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Abstract

There are multi-faceted reasons for the construction of memorials to police officers killed while on duty. Memorials to the dead provide a place for people to grieve the loss of individuals, as well as fulfilling the State’s obligations to remember those who have given their lives in service to the nation. This thesis research examines how police memorials, which can be seen as symbolic representations of policing, have proliferated in a time when it has been argued that police legitimacy is declining in Western democracies. Police legitimacy is influenced by tensions between the need for a publicly funded police force and public perceptions of discrepancies in how policing is conducted at the organisational level and by individual police personnel. Moreover, public police compete with private security as providers of law and order. Police memorials have begun to appear in Australia as one possible affirmation of legitimacy within this context of competing modes and approaches to undertaking contemporary law enforcement. The research outlines the nature of the relationship between public policing, legitimacy and memorialisation, with a focus on Victoria Police memorials and remembrance.
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Introduction

Victoria Police memorialisation and remembrance began in response to dramatic events in Australian bushland near the Victorian town of Mansfield, where in 1878, notorious bushrangers, the Kelly Gang, shot and killed three police officers. Remembrance of the contested circumstances surrounding this event became part of Australian folklore. A memorial honouring the three officers was constructed in 1880, eighteen months after their deaths. The Mansfield Police Memorial is the starting point for Victoria Police memorialisation but it would be another 122 years, and many more police deaths, before officers killed in the line of duty would be remembered again in this way.

This thesis examines what constitutes Victoria Police memorialisation and remembrance, asking when and why did police commemorative activities emerge, and how were these activities enacted. The research provides a contextual outline of relationships to broader Australian national police commemorative activities and ideas around collective remembrance (see page 20), national identity, law enforcement legitimacy and governance. Identifying links to broader, recent global phenomenon relating to built memorials remembering police killed on duty was also part of this undertaking. How police maintain legitimacy in response to criticism and challenges to their hegemony, as providers of law and order, also forms an important part of the inquiry. In this thesis appropriations of military commemorative customs are examined, embracing well-accepted narratives venerating lives lost in service to the nation. For many, memorialisation and commemoration relate to personal loss and grief, with real connections to names listed on police memorials. James Hillman writes that when a soldier is killed in action ‘neither his death nor his body belong to that one man alone’ (Hillman 2004, p. 153), a sentiment that applies equally to state police. He suggests that there is ‘community in dying’ extending even beyond the personal loss of individual families and friends. Names of the dead are often listed together in large numbers on memorials, becoming a powerful symbol of sacrifice often
harnessed for broader social and political purposes. It is now well established in academia that collective remembrance has ‘political’ connotations (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004).

Ritualised police commemoration began in 1989 with National Police Remembrance Day celebrated on 29 September and thereafter annually. Before then, occasional police funerals were the only ceremonies held relating to police deaths. Headstones of individual officers constituted individual memorials. Occasionally, communities in small towns or urban areas erected small plaques memorialising deaths of local police officers. The Australian National Police Memorial was constructed in 2006, in Australia’s capital, Canberra, following extensive activity countrywide, from 1999, establishing state police memorials. Now, national and state police memorials form the nucleus around which annual public spectacles of commemorative rituals occur. Police memorials are permanent custodians for listed names of the dead, communicating in perpetuity the sacrifices of those who died in service to the community and the state.

Presently, little academic work is published on police commemorative practices. As a consequence this study makes an important contribution to emerging national and international discussions on how police deaths are collectively remembered, what these commemorative practices represent, how they are formed and the extent such ‘invented traditions’ (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1992) might also be related to broader issues such as police legitimacy and as a relatively new form of ‘symbolic communication’ (Manning 1997). The thesis draws upon the theoretically rich field of war memorialisation to test the extent of the hypothesis that police memorials appropriated the practices of war commemoration, and the discourse of national identity, to confirm their legitimacy as dominant guardians of law and order. This literature and its central tenets provide an epistemological framework for understanding and analysing this recent phenomenon of police memorials. There has been a proliferation of memorials to Australian police who have died in service: New South Wales (1999), Victoria (2002), Western Australia (2004), Tasmania (2005) Canberra (2006), and South Australia (2012). These developments coincide with global public interest in the topics of memorialisation, commemoration and
remembrance. History and memory scholars such as Paula Hamilton describe this new public interest as the ‘memory boom’ (Hamilton 2003), other writers like Joan Beaumont describe the global interest in memory as the ‘memory industry’ (Beaumont 2004). These terms imply the need for various stakeholders to attract interest in and investment in remembrance activities such as memorial building. Darren Palmer’s book chapter on the subject ‘Police Memory as Global Policing Movement’ (Palmer 2012) suggests that investigations into police memorialisation should reside in four key areas of inquiry: police memorials within the global phenomenon of remembrance; the enhancement of the professional status and image of the police force within an often-critical community; a need to reconstruct the police force’s identity as the prime protector and law enforcer within the context of the post-September 11 terrorist attacks, context where the threat of terrorism led to a convergence of policing with more traditional forms of national security; and finally, the police force’s reciprocal relationship with the state, where the state is obliged to publicly remember service personnel whose lives are lost in the line of duty and the subsequent state appropriation of such activities to project national values.

The National Police Memorial and National Police Remembrance Day are briefly explored in Chapter Two to highlight the positioning of commemorative rituals at the national level and the narrative links to military commemoration. The more detailed empirical analysis of the thesis focuses on examining Victoria Police memorials, including intensive research in a case study of the state police memorial in Melbourne, the Victoria Police Memorial. While there are also many police memorials to individual officers around the state of Victoria, each with its own story and form, these deserve the focus of a specific future research project, so are only ever briefly mentioned in this work.

The research methodology for this project has a multi-disciplinary nature. Traditional historical methodology such as archival and documentary analysis was integrated with key-stakeholder interviews with memorial committee members. Press material was used to provide background information and eyewitness accounts of various events. It also demonstrates an accelerated interest in police commemoration post the September 11 attacks in the United States.
when press reporting and the use of high diction both increase. The internet site, *Monument Australia*, shows the breadth of police memorialisation in Australia as it provides a searchable data base of significant and lesser known police memorials. Gaining access to Victoria Police archival material was essential to this thesis. The story of the Victoria Police Memorial was uncovered from a number of Victoria Police archived files, mostly in chronological order including minutes of meetings, letters and emails, press releases, architectural material such as plans, copies of memorial design suggestions from the public and members of Victoria Police. However, none of these documents could be copied and notetaking could not reveal individual names. Augmenting this material are nine oral interviews with non-serving, ex-memorial committee members and other key stakeholders involved with building the memorial. The recollections and perspectives gained from interviews with ex-members of the Victoria Police Memorial Committee provided invaluable insights into the development of the memorial. Interviews with ex-members and members of Melbourne City Council, National Trust and the Garden History Society provided alternative perspectives relating to controversial elements surrounding the memorial. A full understanding of the memorial’s architectural design elements would not have been possible without the valuable interview with one of its co-designers, Anton Hasell.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter One, a literature review, provides the contextual and theoretical framework for the examination of police memorialisation, utilising secondary literature relating to war remembrance, and memory theory and the limited scholarship on police memorialisation and commemoration. Police memorialisation can be theoretically located within theories relating to war remembrance incorporating memorialisation and commemoration. Concerted academic research into war remembrance emerged in the 1990s with foundational works by Benedict Anderson (1991), and Pierre Nora (1996) who link remembrance of past conflicts and those who fought in them to contemporary constructions of national identity. These works build on earlier works such as Maurice Halbwach’s (1980) concept of ‘collective memory’. Halbwach countered the then dominant focus on individualised psychological approaches to memory theorising how individual memories are transformed and subsumed into larger groups, helping to preserve memories through communal
practices like commemoration and memorial building. Jay Winter’s (1995) work highlights the importance of individual and collective mourning to the process of memorialisation, a complexity of war remembrance, he argues, which should not be lost within discussions relating to the construction of national memories for the purposes of nation building. Academic debates centred around whether collective remembrance was mostly dominated by official agency, government nation-building narratives (top down or state-centred agency) or by vernacular groups, remembering personal loss (bottom up or social agency) (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004; Bodnar 1991; Hobsbawn & Ranger 1992; Mayo 1988). More recent scholarship (Blair, Dickinson & Ott 2010) resists this dichotomy, suggesting the development of most significant memorials is likely to be a mixture of both state and social agency. This later argument can be seen in operation in the development of National Police Remembrance Day and the establishment of Victoria’s state police memorial.

War memorials dominate the Australian ‘memorial landscape’ (Inglis & Brazier 1998) representing the collective grief of smaller communities and larger collectives, such as a state or nation. The design and locations of military memorials communicates ‘top down’ messages like the importance of ‘national unity’ required to face adversities, such as war. These kinds of messages are often appropriated by political leaders to remind communities about the importance of ‘national unity’ when facing a new crisis, such as economic or natural disasters or new wars. War memorials also remind current service personnel about the obligations to uphold the level of sacrifice demonstrated by other individuals, both past and present, whose names appear on these memorials. Moreover, memorials also remind current military personnel that the state is obliged to remember their names, too, should they be killed in the performance of duty (Hass 1998; Mosse 1990). This thesis explores the extent that police memorials perform similar purposes such as communicating community values and recognition of the sacrifices made in protecting the community. Connections between Australian military and Australian police remembrance are explored here both in terms of shared history and shared commemorative practices such as rituals and ceremonies centred on memorials to the dead. A high social value is held for the life given in military service in Western nations such as the United
States, Canada, the United Kingdom, France and Australia. Thousands gather at war memorials in Australia on Anzac Day (Inglis 1965; Seal & Nile 2004; Thomson 1994) to remember the nation’s war dead. Police often see themselves as fighting a symbolic perpetual war against crime in defence of the nation. Memorialising police deaths can be seen as an extension of this national value.

The second part of Chapter One examines literature on police legitimacy. Here, police legitimacy and the challenges presented to it are defined. Police legitimacy is the vital relationship between police and the community they serve. Police legitimacy can be defined as people’s trust in police and the perception of shared values between the police and the policed (Terpstra & Trommel 2009). However, police legitimacy is always contingent on historical circumstances and is always subject to competing and contested ways of articulating and shaping legitimacy. This thesis examines the ways in which police legitimacy has been and continues to be shaped by police memorials and remembrance practices. Policing is most effective when the public relationship is strong but when police legitimacy is fractured, people are less likely to be cooperative and compliant, and less likely to assist police in such matters as reporting crimes or providing information. Allegations of police corruption or malpractice can effect police legitimacy by reducing the level of trust people have in their law enforcers (Loader & Mulcahy 2003; Reiner 1995). Private policing can also challenge police legitimacy by encroaching into areas of law enforcement traditionally performed by public police such as sporting events or the protection of private property (Emsley 2009; Finnane 1987; Zedner 2006) Indeed, the number of private security personnel, now far outweighs the number of public police in most Western nations including Australia. Thus, the level of police legitimacy and perceptions of them as the dominant providers of law enforcement can rise and fall within communities depending on the extent any of these factors undercuts the legitimacy of the state police.

