no man . . .”. The U.S. National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial has the central engraving: “In valor there
is hope." The Canadian Police and Peace Officers Memorial website opens with the statement: "They are our heroes. We shall not forget them." Again a phrase that resonates strongly with the war ritual: At the going down of the sun and in the morning, we will remember them and lest we forget... (http://www.cacp.ca/english/memoriam/). The Rudyard Kipling war commemoration admonition "lest we forget" is commonly used across police memorials.

This chapter examines the processes whereby this appropriation of war diction by police forces has occurred. Is it an affirmation of Jay Winter’s thesis (1995) that communities seek solace through positioning their own grief within a traditional rather than a modernist frame of reference? Are they intended to align police with hegemonic constructions of national identity and/or to acquire the stronger professional status that the military traditionally have possessed? Are these processes organic or orchestrated? If the latter, by whom? Detailed analysis through interviews and planning documentation will allow us to understand how planners sought to develop a subjective hold on police, political, and popular consciousness.

Question 4

How are memorial sites used?

As the international literature on war memorials reveals, the mere construction of a memorial does not ensure it becomes an active “site of memory” (to use Pierre Nora’s 1989 now classic term). For this often unpredictable translation to occur, memorials need to generate an interplay between private and official memories that allows both “an individuated memory of war” (Ann Hass, 2000, p. 15) and wider communal engagement with a memorial. Location is often important, as are the rituals that develop around the memorial site. A key element of the recent memorialization of police deaths has been the moving of the site of commemoration from the private (in the organizational sense) terrain of the police chapel or academy to more public spheres, and moreover, spheres that are associated with the state. As indicated above, the U.S. police memorial is located in Judiciary Square, in Washington, D.C., the seat of the nation’s judicial branch of government, while the Canadian national memorial is located alongside Parliament overlooking the Supreme Court of Canada and chosen to remind parliament of the centrality of police to good order for all and the sacrifices made by police. The Australian Police memorial is in Kings Park, Canberra, within the official realm of the High Court and national Parliament.

Police memorials are thereby connected visibly to the agencies of the state that provide and affirm their legitimacy and core role in law enforcement. How much was this juxtaposition a deliberate strategy? The memorial sites in the United Kingdom are quite distinct in not being in locations of both high public and symbolic profile. The Scottish and RUC memorials
are removed from the public, the former being within the Police College, the latter located in a secluded garden at police headquarters in east Belfast. This latter case represents the specific context of “the Troubles,” whereas Jane Leonard (1997) documents that locating memorials in public places and, particularly, police memorials, leads to their desecration. On the other hand, the London memorial is in a high profile location on the corner of Mall and Horse Guard, connected symbolically to the powers of state and the monarchy, a site actively sought by the Memorial Trust founder as a “significant place in our cultural capital,” commenting that “memorials to soldiers, sailors, and airmen were common place. But the police fight a war with no beginning and no end.”

We seek to analyze what factors have shaped the selection of the sites for the police memorials, how site location is informed by different concepts of memorial audience and usage, and finally how the location actually shapes the manner of usage.

It is quite clear that national police memorials are not the first attempt to dramatize police work in the public sphere. Individual police funerals have long been conducted in the public sphere on an ad hoc basis. Similarly, local sites of memory have been used over a long period of time to mark the spot where the ultimate sacrifice was made. However, with the creation of permanent national police memorials, new questions arise concerning how these public memorials are used by police and public alike. Do the memorials operate as a physical space that reconnects the police officer to the public? Alternatively, in the increasingly pluralized and consumer-based cultures under study, how are the memorial sites consumed? For instance, in the United States, it is estimated that more than 200,000 people visit the national memorial each year and in excess of 20,000 attend the annual candlelight vigil held during memorial week. No data is available for the Canadian memorial, though Internet sources indicate relatively far less associated consumerism occurs in the United States. In Australia, approximately 5,000 people attended the dedication of the new national memorial in 2006. For the London, Scottish, and RUC memorial, there is little information available on site usage, the latter two partly explained by their location on police grounds, and from personal experience, locations where ad hoc public access requests (i.e., not part of a memorial event) meet considerable surprise and questioning. We seek to complete the empirical data on site usage and examine what explains the differences in site usage across different countries.

Conclusion

The Australian National Police Memorial was finally opened on September 29, 2006, in Kings Park, Canberra, as part of the Parliament House Vista
and within view of the High Court and national Parliament. The planning for the memorial had begun in 1989 when the possibilities of developing a memorial were discussed amongst chief police officers. Following this, the Commissioners and Police Ministers placed the memorial on the agenda of the Australasian Police Ministers Council and, in 2005, an Australian national design competition was launched for a national police memorial to be situated at the heart of the national capital, Canberra.

In a rather strange twist of fate, the opening also included condolences to the family of a police officer who died the previous evening during rehearsal for the opening dedication. The dedication itself was a highly ritualized event, with police executives (Commissioners) and union leaders (including the top representative body the Police Federation of Australia, which also acts as the secretariat for the memorial) from across the country in attendance as well as senior politicians from the Prime Minister down. In a symbolic move, the Prime Minister arrived via boat, sailing across Lake Burley Griffin from the High Court and old and new national Parliament buildings and mooring close to the memorial site. Upon disembarking, the event was rich with the symbols of state, tapping into not only the image of the first settlers arriving by boat to colonize the country, but also one of legitimate state authority meeting the loss and sorrow of grieving relatives of the fallen. It was a moment, despite the tragic loss of life in its preparation and indeed gestation, in which the powerful symbols of state and law enforcement authority were entwined. It was a truly moving moment, yet one also redolent of so many questions regarding its meaning, not the least of which is the extent that memorialization is, more or less, a strategic response to the critique of policing. It was an attempt to recapture police legitimacy in a time of loss, a loss that fuses the loss of legitimacy with the loss of life. And, this is the exact nature of the larger research program we are undertaking.
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