Police, across many international jurisdictions, have attempted to off-set challenges to police legitimacy by implementing ‘managerialism’ which attempts to improve the efficiency and professionalism of policing and or ‘procedural justice’ relating to better regulation of police behaviour (Loader 1999; Palmer
Some scholars suggest that police legitimacy goes well beyond perceptions of efficient policing and is intertwined with ‘symbolic representations’ of the public good. It is argued that it’s not just what police do but who they are that is important (Bradford & Jackson 2011; Ellison & Smyth 1996). In this sense, police are positioned as legitimate symbols of law and order, safety and security.

Chapter Two provides an overview of Australian police commemorative practices in order to provide the context for the focus on Victoria Police in the subsequent chapters. Ritualised police commemorative practices begin in Australia with the establishment of National Police Remembrance Day on 29 September 1989. Initially these services were conducted in churches, at war memorials or within the confines of state police academies. This began to change from 1999 with the dedication of the first of the state police memorials established in New South Wales. In 1998, Victoria established the Blue Ribbon Foundation and Blue Ribbon Day, subsequently coinciding with National Police Remembrance Day. With the construction of memorials, annual remembrance rituals and practices became standardised, including the addition of military-style marches arriving at these memorials to enact ceremonies. Press reporting of these annual days was initially sparse but increased notably after the September 11 terrorist attacks in the United States. Large scale fatalities amidst the United States emergency workers, including many police officers, reminded Australians of their need for and reliance on police for protection. Australian parliamentary speeches made in the wake of the September 11 attacks also reflected the above sentiments, calling for greater awareness of police sacrifices and putting forward the idea of a national police memorial to be constructed in the nation’s capital city Canberra.

Part of Canberra’s landscape is dominated by national military memorials. The importance of the national police memorial’s location near these sites is also discussed in the first section of Chapter Two. Australian police and military have considerable historical overlaps. There was often little distinction between the two services in the nineteenth century. Police commissioners with a military background were often favoured up until the Second World War. In recent years, there has been a blurring of distinctions between police and military roles with
Police being deployed into war zones as peace keepers. Military hardware and military style tactical units have also been adopted by police in Australia and to a far greater degree in the United States. In relation to commemoration and remembrance, the danger involved in the two occupations is often highlighted and compared in press reports and parliamentary speeches. The same special kind of language, ‘high diction’ (Fussell 1975), is also used to describe the service and sacrifices of military and police personnel in the media, parliamentary speeches and on memorial inscriptions. The construction of Australia’s National Police Memorial in close proximity to the nation’s most important war memorials demonstrates the close association between the two services. The second section of Chapter Two provides an overview of the National Police Memorial in Canberra. Constructed on accessible public land, representing police commemoration for the larger collective of the nation, this memorial lists all the names of Australian police officers killed in the line of duty. Spaces are left for names of the future dead, a subtle nuance hinting at ongoing dangers associated with police work.

The emphasis of Chapter Three is on the development and particular nuances of Victoria Police memorialisation and remembrance. The chapter provides chronological and contextual history, and highlights themes associated with Victoria Police memorialisation. Controversial circumstances surrounding the construction of Victoria Police’s first memorial in 1880, maintain an ongoing resonance throughout police remembrance in the state. In 1878, three Victoria Police officers were shot and killed in bushland called Stringybark Creek, near the Victorian town of Mansfield (approximately 200km north east of Melbourne). The three officers: Sergeant Michael Kennedy, Constable Michael Scanlan, and Constable Thomas Lonigan, were killed in an exchange of gun fire with the Kelly Gang. The Mansfield Police Memorial is an early example of how memorialisation can be used to bolster police legitimacy. Victoria Police were criticised for mismanaging what became known as the ‘Kelly Outbreak’ (Haldane 2009; McQuilton 1979). However, the rapid construction of the memorial, constructed while the Kelly Gang remained at large, was made possible due to the many supporters of the police from Victoria and New South Wales donating the required funds. The Mansfield Memorial stood as a public demonstration of
support for law and order, and to honour those who had died upholding it. Moreover, the memorial was constructed to inspire other police officers to continue pursuing the dangerous bushrangers, knowing a grateful community would remember them should they also be killed in the process. Furthermore, this memorial precedes the proliferation of war memorials in Victoria and, in a sense, can be seen as one of the first memorials to honour the state’s ‘fallen’. The ‘Kelly Outbreak’ is often described as a war in historiography and literature (Kenneally 1969). Ken Inglis positions the Mansfield Memorial as a forerunner to the practice of building memorials to war dead, honouring instead, Australian men who ‘fell’ in civil strife (Inglis & Brazier 1998, pp. 14-21).

Ned Kelly is one of Australia’s more famous bushrangers known for his use of crude body armour, made from iron ploughs, in the final gunfight with police before his capture at Glenrowan in 1880. Few if any other Australian criminals share the same broad popularity as Ned Kelly. It is this infamy and popularity that shapes the symbiotic relationship between remembrance of Victoria Police and Kelly (Strange 2004). Remembering the events necessarily means remembering both police and the bushranger at the same time, regardless of diverging historical perspectives. Both police and Kelly are linked to Australian national identity, serving as historical examples of the mythical volunteer Digger and Bushmen. The symbiotic relationship between the police and the bushranger is also demonstrated in the Victoria Police Museum, another important site of memory for Victoria’s state police.

The Victoria Police Museum is an important site of remembrance. Museums mostly have different forms and purposes to memorials. Some memorials serve a dual function as museums. The Australian War Memorial in the nation’s capital Canberra does this. Staff select displays and artefacts in museums to present certain narratives, often conforming to the parameters the museum’s governing structures and stakeholders (Noakes 1997). The museum provides an example of symbiotic remembrance because it presents the stories and objects of both police and villains. From the museum’s beginning, Kelly Gang armour was and remains a prominent feature. The Kelly’s are not portrayed as heroes in the police museum, but their story and imposing artefacts maintain an allure, attracting
visitors into the museum to learn more. Visitors engage with displays and exhibits learning about police history along with the history of criminals.

The Victoria Police Museum’s development provides early examples of police memory work. The same can be said for the officers who guarded Melbourne’s Shrine of Remembrance, the state’s most significant war memorial, from 1934. These officers, known as Shrine Guards, dressed in military-style uniforms demonstrating the early connections between police and military commemorations. This duty is now performed by Protective Services Officers, part of Protective Services Unit, a subsidiary of Victoria Police, formed in 1986 to carry out specialist security services. They now also take part in police remembrance activities still wearing the military-style uniform. Another early example of police memory work was the construction of the Pioneer Police Memorial established in 1972 to commemorate the antecedents of Victoria Police. This memorial was dedicated to the service rather than the death of officers. The public supported the dedication ceremony, providing an example of police remembrance not instigated by the death of officers. Further developments in police commemoration were made in 1977 when Police Commissioner Mick Miller took office. Miller realised Victoria Police had done little to commemorate its officers, both living and dead; he instigated the drawing up of lists of deceased officers, leading to the construction of honour boards. These honour boards became an important element of Victoria Police’s first significant site of remembrance, The Victoria Police Academy Chapel of Remembrance.

The Victoria Police Academy Chapel was established in 1988 to commemorate all Victoria Police officers killed on duty and to serve as the spiritual centre of Victoria Police where various services, such as police funerals, and commemorative services on National Police Remembrance Day on 29 September are held. There is no mistaking the Christian symbolism in the chapel, which is not necessarily conducive to all faiths. Moreover, the chapel is located in the grounds of the Victoria Police Academy which has limited public access. The same can be said for the Necropolis Police Memorial constructed in the Springvale Botanical Cemetery in 1999. The Necropolis Trust designed, and paid for the memorial. Thus, this memorial was a private demonstration of police
remembrance in reaction to the shooting deaths of officers Silk and Miller in 1998. The Necropolis Police Memorial is dedicated to all Victoria police officers who have died on duty since 1853. However, it too is not in a prominent public space. Thus, while the Necropolis Police Memorial was being designed and built, another memorial was being developed that would provide an official, permanent and prominent public site of remembrance: the Victoria Police Memorial.

Chapter Four chronicles the development of the Victoria Police Memorial as a case study, showing how and why it emerged and demonstrating complexities of establishing significant ‘sites of memory’ in public spaces. The chronicle of this memorial also highlights relationships to military commemoration, and the enhancement of police legitimacy through remembrance of those who died serving the state. A public call to memorialise Senior-Constable Rodney Miller and Sergeant Gary Silk, who were ambushed and killed by members of an armed robbery gang in 1998, prompted the memorial. Victoria Police harnessed the initial groundswell of public and political will to construct this memorial on a prominent Melbourne road, conjoining with Melbourne’s military commemorative precinct. Ken Inglis, well-known author on Australian war memorials, states that all memorials have a story. The story of the Victoria Police Memorial shows how Victoria Police were forced to confront the issue of how they wished to be remembered in the public domain. The details relating to the design development, location, funding and resistance, demonstrate the complexities involved in establishing a public memorial of this magnitude and the importance Victoria Police now place on public memorialisation to convey messages about the organisation’s service and sacrifice. The memorial was a product of many minds including serving and ex-members of Victoria Police as well as artists, public servants and other members of the public. Not all agreed with the form and location of the memorial and opposition from the National Trust, The Australian Garden History Society, and the Returned and Services League, delayed the memorial’s construction.

What eventually emerged was a memorial communicating service and sacrifice for the community, providing them a site for personal grieving, and a public place to enact annual rituals. The location of the memorial, on a main public road and in
close proximity to the state’s military commemorative precinct, lends itself to much stronger messages of national unity and the importance of defending law and order. What is more, large segments of Australian communities value giving of life for the larger collective such as the nation. This is evident in the significant public attendance at annual war remembrance days such as Anzac Day, 25th April, and Remembrance Day, 11th November. A common biblical inscription (John 15:13) on war memorials also reflects this value: ‘Greater love hath no man than this, than a man lay down his life for his friends’. The core elements of police legitimacy are the extent to which the community and the police can be seen to share the same values. Listing the names of large numbers of dead on police memorials sends the poignant message that police die protecting the community, the ultimate sacrifice. The Victoria Police Memorial is an excellent example of how police memorials uphold police legitimacy by reaffirming the common value of risking and surrendering individual lives in defence of larger collectives. This is not something attributed to private security, and the ‘war on terror’ has reaffirmed government-funded police as second only the military as dominant protectors of the community.

Chapter Five, the final chapter, examines the construction and dedication of the Victoria Police Memorial and post-construction issues and reactions to its construction and design. Progress was unimpeded once construction began on the Victoria Police Memorial and it was dedicated on 5 July, 2002. The high level of public support initiating the memorial was not apparent at the memorial’s dedication ceremony. Whether this was due to a lack of publicity or not is uncertain but the dedication was largely attended by police, dignitaries and extended police family and friends. The chapter then discusses reactions to the final product. The Memorial Committee were obliged to set down several criteria of success in a funding application to be measured against the final memorial outcomes, such as expressions of public support, public participation in the design process, scholarly or artistic interest demonstrated by published articles, and amounts of vandalism the structure has sustained. The fact that the memorial met very few of these success criteria was of small concern to its creators who were buoyed by the successful completion of the project.
Chapter Five also discusses some of the ex-committee member’s retrospective thoughts of the memorial. Their comments suggest the memorial’s greatest achievement was that it was located in a public space, and that fact was important because it facilitated a connection to the community by highlighting the service and sacrifice police make defending the community. The communication of this message could not be achieved to the same degree if the memorial was shut away in a police academy or other police grounds.

Most police officers and soldiers are not trained artists, and find it difficult to articulate descriptive responses to abstract designs. Indeed, sculptural memorials, statues of soldiers or police officers, are often preferred by rank and file because they are easier to access or understand. Thus, this research provides some unique and valuable responses from the ex-committee members, some resonating with elements of the artists’ design intentions. The artists’ deliberately chose an architectural form rather than a sculptural form because they believed this would provide the kind of space needed to accommodate personal grieving as well as large ceremonies. The spaces provided in the memorial’s large frontal wall offer a porousness allowing the sights and sounds of the city, the place where police work, to pass in and out of the memorial’s inner space. At least one ex-committee member related to this design device.

The chapter also examines the utility of the Victoria Police Memorial, asking if it can be considered as an ‘active site of memory’. As has been found with many war memorials, the Victoria Police Memorial, is not in constant use. Aside from occasional visits from family or friends of the deceased, the memorial is mainly utilised during the annual rituals of Anzac Day and National Police Remembrance Day. Thus, it is equal to that of most significant Australian war memorials in terms of its usage. Australian war and police memorialisation has not attracted the commemorative practice of leaving memento objects, aside from flowers, at memorials in remembrance of loved ones, and so the physical trace of visitation is not as apparent as it is at the American National Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington.
It is difficult to gauge just how much positive attention the memorial attracts on a daily basis but there has been little in the way of negative attention like vandalism. It is on this point, however, that the Kelly Gang theme returns to police memorialisation. One of the only incidents of defacement related to the names of the officers killed by the Kelly Gang in 1878. The names of officers listed on the memorial who have been deliberately killed are denoted by a small asterisk next to them. In an incident occurring in 2009, these asterisks were removed, chiselled off, from the Kelly Gang victims’ names by parties unknown. The message here was that the officers were not murdered, the opposing narrative to the one Victoria Police hold. This incident demonstrates how the symbolic communications emanating from memorials are contested.

Finally the question of why the Victoria Police Memorial, inspired as it was by the death of two officers, was not inspired by earlier remarkable police deaths. Most interviewees were uncertain about why this was but most ventured to suggest it was mostly about timing. The circumstances for Victoria Police in the 1980s, when they experienced some spectacular attacks upon their personnel, were very different to the late 1990s when officers Silk and Miller were shot and killed. The 1980s were violent times for Victoria Police, their Russell St Police Headquarters building was hit by a car bomb, killing one officer and injuring many others in 1986. The motivation for this attack was hatred for the police amidst organised criminal elements, notably armed robbery gangs. In 1988 two young police officers were gunned down in an ambush set up by members of an armed robbery gang. In this same period, however, Victoria Police were responsible for the shooting deaths of eleven civilians in just three years, a very high number for anywhere in Australia. Some of these deaths were in controversial circumstances and police were accused of enacting revenge killings. Thus, police legitimacy was being undermined in the late 1980s and, while the construction of a significant memorial may well have been beneficial at this time, it was just as likely to produce significant public protests given the heightened concerns with police corruption and misuse of lethal force allegations. However, the political climate for memorial construction was much more conducive in the late 1990s. There was a new wave of Australian nationalism during the John Howard Federal Liberal Government (1996-2007) and projects supporting images
of public unity were often favoured and lavishly funded. Also, Victoria Police had done a great deal of work to redress their 1980s image with further fire-arms training and other training programs designed to improve police negotiating skills. In essence, the sense of undeclared war between police and criminals pervading the late 1980s, had diminished by the late 1990s. The shooting deaths of officers Silk and Miller in 1998 seemed more out of place, were more shocking to the populace, and out of the context of an undeclared war with a cycle of revenge. All these factors combined support the notion that the Victoria Police Memorial was not inevitable but emerged when it did due to a number of incidental conducive circumstances. What follows is the story of how Victoria Police remembers its officers, who have died in the line of duty, through the creation of monumental structures and annual remembrance days.
Chapter One: Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter establishes the framework for the translation of the literature on memory, memorialisation and commemoration, and in particular war memory, to the field of policing. This is not a direct nor unproblematic translation but rather one that seeks to subtly parse this literature for key concepts, theories and methods to frame the analysis of the meanings attached to the emergence of police memorials from the late 19th century to the present. The first part of the chapter reviews this literature to gain insights into the key aspects – tools and themes - that need translation. The proliferation of interest in ‘memory politics’ (De Brito, Enríquez & Aguilar 2001) and war remembrance – politically, culturally and academically – demands a certain selectivity. The aim therefore is not to provide an extensive review of the ‘field’ (Olick 2008) of ‘memory studies’ or the ‘politics of memory’ (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004) but rather to identify the means of grounding research into police memorialisation within this field. The chapter begins with an examination of this literature.

The second part of the chapter draws on criminological and policing literature, two academic fields not included in Roediger and Wertsch’s (2008) overview of ‘the new discipline of memory studies’, that has in some way addressed some aspects of police memorialisation and commemoration (see Palmer 2012). This literature is concerned broadly with late 20th and early 21st century ‘desacralisation’ of police arising from challenges to police legitimacy. These include the documentation of police corruption, discrimination and general poor performance of service delivery, the incorporation of managerialism and competition from alternative policing providers such as private security. References to the broader ‘policing family’, ‘policing networks’, and the ‘web of policing’ (Brodeur 2010) are suggestive of the ways in which state police – commonly referred to as the police – have been subject to a processes of being decentred as ‘the embodiment of a common moral and political community’ (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, p. 16) or sole representatives of the ‘public good’
The chapter concludes by highlighting the utility of the themes derived from the memory literature for a detailed analysis of police memorialisation.

**Memory Studies and War Remembrance Literature**

The academic analysis of memorialisation, commemoration and war remembrance has grown significantly over the last three decades, replacing ‘the previous absence of scholarly work’ on the subject (Mariarty 1999, p. 655). This has been shaped by the broader interest in memory that has become a passion (Nora 1996) to the point of obsession (Huyssen 1995). Ken Inglis’ ‘monumental’ (Ashton & Hamilton 2008, p. 2) work, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*, suggests the study of death (Jalland 2002), including memorials to the dead, has become of particular interest to many working in the field of popular culture (Inglis & Brazier 1998, pp. 7-8). A recent genre relating to death and remembrance, called ‘Dark Tourism’, examines how sites such as Second World War Nazi death camps, have become popular tourist attractions (Walby & Piché 2011), evidence of further interest within popular culture in memory and further fostering academic analysis.

Timothy Ashplant, Graham Dawson and Michael Roper in their book *Commemorating War: The Politics of Memory* argue that an over-arching explanation for the prolific interest in war remembrance may be difficult to locate (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, pp. 3-6). However a number of ‘key features’ can be identified, such as, Holocaust remembrance and commemoration generating academic interest in war remembrance in the USA, Israel and particularly Germany where the debates are described by Charles Maier as the ‘*Historikerstreit*, the historians conflict’ (Maier 1988, p. 1). Also war victims such as veterans, civilians and other war survivors continually add to the momentum with published diaries and war accounts as well as public awareness campaigns to highlight claims for compensation or justice (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 3). Moreover, edited works such as Kenneth Lunn and Martin Evans’ *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century* (Lunn & Evans 1997), Emmanuel Sivan and J. M. Winter’s *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (Sivan & Winter
1999), and John Gillis’ *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (Gillis 1994), and Australian works such as *Memory and History in Twentieth-Century Australia* (Darian-Smith & Hamilton 1994), and *Memory, Monuments and Museums* (Lake 2006a), and *Places of the Heart: Memorials in Australia* (Ashton, Hamilton & Searby 2012) provide a range of perspectives within the ‘memory industry’.

Further factors shaping ongoing interest in commemoration and remembrance are the links to the healing process for many war veterans and survivors. Works by Jay Winter (Winter 1995), a veteran himself, and Ken Inglis (Inglis & Brazier 1998) remind us that commemorative sites such as shrines and memorials are places where victims of war can express their grief publicly and often on an annual basis. Indeed, the existence of annual commemorative activity relating to a given memorial determines if the site becomes an ‘active site of memory’ (Beaumont 2004) or just another memorial in the landscape. In Australia, annual national remembrance days such as Anzac Day (25 April), Remembrance Day (11 November) and Vietnam Veterans Day (18 August) ensure that many war memorials are regularly utilised. The proliferation of ‘anniversary commemorations’ marking significant events in war or remembering the beginning or end of wars has also perpetuated public and academic interest in the subject of war remembrance. Ashplant, Dawson and Roper argue that ‘public communications media’ provide the momentum for the commemorating of military anniversaries which take form in a variety of cultural products such as films, books, documentaries or minted coins. Moreover, various interest groups are increasing public awareness by contesting the dominant narratives of war to push their own grief, memories or political aims (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 3).

This ‘passion’ (Nora 1996) has not translated into academic research and publications on police memorials and commemoration. As discussed below, there are few direct studies of memorialisation and commemoration practices (Dunnage 2012; Dunnage & Rossol 2015; Manning 1977; Manning 1992; Manning 1997; Mulcahy 2000, 2006; Palmer 2012) and even less addressing the broader issue of ‘commemorative rituals’ (Durkheim & Fields 1995) such as Loader and Walker...
(2001), and Loader and Mulcahy (2003). As leading Australian police historian Mark Finnane (2001, p. ix) has suggested, there is a need for examination and analysis of ‘the public representation of criminal justice’, a gap that remains and which this thesis seeks to address albeit limited to police and largely on one state police agency.

In sum, memory studies and, in particular, war remembrance has garnered significant public interest and engagement and has engendered significant academic analyses. What, then, of the theoretical tools arising from war remembrance research and analyses that can be utilised in the study of police memorialisation and commemorations?

**Memory Theory**

There are four central elements of memory theory to be considered for heuristic guidance in the study of police memorialisation: the level and scale of memory; whose memories are memorialised; forms of memorialisation; and the political, social and cultural contexts shaping the memorialisation.

**Scale: From Personal to Global Memory**

Memory can be said to occur at four ‘levels’ - personal, collective, national and global; though the main division occurs between the personal and collective approaches to memory. However, as Ashplant et al (2004) indicate, we need to examine the intersections, overlap and interplay across these levels. To complicate matters further, many authors either do not provide clear definitions of these and other concepts or use them interchangeably. For example, authors such Ashplant et al (2004), Lunn and Evans (1997) and Siven and Winter (Sivan & Winter 1999) discuss how individual memory, personal memory and private memory are all used by different writers when discussing the memories of one person. When discussing the memories of larger social groups authors might use terms such as popular memory, public memory, cultural memory, social memory and collective memory. The terms historical memory, official memory and national memory are often used to describe representations of the past that are constructed by national institutions such as national war memorials, or national
histories commissioned by government agencies (see Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004; Lunn & Evans 1997; Sivan & Winter 1999). While definitions for these terms are often lacking or vary from one author to another, there is a clear consensus that the nature of the commemoration and remembrance of war is contested, multi-layered, and complex. Nonetheless, drawing on Ashplant et al (2004) this thesis will delineate between ‘personal’ and ‘collective’ memory in order to be able to apply these concepts to the study of police memorialisation and commemoration.

**Personal Memory**

Personal memory is the manner in which individuals remember past events, focusing on the individual and shaped significantly by Freud (1962, pp. 320-22). In more contemporary writings Winter’s work represents this psychologically-oriented approach. He argues that commemoration translates individual grieving into public mourning through civil society. His focus is centred on the translation from individual mourning to shared rituals such as ‘reading of the names of the fallen’ and the touching of ‘statues or those names’ (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 11) that are commemorative forms expressing a universal response to mourning. This approach significantly downplays any political meanings that could be attached to memorialisation and instead argues that this translation of ‘individual grief’ into material forms, memorials, and social practices, memorialisation and commemoration, is ‘stimulated by a universal human desire for psychological reparation of loss’ (2004, p. 8).

Winter’s analysis of veteran support networks in post First World War France identified small support networks that helped victims of war, outside the victim’s family. He describes these small groups as ‘fictive kin’ (Winter 1999); groups beyond veterans and their families in the case of war memory. While Winter and Sivan’s edited book on war remembrance (1999) suggests there is no consensus regarding the definition of collective memory, they do agree that there is a relationship between personal, group and state-sanctioned memories or national memories. They prefer the term ‘collective remembrance’ to collective memory as a means of distinguishing their approach: ‘collective remembrance is public
recolletion; it is the act of gathering bits and pieces of the past, and joining them together in public’. They describe the ‘key mid-point’ between private and ‘socially determined’ memory as action or ‘agency’. That is, there are those individuals who act in a formal and deliberate manner to construct memory in ways that help to establish collective remembrance and others who while engaging in some form of memory practice do not seek to shape some ‘larger’ formation of collective remembrance (Sivan & Winter 1999, pp. 6-10).

However, Ashplant et al suggest that holding on to the ‘universality’ of mourning effectively ‘takes the history out of commemoration’ (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 11) and leaves little scope for exploring ‘the interacting processes that link the individual, civil society and the state’ (2004, p. 12). The idea of ‘agency’ opens the way to considering, in greater detail, the process involved in translating the personal to the collective, while also, showing how the collective shapes the personal. Understanding the relational dynamic between the personal and the collective in ways that reduce neither to some pre-ordained outcome is an important for consideration for studies of memorialisation.

Collective Memory

As Olick’s (2008) reflective article in the first issue of the then new Memory Studies journal indicates, in the early 1990s the idea of and use of the term ‘collective memory’ was nascent (Halbwachs 1980; Halbwachs & Coser 1992; and see Olick & Robbins 1998; Schwarts 1982) but has since undergone ‘metastatic growth’ (Olick 2008, p. 26).

It was sociologist Maurice Halbwachs who argued that all personal memory is maintained within a ‘social framework’ of more than one person and that without it personal memories tend to fade (Halbwachs & Coser 1992, pp. 24-30). For Halbwachs (1980), memory is socially constructed rather than being an unmediated individual recollection and, following Durkheim (Halbwachs was his student, see Olick & Robbins 1998, p. 109), important ‘to the revitalisation of a group’s social heritage for the reinforcement of its bonds and the reinforcement of its solidarity’ (Misztal 2003, p. 124). The understanding that emanates from this
debate and which is supported by subsequent writers is that memory is both an individual and social (collective) phenomenon (Fussell 1975, p. 334; Nora 1996, p. 3; Sherman 1999, p. 2; Thomson 1994, p. 9). Halbwachs uses the term ‘collective memory’ in relation to small groups of people and their ‘collectively shared representations of the past’ (Kansteiner 2002, p. 181) in ways that are ‘always instrumental to the solution of present problems’ (Schwarts 1982, p. 376). Halbwachs was interested in ‘how social groups retain, alter and reappropriate social memory’ (Mitzal 2003, p. 124), shifting the understanding of memory from a ‘biological framework into a cultural one’ (Assan 1995, p. 125). However, this starts to take on more functionalist overtones as ‘Memory functions as a mechanism that unites groups and cements identity’ (Green 2004, p. 38).

Halbwachs’ work was extended in scale from the shared memories between a few people to a nation and revised with concepts such as ‘social memory’ (Müller 2002), ‘popular memory’ (Lunn & Evans 1997, p. 165), and ‘cultural memory’ (Sturken 1997).

There is another approach within the literature on collective memory which focuses on the ways in which commemorative practices, including memorials, are approached from the perspective of political power (Olick & Robbins 1998, p. 108). Ashplant et al (2004) use Hobsbawm and Ranger’s *Invention of Tradition* (1992) and Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1991) to highlight studies that approach memory by focusing on ‘the relations between the nation-state, the ‘invented traditions’ and ‘imaginings’ that give shape to national identity, and the forms and rituals of commemoration and how these practices ‘draw upon the sacrifice and loss’ in ways that preserve or enhance dominant elites and ideologies (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 8). The focus of this approach tends towards examination of the ways in which commemorative practices are shaped by the state and in the interest of elites and dominant ideologies and the importance of ‘constructed versions of “the past” – and of continuity between past and present – in establishing social cohesion, legitimizing authority and socializing populations into a common cultures’ (Ashplant et al 2004, p. 7). Anderson (1991) established the importance of national memories in the formation and maintenance national identity. Events or individuals who might be deemed worthy of national remembrance are often sanitised, reconfigured, or
edited to project the maximum positive image. Events and images that project national unity are favoured over those that might cause disunity or controversy. Tony Kushner (1997, p. 5) suggests ‘selective amnesia, along with myth-making, has been essential in constructing successful national memories in the modern era’ (also see Henneberg 2004, p. 1; Judt 2002, pp. 39-40; Sherman 1999, p. 1). Landsberg suggests memorialisation plays a central role in national remembrance because memorials and monuments ‘were intended to serve as guarantors of national memory; they both created the illusion of a stable, recognisable past and promised to serve as a bulwark against…social upheaval’ (Landsberg 2004, p. 6).

Ashplant et al suggest the tensions between writers focused on individual memory and those focused on collective memory produce ‘dichotomies and polarisations …[that] .. have had a deleterious effect on the study of war remembrance (2004, p. 9). For them, politics is always at work and is always having to engage with individual mourning, intentions and aspirations that are always open to contest; the notion of ‘elites’ as a singular entity does not account for ‘elites’ not always being in such a state of unity; and it is the inter-relations between the two levels of analysis, individual and collective, that will provide fuller accounts of ‘the interacting processes that link the individual, civil society and the state’ (2004, p. 12). They suggest a three-layered approach examining ‘narratives’, ‘arenas’ and ‘agencies’ of articulation (pp. 16-32) to overcome the dichotomies and polarisations in memory studies discussed further below under the fourth central element of memory studies.

**Whose Memories are Memorialised?**

The second central element derived from memory studies concerns the issue of contested memory or ‘contestation’ in Olick and Robbin’s term (1998, p. 126). Different memories are collated and documented through various means, including memorialisation. What activities are parsed into collective memories and through what means? Put another way, there is a process of ‘forgetting’ at play, whereby some memories are forgotten, ignored or suppressed. Collective memories can only move beyond small groups if a group manages to find ‘the means to express their visions, and if their vision meets with compatible social or
political objectives and inclinations among other important social groups’ (Kansteiner 2002, pp. 182-3). Furthermore, these process can be contests, a ‘struggle for possession and interpretation of memory’ (Thelen 1998 cited in Olick & Robbins 1998, p. 127). For example, in the context of war memorialisation there can be a determined effort to ignore the role of particular groups that might prove troublesome for the construction of national identity (for instance indigenous Australians, and see Inglis 1998 on the absence of memorials on frontier conflicts) or to marginalise accounts of atrocities committed by soldiers, particularly the deaths of non-combatants/civilians. In the context of policing, citizens killed by police are similarly ‘forgotten’ or at best given temporary memorials by relatives and friends but such memorialisation practices rarely extend beyond these groups. Such exceptions can be identified in cases of regime change that leads to the memorialisation of the victims of repressive political policing or when individual cases are aggregated that an emergent resonance might be seen with broader social and political objectives and inclinations, something currently occurring with the ‘Black Lives Matter’ social movement. In such instances, there is still the need for social actors to translate memory from the individual to the collective level, referred to as memory or ‘cultural entrepreneurs’ (Olick & Robbins 1998, p. 127), or more generally drawing from Thompson’s *Anzac Memories* (1994), various ‘agents’ shaping these processes. One of the analytical tasks is to identify such agents and, where present, the ways in which they help to link individual loss or grieving to broader ‘cultural narratives’ (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 14), albeit with no guarantees that such linkages and constructions are widely accepted by those receiving such accounts. As will be seen in Chapter Three, the positioning of the Kelly Gang in popular culture and collective memory offers a competing set of narratives about policing that are not easily overcome by dominant state narratives, pointing to the need to be alert to contested memory, or what can be referred to in this instance as an ‘oppositional narrative’ (2004, p. 21).

**Forms of Memorialisation**

The third key theme arising from the war memorialisation literature concerns the variations in memorial form. One of the key themes in war memorialisation
concerns the use of ‘high diction’ in scripted on memorials, something that has continued despite the shift in ‘aesthetic forms’ (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 38). In general terms war memorials have shifted from the ‘traditional imagery of the fighting man’ with highly masculine and heroic imagery to more reflective spaces that also invite more intimate and active engagement. This change is clearly seen in memorials to the Vietnam War in the United States and Australia for instance. Apart from individual memorials and one off events such as at Mansfield in 1880, police memorialisation that begins at the state level emerges in the period following this shift in memorial aesthetic forms. Chapters Three and Four examine these aspects of police memorialisation in greater detail.

In addition, the issue of ‘forms’ also relates to another important concept drawn from war memorialisation. This concerns the extent that memorials become ‘active sites’ of memory (Nora 1996). As Beaumont (2004, p. 69) identifies in her study of the Australian-American Memorial in Canberra, the memorial ‘did not provide a public or sacred place at which private and public memories of war intersected’. Having failed to become such an active site of memory, the ‘memorial now stands as a monument to the failure of commemorative practices that are exclusively the products of official orchestration and which do not engage with private memories of war, grief and mourning’ (2004, pp. 69-70).

The Political, Social and Cultural Contexts Shaping Memorialisation

The fourth central element of memory studies to be adapted to the study of police memorialisation concerns the broader context. As indicated above, to overcome the dichotomies and polarisations in memory studies, and to place memorialisation within its broader social context Ashplant et al. have outlined a three-layered approach to the study of the politics of memory: ‘narratives’, ‘arenas’ and ‘agencies’ of articulation (pp. 16-32). Narratives of articulation refers to ‘shared formulations within which social actors couch their memories’ and the ways in which these practices ‘draw on the language of wider discourses. Preeminent among these are the discourses of national identity’ (p. 16). In terms
of this thesis, this articulation highlights why war memory is important to police remembrance specifically as it lends itself to a closely shared language in the form of high diction – notably ‘sacrifice’ – and is a successful narrative framing the ANZAC ‘tradition’ and its connection to the making up of Australian identity and nationhood. However, rather than ‘reading off’ a direct appropriation of military memorialisation into policing remembrance practices, there is a need to examine empirically the extent to which there is evidence of such efforts by key actors and groups. Is there evidence of police actively and purposefully adopting or adapting the narratives of war remembrance in police memorialisation practices?

_Arenas_ of articulation refers to ‘those socio-political spaces within which social actors advance claims for the recognition of their specific war memories’ (p. 17). These range from closer groups such as Winter’s ‘fictive kin’ and formal associations, through to networks or communities of interests to national and international collaboration. These are key sites or ‘arenas’ where claims are made for larger recognition. In what socio-political spaces did police advance their claims for police memorials and memorialisation practices?

_Agencies_ of articulation refers to ‘institutions through which social actors seek to promote and secure recognition for their war memories’, from official agencies through to civil society organisations. Which agencies did police work with and through to secure their memorials in particular, and memorialisation practices more generally? It is here where there is a need to identify which social groups are making claims for recognition, what agencies are being utilised to ‘advance claims’, and what ‘narratives’ are being employed (p. 17).

Ashplant et al (2004) suggest the first two forms of articulation are best approached from the ‘bottom up’, while the latter from a ‘top down’ approach. However, the extent of agency exhibited either by the ‘top down’ or the ‘bottom up’ in a given memorial’s construction might not always be clear. In terms of _agencies of articulation_ the state certainly has a role to play in relation to the construction of national memorials concerning soldiers and police. There is a reciprocal relationship between the state and the personnel belonging to state
funded organisations that put lives at risk. The nation state in most western democracies must honour and remember those who give their lives in the state’s name. This new tradition emanated from the French revolution whereby the civic values of the French Republic included the obligation of all eligible male citizens to fight and risk death for the nation; becoming a universal obligation in most modern Western democracies (Agulhon 1981; Hobsbawm & Ranger 1992).

Leaving the issue of conscription aside, the advent of the French volunteer citizen soldier created a lasting legacy. Mosse argues that ‘from the beginning of their history, volunteers stood for commitment to a cause and for the loyalty which derived from such a commitment’ (Mosse 1990, p. 16). During the American Civil War the tradition of giving each soldier an individual grave (where possible) began and by the end of the period encompassing two world wars, dead soldiers were honoured as official national sacrifices – symbols of nationhood – their names inscribed on memorials across a global memorial landscape. Thus, death resulting from the sacred service to the state had become a sacred death which the state is honour bound to remember (Hass 1998; Mosse 1990).

The sacred reciprocal relationship between serving citizens and the state was initially focused on the military, but most Western police forces have successfully expanded this idea to include themselves. Yet it’s not clear, argues Murji, whether sacredness was bestowed upon police by external factors or if police bestowed the idea of sacredness upon themselves (Murji 2009). What is of particular interest to this thesis is when, why and how well police have been similarly portrayed as their military counterparts? What narratives of articulation are employed, through what arenas and agencies and by what means? Chapter Two chronicles the development of Australian police commemorative practices revealing a number of appropriations from military commemoration. External sources such as the media and political rhetoric use ‘high diction’, a special language used for military commemorations (fully discussed in Chapter Two) when reporting on or making speeches at police commemorative events. Overall, the narratives, arenas, and agencies of articulation will be examined in greater detail in subsequent chapters. However, before proceeding to this detail the discussion needs to address the ways in which existing policing scholarship has sought to understand police memories, memorialisation and commemoration practices.

While Manning does not directly address the field of police memorials and memorialisation practices, he has alluded to ‘memorials’ generally, referring to ‘memorial services’ (1992, p. 144), and police funereal practices more specifically as part of symbolic communication used by police organisations. In *Police Work* (1977, 1997) Manning argued that police ‘communicated their purposes, authority, and societal role through rituals, collective celebrations, rhetoric, strategy, and tactics’ (1992, p. 7). He went on to argue in *Organizational Communication* (Manning 1992) that their efforts were directed in a manner that would ‘reify their central sacred qualities in societies’, albeit with relatively ‘thin materials’ (p. 7). By ‘thin materials’ Manning meant that police had little by way of traditions and myths and history that could be used instrumentally in such a manner to ‘renew sacred ties’ (p. 7), though he does suggest this is less so in the case of England. As will be seen further below, this thesis argues that Manning concentrates on the individual funeral and associated practices rather than the more general memorialisation processes and practices. Manning’s original publication (1977) occurred at a time when the memorialisation processes involving relatively large-scale state and national memorials was only in its’ infancy. The 1997 revised edition occurred after considerable activities in police memorialisation though these developments were not addressed (1997, pp. 319-33).

Manning views police memorialisation as a means of ‘ideological work’ (Beare 1987 cited in Manning 1992, p. 155) that allows for the communication of core values of sacrifice and honour beyond the individual death and the funeral. In this sense, memorials can be seen as a means to establish long-term organisational communication that transcends the immediate. Memorialisation sustains the legitimacy and political authority of police in an era of increasing complexity. For example, the loss of strong local ties to communities; the undermining of any semblance of singular, shared communal values (though this is a perennial issue captured by the culture wars over ‘Australian values’ and the meaning of being ‘un-Australian’); the competition from other sources of control, authority and morality; ongoing racial, ethnic, class and gender concerns with various aspects of
policing; more generally the ever-failing ability to perform ‘crime control’; and the competing narratives of social conflicts that cannot be easily ‘depressed in salience’ (1992, p. 152). As Manning suggests, the police funeral central to his analysis (see below) occurred in a time and place of ongoing volatility in ‘race relations’ including a series of fatalities resulting from police shooting civilians (1997, pp. 152-3). While organisational communication seeks to locate the ‘police as symbolising the community as a whole’ (1992, p. 153), alternative narratives can challenge this symbolic work. As will be argued in this thesis, Victoria Police has to contend with a powerful form of symbolic communication in the form of the cultural capital that surrounds the place of Ned Kelly and the Kelly Gang: variously seen as nineteenth century freedom fighters, the embodiment of Australian values of anti-authoritarianism, the frontline fighters of poor, rural Catholics and the source of artistic and cultural symbols as utilised at the Sydney 2000 Olympics opening ceremony on the one hand, and cop-killing, violent Bushrangers on the other.

To return to Manning’s works on funerals and organisational communication; he examined a particular police officer’s death in 1974, the first policewoman ‘killed in the line of duty’ (1997, p. 19) to begin his exploration of the ‘symbolisation of police work’. As it is the only time Manning directly analyses police memorialisation practices in detail, and is one of only a few policing scholars to analyse police memorialisation (other literature will be referred to below), it is pertinent to provide a detailed account of this work and its importance for this thesis.

The police funeral, including the presence of police and police vehicles from across the country, embraced the idea, formally stated by the presiding police chaplain Father Dooley, that ‘an attack on you [police] is an attack on the country and all it stands for …’ (1997, p. 20). More specifically, the funeral is positioned as one part of the broader drama of policing and the ways in which particular dramatic performances ‘illuminate the meanings of the police to their audiences’ consisting both of police themselves as well as civic society (p. 20), providing a window into the symbolisation of the police via six key interpretative themes.
First, the police are ‘Leviathan enacted’, representing the highly visible capacity of the state, and ‘traditional values of patriotism, honor, duty and commitment’ (1997, p. 20). The death of a police officer undermines the perceived capacity of the state to order civil life and is positioned as a threat to the state and civic life. This thesis explores the extent that police memorials can be viewed as an elevation of Leviathan enacted by locating the singular death and funeral within a larger historical and cultural landscape of longstanding ‘sacrifices’ for the state and civic life, and spatial and architectural devices utilised, at least annually, even when a new sacrifice has not been made. In this sense they are sites of permanent memory insofar as they remain active sites of memory.

Second, the highly formalised funereal practices such as full uniform, guards of honour and collective coordinated action ‘transmits messages about their mutual identification with the corporate body of police’ – it is about the mutuality to one another of those holding the office of constable, rather than to community or locality. The police have a bounded separateness or isolation from the community, something strongly identified in the ‘police culture’ literature (see Chan 1996; Westley 1970). This thesis explores the extent that police memorialisation both allows for this ongoing mutuality on the one hand, but also represents an effort to reform the communication strategies (see below) around sacrifice, honour and duty in a way that engages with the public. It does this by being public: funerals have previously allowed limited public involvement such as lining streets for the funeral procession, but ended in ‘police privacy’ – the police chapel. Public memorials are public engagement strategies, an ability to engage in symbolic communication with the public on public space that invites the community to share in the loss and sacrifice in the public domain. This is an important new development in organisational communication and will be explored further in the chapters that follow.

Third, ‘A sacred canopy is drawn over police work’ (1997, p. 21). The police are tied to an ‘absolutist morality’ located in the state – what the state and its’ agents do is by definition good and proper and demands population ‘deference to rules, laws, and norms’ (p. 21). Police are given the task of protecting this morality and through this ‘mystifying’ of police work, occupational activities are justified on
the grounds of the need to protect this morality and are characterised as having ‘a semblance of control’ over ordering (p. 22). The death of a police officer, particularly one caused by a criminal act of a ‘domestic enemy’, undercuts this absolutist morality and semblance of control. In this way, the ‘high diction’ (Fussell 1975, see Chapter Two below) utilised by Father Dooley meshes the death of the officer to the threats to ‘our way of life’ – an attack on police is an attack on us all.

Fourth, police practices embody the enforcement of the status quo, making the death of an officer an indicator of the mortality of the status quo and how ‘society as an organic unity is shown to be dependent on a constant reestablishment of its own outlines and boundaries’ (Manning 1997, p. 22). The elevation of a police death to that of sacrifice for the state places police, and, as argued in this thesis, similar to the armed forces, as a noble calling elevated above the everyday deaths of the rest of us. These are sacrifices made in the protection of ‘nationhood’.

Fifth, the police role in deterring ‘acts that threaten the order they are believed to symbolise’ means that the death of a police officer is indicative of ‘the vulnerability of the society, of the weakness of the sacred moral bonding of the society, and of the reduced capacity to deter such acts’ (1997, p. 22). Police carry with them ‘sacred symbols’ of the state such as decals and signage, ‘secular symbols of power’ such as weapons, ‘symbols of technology and science’ such as electronics, and high-tech protective gear. If these symbols fail to protect police against violent acts as represented by a police death, ‘then doubts are raised about the protective power of the symbols and the order they represent’ (1997, p. 22). The failure of community members to identify with and support police is to fail to be a part of the bounded community.

The sixth and final theme concerning the drama of police funereal practices concerns media portrayals of deaths and memorialisation more generally. Police deaths are front page news, opportunities for the deployment of ‘high diction’ and an emphasis on sacrifice and honour. Each funeral provides an opportunity for the media, informed by police directly and indirectly, to ‘dramatise … the significance of the death of a single officer.’ The media coverage also ‘heightens
the relative place of the police on the social scale’ and is indicative of ‘public trust in police … and legitimacy in providing operational definitions’ of the social problems of ‘crime’, ‘order’, ‘law’ and ‘immorality’ (1997, p. 23).

For Manning (1977; 1997) these six interpretive themes ‘have occupationally derived meanings … evoked by the image of ceremony, the collective acting out of the occupation’s mission, and the display of many of their most sacred symbols’ (1997, p. 23). The death of a police officer affirms the danger of the occupation, police officer isolation, and the vulnerability of police to a population they generally distrust and remain suspicious about. Finally, the death of a police officer is solidarity-provoking, a recoating of ‘moral bonds’ and elucidation of ‘the norms of the society … to symbolise deference and respect for police as a moral unit’ (p. 24).

It is here that a more direct Durkheimian take on police funereal practices can be seen; the ways in which the death and funeral are used to ‘mark the boundaries of society itself’, and the interconnection between individual and collective honouring as solidarity-inducing, internally for the police ‘family’ and externally for the ‘respect and dependence of the society upon the police’, (1997, p. 24 referencing Durkheim 1961, pp. 434-48). According to Manning, a police ‘funeral sets out what Durkheim (1964) calls ‘social facts’: social matters such as social values, symbols, beliefs, and norms’ (Manning 1992, p. 151). Following Durkheim, social facts that ‘become recognised as essential to communal life [are] the essence of social and moral integration’ (p. 151). The police are a ‘profane object’ made ‘into something of a sacred entity: they perform sacred duties’ (1997, p. 10). A police officer is a ‘representative of central social values’ and their ‘sacrifice’ an ‘occasion for a public, collective display of society’s view of itself’ (1992, p. 151). The police are the embodiment of state authority, the state agency that is called upon to do the dirty work of ordering society, the authority called upon when something needs to be done (Bittner 1974) and the response to their ‘sacrifice’ registers their ‘singular significance and importance within society’ (p. 151).

As Manning suggests:
Not only does a religious funeral celebrate the place of God and religious beliefs (or ideology), more generally, it conflates or makes equivalent the values, uniforms, and practices of the police with those of other sacred/religious entities and with worthy citizens who support the police (1992, p. 151).

While Australia has become increasingly diverse in the post Second World War period, and funerals are not coterminous with memorials, this thesis explores the ways police memorials can be viewed in part, as an adaptation to the changing post war social context. This social context is less singularly Christian and more accommodating to a multi-faith engagement, seeking new ways of articulating the relationship between police and their sacrifices and the broader, more diverse community where ‘value consensus’ has fragmented (Manning 1992, p. 151).

Manning’s *Organizational Communication* (1992) does more to outline the ways in which the researcher can approach and understand the different forms of organisational communication, in which funereal practices can be located. First, he suggests the study of organisational communication ‘should explicate the social climate, social context, and formal structure within which organisational communication as performance takes place’ (1992, p. 9). These ideas will be examined in greater detail further below and are mentioned here to contextualize the research temporally, spatially, politically and institutionally as is done in the second part of this chapter. As Innes (2004, p. 153) has recognised, the wider social context is important but needs ‘a coherent framework of the dimensions involved in the social shaping of any situated object’, which for him, are historical, political, economic and cultural.

Second, Manning suggests that drawing a distinction between ‘instrumental’ (rational, purposive) and ‘expressive’ (ritual, ceremony) communication is ‘artificial’ (Manning 1992, p. 7). That is, any form of social action is ‘interpreted action’ on the one hand, and ‘always purposive’ on the other. This is somewhat similar to the position taken by Ashplant et al (2004) on the unnecessary divisions between individual and collective memory. Individuals act within particular contexts and the collective is necessarily constituted by individual social actors. It
is an empirical question concerning how social actions, in this case memorialisation processes, ‘produces, processes, amplifies, and suppresses differentially messages about the nature of the social order, and the ranking of groups (including themselves) in it’ (1992, p. 7). While Manning suggests police have had limited means – ‘few traditions, myths, and little history’ – to ‘reify their central sacred quality in society’, this thesis suggests that the rise of national and state police memorials and associated memorialisation practices such as the introduction of the National Police Remembrance Day are precisely directed at working upon these ‘deficits’ in the ‘thin materials’ available to shape the reification of their sacredness.

Third, Manning posits a number of ‘orienting questions’ that guide the analysis of organisational communication: ‘What meanings are to be studied, where are they to be studied, when are they to be studied, how, why, and with what methods’ (1992, p. 14)? This thesis delimits the study of organisational communication in policing to police commemoration and memorialisation; the processes shaping the rise of commemoration memorialisation and the practices of commemoration and memorialisation and links these to efforts to understand associated ‘meanings’. It does so through a focus on Victoria, Australia drawing on document analysis and key stakeholder interviews. In answer to the questions of ‘when, how and why’, the thesis conducted historical research into the memorialisation process, exploring the narratives, arenas and agencies of articulation (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, pp. 16-7) to render an account that is capable of exploring the extent to which police commemoration and memorialisation draws upon the ‘template’ of military commemoration and memorialisation processes and practices as part of a contemporary communication strategy ‘to enhance their image and authority’ (Manning 1992, p. 135).

**Mulcahy (2000; 2006): Royal Ulster Constabulary Remembrance**

Aogán Mulcahy’s article on the Royal Ulster Constabulary’s (RUC) policing history in Ireland is one of the few works to address police memory and history
specifically. Here, Mulcahy demonstrates the sanitisation of national memory evident in constructions of RUC national remembrance (Mulcahy 2000, p. 71; and see chapter 3 in Mulcahy 2006). The RUC’s role in Ireland was semi-military due to the conflict between the Irish Republican Army and various other paramilitary groups and government forces. Mulcahy argues that selective deployment of memory is a useful strategy for organisations to construct positive representations for the purposes of good public relations. Therefore, ‘the use of memory is an important legitimisation strategy…’ He suggests that in recent literature, the past is often treated ‘ambivalently’ in constructions of Irish policing history. Using the RUC as an example, his article suggests the alternative view, that the past is pivotal but used selectively, reflecting the way in which most national memory is sanitised (2000, p. 69), and in this instance the organisation’s own selective use of historical events was used to ‘enhance its claims of legitimacy’ (2000, p. 71).

Mulcahy’s account of ‘policing history’ ties a specific account of the RUC’s history based in selective organisational memories along three tropes – themes of sacrifice and bravery, community support, and accountability. As a counterpoint to Loader’s (1997) earlier view that ‘the precise role that history and memory play in the legitimation of policing remains uncertain’ (Mulcahy 2000, p. 68), Mulcahy argues that in the case of the RUC at least, ‘the production of police history is deeply implicated in broader debates over police legitimacy’ (2000, p. 69) and is used as a strategy of legitimation. Further, in this account, ‘memorialisation’ is viewed as one of the key ways in which ‘various memories are deployed to serve an explicitly legitimising function’, namely the ‘moral appeals emphasising issues of sacrifice, bravery and commitment’ (2000, p. 75).

The human costs of police killed, ‘these sacrifices willingly made’, and the dangers of police work, ‘establishes a moral dimension’ (2000, p. 75) that demands community support. The memorialisation process Mulcahy captures include the prominence given to deaths in the Annual Reports ‘Roll of Honour’ and the use of the ‘high diction’ (Fussell 1975) of the ‘ultimate sacrifice’ throughout the narrative. In addition, local stations had memorials, including the ‘Book of Remembrance’ ‘prominently situated in a glass case at the entrance to the RUC headquarters in Belfast’ (2000, p. 76). Finally, drawing on Manning
(1997), Mulcahy highlights both the congruence with Manning’s account such as the ‘high diction’ referents of sacrifice, danger, the ‘front line’ and the ‘ultimate’ or ‘supreme’ sacrifice. He also argues, reasonably, that in Northern Ireland a police funeral takes on even greater poignancy due to the frequency of police deaths and, relationally the ‘greater need for solidarity, vigilance and commitment that each funeral came to symbolize’ (2000, p. 77). Furthermore, in the transition following the 1994 ceasefire, the bravery and sacrifice of police took on even greater salience. The then Chief Constable highlighted in the 1994 Annual Report that these sacrifices were ‘instrumental in delivering peace’ (p. 77). As quoted in Mulcahy:

The people of Northern Ireland and the nation as a whole owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the police officers and service personnel who did their duty honourably and bravely, with exceptional commitment and dedication … They gave their lives and suffered injury in the just cause of peacekeeping. … [P]eace was only made possible because of such sacrifice (Chief Constable's Annual Report for 1994 p.11 cited in Mulcahy 2000, p. 77).

As indicated above, Mulcahy combines the use of history and memory along three axes (sacrifice, community support and accountability) to identify how the RUC attempted to produce a ‘satisfying account of its history … deployed both to maintain the support of its champions and to reaffirm the force’s own collective identity’ (2000, p. 82), particularly in the face of pressures for fundamental reforms to policing following the 1994 ceasefire and the subsequent Patten Commission (Independent Commission on Policing in Northern Ireland 1999). For Mulcahy, ‘[t]he organisational memories of policing [analysed] … constitute history as part of the present: a means of understanding and constituting contemporary reality’ (2000, p. 85). While there is much to be gained by Mulcahy’s consideration of the importance that ‘memories’ play in understanding contemporary legitimisation strategies, mindfulness of the extent this deliberate, intentional use of memory is contextual is needed. To what extent is this the case with police memorialisation generally? Only more detailed empirical accounts can address this issue and this thesis seeks to make a contribution to further
examination of the interplay between memorialisation and police legitimation strategies.

Second, while Mulcahy points to the key semiotic work done by the Chief Constable Annual Reports, more can be done to explore the ‘memory work’ and ‘memory entrepreneurs’ more generally, which emphasises the projects and practices of situated actors articulated through narratives, agencies and arenas (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004). As Conway (Conway 2008) suggests, this invites exploration of the ‘ongoing, dynamic and continuing efforts’ and the ‘contextual changes [that] help to account for changes in remembrance’ including the ways these ‘contexts’ of prior memorialisation practices ‘enable or constrain later ones’ (2008, p. 188). One of the key themes explored in this thesis concerns the ways in which the historical and cultural contexts of Australian memorialisation has had two important antecedents for police. The first being the use of individual ‘sites of memory’ that were actual sites to be remembered, ‘a socially specific spatial framework’ in Halbwach’s terms (1992, p. 38), with the second being the collective sites that ‘failed’ to ‘connect or compete with existing nodes of collective memory’ (Gough 2002, p. 214), most particularly the dominance of war memorials and memorialisation practices, not only in the ‘monumental phase’ of the interwar years (Clout 1996; Gough 2000) but also subsequently (Ashton & Hamilton 2008).

Third, Mulcahy highlights the ‘oppositional discourse’ to the RUC’s version of history (2006, p. 190), pointing to the need to examine how historical memory is received. This took place within debates about reform following the Pattern Inquiry and various efforts to address ‘long-standing grievances over policing’ (2006, p. 198). So rather than receiving the ‘collective memory’ concerning policing history, the new conditions allowed longstanding ‘nationalist and republican suspicion and/or hostility to the police’ to enter the ‘mainstream political agenda’ (p. 198). This account follows Ashplant et al’s (2004) concern about the need to examine how narratives and sites of memory are received, and the need to be alert to oppositional voices and narratives. How are sites of memory and memorialisation practices ‘consumed’ (Conway 2008, p. 188)? While a detailed analysis of consumption is beyond the scope of this thesis,
acknowledging the importance of how sites of police memory are interpreted and utilised by different groups is important for future research. However, Chapter Three of the thesis points to the site of the ‘Kelly Gang’ where consumption in the form of tourism at sites of memory commemorating those who shot and killed police (as well as police efforts to challenge these commemorations) highlight the competing narratives and differences in consumption.

Fourth, Mulcahy invokes Manning’s work (Manning 1997, see also 1977) on police funerals to argue that at the least Northern Ireland involves an intensification of these funeral rituals and their symbolic dimensions due to the regularity of the ‘sacrifices’ and the context of significant political weight attached to the potential for substantial police reform (which did subsequently occur). But could it be the case that, at least to varying degrees to be explored empirically, any police organisation under sustained criticism utilises police ‘sacrifices’ to ward off foundational critiques (see Palmer 2012)? Northern Ireland was an unusual case study in one sense, leading to the elimination of the extant police force and replacement with a new set of policing arrangements. However, as this thesis suggests, following Manning, there is a more basic set of claims being made about ‘the police’ and their sacrifices that relates directly to the foundational myths of the modern police. More broadly, to what extent is this process ‘global’? To some extent Manning assumes this global application, albeit with variations based on local history and social context, whereas Mulcahys detailed analysis of the place of memorialisation in a particular police agency is important for highlighting the need to examine, in detail, how memory and memorialisation are constructed and utilised and the practices of key social actors in these processes while at the same time being mindful to the global dimensions of such activities (Conway 2008; Palmer 2012). Furthermore, it is vital to acknowledge the potential spread of an ‘orthodoxy of ritual remembrance’ (Gough 2000, p. 214). While Gough is referring to such practices as minutes of silence on 11/11 and poppy wearing for this and other military memorial dates, the spread of national police memorial days and national and sub-national police memorials and their attendant processes and rituals are also suggestive of a certain ‘template’ or ‘orthodoxy’ to acknowledging police ‘sacrifices’. It is rather remarkable that the global spread of police memorials as an orthodoxy to police
‘sacrifices’ has remained in the shadow of military (and other) memorialisation practices and processes.

This thesis argues for a detailed examination of the processes and practices of police memorialisation before any such claims can be made. Having said that, the thesis agrees with Mulcahy that the evidence he has presented suggest the orthodoxy, described above, is the case on Northern Ireland. But is it true of elsewhere? To what extent can police memorials and memorialisation practices become a ‘symbolic and normative resource … [to seek] to overcome periods of crisis’ (Druliolle 2008, p. 76) specifically, or instrumental means of enhancing police legitimacy generally?

Museums and Historical Commemoration

Beyond the studies cited above, there is also an emerging literature looking at the role of police museums on the one hand, and police rituals, memorialisation and commemoration in Europe in the inter-war years.

First, a special edition of Radical History Review contained articles on Argentinean and Mexican police museums. Caimari (2012) explores the historical development of what is now the Argentine Federal Police Museum. The museum was started as a private initiative in 1899 but subsequently developed into a resource for police training. In 1932 it was opened to the public as a means to ‘build a public narrative that stressed modernity and professionalization’ in the face of the low public esteem of police (2012, p. 144) following the 1930 military coup. For Caimari the museum fits within symbolic communication strategies for the ways in which it is ‘intended to teach about formalized myths, about institutional power, and about technological expertise’ (2012, p. 153). Buffington (2012, p. 156) examines three recently established Mexican police museums as ‘sites of institutional memory’. The museums seek to ‘preserve and educate’ on such things as ‘the supreme sacrifice’ of the police (2012, p. 159). There is a dual purpose to these museums. On the one hand they seek to ‘obliterate a too-well-remembered past that troubles the present and threatens to overwhelm official
attempts to give birth to an unencumbered future’ (p. 158). Civilian collective memories of police malfeasance, venality, corruption and lethal force means the museums are positioned ‘to manage the collective memories of police and citizens alike, to convince both groups that things have changed, that policing is respectable work performed by trustworthy public servants’ (p. 166). While each museum has a different task and approach, ‘memory work is the heart and soul of the recent Mexican police museums’ (p. 166).

Second, recent work on policing in interwar Europe has focused more directly on the place of rituals, commemoration and memorialisation as part of the negotiations of policing within changing cultural and ideological landscapes of Germany and Italy. Dunnage and Rossol (Dunnage 2012; Dunnage 2017a, 2017b; Dunnage & Rossol 2015) provide a fascinating account of how ‘police days’ and ‘rituals of commemoration’ to ‘fallen policemen’ are used to ‘showcase the police as pillars of their respective regimes to the general public’ and ‘as a means of creating a common culture’ with their respective political masters (Dunnage 2012, p. 90). Importantly, Dunnage suggests the need to locate these developments within the context of broader ‘fascist/Nazi rituals, with their stress on symbols and gestures’ to forge a newly constructed national community (2012, p. 90). In addition, the police examined were in competition with other policing agencies as well as the military for status, ‘prestige and funds’ (2012, p. 91). Central to Dunnage’s analysis, is the need to add to the dominant studies of repressive policing through an examination of ‘the largely neglected ritualistic aspects’ of police that positioned police as ‘powerful organs of “new states”’ and enabled the police to ‘stress to the public and the government that it was an indispensable security force’ (2012, p. 108). While they document some of the differences in contexts and narratives, they identified a ‘strong element of manipulation and fabrication involved in the processes of ideological integration behind the rituals’ (p. 109). While not directly addressing contemporary memorialisation, Dunnage and Rossol’s work highlights the importance for examining rituals as forms of symbolic communication that is in turn important for developing an understanding about how police negotiate their status within particular political and cultural contexts. Let us now turn to the Australian context and police history and memory.
Police History and Memory

The sanitation of the various policing histories in Australia has significant contestations to overcome. Haldane, who primarily concentrates on Victorian policing history, points out that bush rangers and other felons have dominated Australian history and literature. Nineteenth century relations between community and police in Australia are described by Haldane as ‘unhappy’ (Haldane 1995, p. 63). There seems to have been a continuous tension between the demand by the public for police protection and resentment toward them. Indeed it seems to be the failure of the Australian colonial police forces to adequately deal with the bushrangers which solidified their poor standing in ‘popular memory’ in Victoria (1995, p. 63). Many Australians still admire the legacy of famous 1870s Victorian Bushranger Ned Kelly, a fact lamented by Victoria Police. Haldane’s research suggests the symbolic legacy of police actions against rebel gold miners at Eureka Stockade, Ballarat, in 1854, had a lasting effect, in ‘ideological and philosophical terms’. This is largely due to accusations such as the mounted police’s degradation of the rebel’s Southern Cross flag and the killing of fleeing rebel miners, by mounted troopers, after the fighting had ended (Evans 2001). Haldane writes that ‘…there remains the unsettled and unsettling question of the true impact of Eureka upon the police image in partly subconscious memory’ (1995, pp. 46-8). The many accounts of police shootings of indigenous people and the colonial policing practices also presents problematic imagery for colonial police remembrance (Finnane 2005, pp. 60-3). Finally, the steady stream of Royal Commissions and other types of inquiries critically evaluating policing, adds to the negative imagery of police histories, rendering celebratory histories and commemorations problematic.

Another important element of Australian policing history is the long association with the armed forces. Palmer argues ‘police memorialisation has been successfully positioned within… [the] wider agenda of war commemoration…’ He also cautions that the issue of how deliberate police have been in situating contemporary police remembrance with military commemoration is yet to be resolved (Palmer 2012). Nevertheless, the hierarchical organisation of most police forces are modelled upon various military ranks and titles as is the use of
uniforms and insignia to solidify identity. The appointment of ex-army officers as police commissioners was common in Australia up until the mid-twentieth century (Haldane 1995; Palmer 2012). In Australia the relationship between the military and the police in various locations was particularly close in the 19th century. Early policing in Australia drew recruits significantly from the Royal Irish Constabulary which closely emulated a military force. Haldane’s book on the history of the Victorian Police suggests the early police force had a constant tension between being a civil and military force. Under the influence of various militaristic leaders such as Chief Commissioner Charles MacMahon (1856-1858), the police force often acted as or resembled a military organisation. Other leaders such as Chief Commissioner Frederic Charles Standish (1858-1881) tended to resist the militarism and encourage keeping the police as a civil force apart from the military. However, in 1870 the British government withdrew the last of its imperial troops from Victoria leaving the colony to arrange for its own defence. This meant that the police force had to double as defence force and was militarised like no other time in its history (Haldane 1995, pp. 72-3).

Importantly, the police along with the military are the only government organisations which are entrusted with the right to use state-sanctioned force and indeed given the right to bear arms. Some police special units closely resemble the military, in appearance, training and weaponry. This right to bear arms and use lethal force is in itself a powerful symbol which has shaped the past and present of both organisations. For the military, the use of force is for the sacred task of defending the nation. The police are given the right to kill in the sacred task of defending law and order. Moreover, as the Anzac soldier is tied to constructions of national values and identity so too are the police intertwined, by the nature of their purpose, with the ‘maintenance of ontological security’. That is, the police’s symbolic power tied as it is to the nation state, is inextricably connected to the public’s ‘hopes, fears, fantasies, and anxieties about such matters as protection/vulnerability, order/entropy, and life/death…’ There is too then, the idea that the police play a part both in the shaping and maintaining of national identity (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, pp. 41-2).
The act of killing and the result of death in the line of duty appear to be treated the same way in both police and military commemoration and remembrance. Memorials are built to symbolise the sacredness attached to loss of life of the service personnel, not the destruction and death caused in war or as a result of law enforcement. Indeed, this common ground is nowhere better demonstrated than in the language used on both war and police memorials. Paul Fussell’s (1975) work examined the use of ‘high diction’ in relation to written accounts of First World War experiences. The use of this language also became common on war memorials and indeed subsequently on police memorials. High diction replaces words such as killed with ‘fallen’ or ‘slain’. The loss of life of soldiers or police is described as ‘fallen in the line of duty’ or the ‘ultimate sacrifice’. Mulcahy identified the use of high diction on RUC memorials such as ‘ultimate’ or ‘supreme sacrifice’ (Mulcahy 2000, pp. 76-7). Palmer’s (2012) initial examinations of police memorials suggests the use of high diction and Christian phrases such as ‘we shall remember them’ and ‘greater love hath no man’ which are common features on Australian and other war memorials, are also common on most Western police memorials. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter Two.

The funerary practices for deceased police officers also mirrors military practices with the presence of numbers of uniformed personnel and other such rituals. Manning’s (1997, pp. 23-4) account of police funerals suggests that for police officers the death of a fellow officer and the funeral ceremony has ‘occupational derived meanings. They are evoked by the imagery of the ceremony, the collective acting out of the occupation’s mission, and the display of many of their most sacred symbols.’ The various meanings and themes that are evoked by the death and burial of a fellow officer are closely intertwined to how officers understand their ‘occupational role.’ The death of an officer in the line of duty reaffirms the sense of separation they feel from the sometimes adversarial and distrustful public. Again there are military parallels here, as soldiers too sometimes experience the sense of separation and isolation from the people they are serving (Brown 2014; Garton 1996; Thomson 1994). Nevertheless, the prevailing social value in most Western nations is to honour dead soldiers. Police are called upon to fight symbolic wars against crime and symbolic wars need
symbolic soldiers to fight them and on occasion die fighting them (Terpstra & Trommel 2009, p. 133). For large sections of the public in countries such as Australia the death of a soldier is not so very different to the death of a police officer: a fatal loss to the state.

The above discussions have shown that the limited literature on police remembrance, memorialisation and commemoration leaves open considerable space for new police scholarship that can draw from the rich tapestry of war remembrance literature compiled over the last thirty years. The theoretical framework established to examine memory, war memorials, and war commemoration is applicable to the study of police remembrance events and activities, including investigations into the extent to which police remembrance has borrowed from military remembrance in the construction of the National and Victorian police memorials. As suggested above, part of the motivation to construct police memorials is because the state is obliged to remember police officers who have died in the performance of their duty. There are other motivations to construct police memorials such as Mulcahy’s idea that imbuing the RUC casualties with ‘worth’, reminding the public of their sacrifices, contributes to the process of legitimisation through remembrance.

**Police Legitimacy**

One of the main investigations of this research is to examine possible connections between the construction of police memorials and the enhancement of police legitimacy. Police legitimacy is challenged by corruption, malpractice and the ongoing expansion of alternative police services in the form of private security services. Part of the problem seems to be a loss of faith in the police by the general public in most Western nations brought about by a combination of developing social, political and economic changes (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, pp. 14-20; Reiner 1992, p. 779). A number of solutions have been tried and implemented such as managerialism which attempts to improve efficiency by the adoption of business practices in the running of police forces. Yet as Loader and Reiner argue below, managerialism forces police to compete in a consumer
market with limited resources, inhibiting the fulfilment of public expectations and further exacerbating the legitimacy problem. Another suggested solution is procedural justice which relates to improving police behaviour toward the public through adherence to procedural justice guidelines. There are also symbolic attempts to address the issues of legitimacy through the media and other symbolic representations such as memorials. What then is police legitimacy and how might building memorials to dead police officers help with problems relating to police legitimacy?

**Defining Police Legitimacy**

The literature on police legitimacy has increased significantly since the mid-1980s. Like the literature on memory theory and memorialisation, the literature pertaining to police legitimacy is complex. Indeed Jan Terpstra and Willem Trommel describe police legitimacy as ‘an heterogeneous, multi-dimensional phenomenon’ (Terpstra & Trommel 2009, p. 134). They argue that given the difficulties policing has in achieving a ‘true’ alignment with varied social values and expectations, the best they can hope to do is present a ‘symbolic legitimacy’. That is, police use presentational strategies to give the illusion of being the police force that communities want, in the face of for example, rising crime rates. Mark Suchman’s article is perhaps one of the more useful works on legitimacy (for a recent application to policing see Fitzgibbon & Lea 2017). Suchman’s work tried to bring together many of the disparities of definition between different authors who have written on the topic. He identified three different types of legitimacy: ‘pragmatic, moral, and cognitive legitimacy’ (Suchman 1995, p. 573). While these three types of legitimacy are not necessarily mutually exclusive, their delineation helps to clarify the different functions of legitimacy for different organisations. His definition of the term is ‘inclusive and broad based...Legitimacy is a generalised perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions’ (1995, p. 574). In the context of this discussion such norms and values could be conformity to accepted moral standards and a belief in the rule of law.
The concept of legitimacy is closely linked to the concept of trust. The two terms are often used interchangeably but, as Bradford and Jackson point out, the terms are ‘conceptually and empirically quite distinct’ (Bradford & Jackson 2011, p. 3). The application of the concept of legitimacy often relates more ‘to a specific set of social relationships between individuals and institutions.’ Thus there is a distinction between trust (which has more general social applications) and legitimacy which is more specific to the individual/institution relationship. Bradford and Jackson suggest that ‘the concept of legitimacy is generally bound up with the right to be recognised, to have remit over a specific area of life to command, to be obeyed’ (Bradford & Jackson 2011, pp. 4-5). Bradford and Jackson link the definition of legitimacy, as they do with trust, back to the importance of a value convergence between the policed and the police. They are working from David Beetham’s (1991) notion which argues that ‘a given power relationship is not legitimate because people believe in its legitimacy, but because it can be justified in terms of their beliefs’ (Beetham 1991, p. 11). Similar to Suchman (1995), Bradford and Jackson link the concept of legitimacy to core societal values. Thus, because social values change over time, police legitimacy will fluctuate in accordance with these changes.

Variations in public perceptions of police legitimacy can also arise where social values conflict with dominant police values, such as in communities exhibiting a high crime rate for example. There are many different social and political variables in relation to who is policed and who does the policing. For example some segments of a given society are more policed than others which may produce different public perceptions of police legitimacy. Otwin Marenin argues that ‘the identities and practices of legitimate coercion fluctuate with social norms and demands, [and that] legitimacy “implies that the police are granted some degree of monopoly by those in society with the power to authorize,” which can be “the legal system, the community, the state, the police organisation itself or the political elite”’ (Marenin 1996, p. 7). In some nations, police legitimacy has been strongly tied to religious and racial notions, which was the case in South Africa during the Apartheid era of 1948-1994 (Brogden & Shearing 1993, p. 45). The South African example is rather extreme in that large segments of that society, black South Africans, were given no voice in how they were policed and any
concerns about police legitimacy were considered irrelevant at least at the
government level. For most Western democracies the populations are largely
policed by consent. Peter Manning suggests that:

the police have become controlling factors in everyday life; they construct
in many respects the meanings imputed to social control and to social
order; they are implicitly trusted and invested with legitimacy in nearly all
segments of society; and they control the available information by which
citizens construct at least in some measure their notions about quality of
life’ (Manning 1997, p. 25).

As a matter of further qualification Reiner argues that ‘realistically, the most that
“policing by consent” can mean is not universal love of the police, but that those
at the sharp end of police practices do not extend their resentment at specific
actions into generalised withdrawal of legitimacy from either individual officers
or the institution of policing per se’ (Reiner 1985, p. 50).

**Why is Legitimacy important for Police?**

Why is legitimacy so important to an institution that is publicly funded and
deemed, for the most part, to be a necessary element of the state’s governing
apparatus (Ericson 2005, p. 215)? As Colleen Lewis suggests the ‘police are the
coercive arm of the government created by an act of Parliament…As the
enforcement arm of the state, the police are indeed privileged as they are essential
to the state’s very existence for, without the power to coerce, governments cannot
govern’ (Lewis 1999, p. 52). Part of the answer for why police need to maintain
legitimacy resides in public compliance and cooperation. Without the public’s
support, police operations become very difficult. Public requests for police
assistance and public assistance of police operations are what constitute police
legitimacy. When police legitimacy is actualised within a community, it might be
assumed the police have ‘earned an entitlement to direct specific areas of social
life, generating in citizens a sense of obligation to act in ways compatible with
this entitlement’ (Bradford & Jackson 2011, pp. 4-5). Yet meeting the policing
outcomes expected by different social groups in modern industrial societies
presents an insurmountable problem (Terpstra & Trommel 2009, pp. 133-34). Indeed, as Steve Herbert suggests, ‘the quest for police legitimacy will be forever ongoing…’ because public consensus about police powers and how they are executed can never be fully achieved (Herbert 2006, p. 484).

**Challenges to Police Legitimacy**

Challenges to police legitimacy began with the introduction of the first police force in England in the 1830s have been an ongoing problem for police forces in Western liberal democracies including Great Britain, the United States and Australia, at various times, in the 20th and early 21st centuries (Bradford & Jackson 2011; Mulcahy 2000; Reiner 1985; 1995; Tyler 1990). Policing systems in most western democracies are shaped by similar issues and this is exacerbated by the globalisation process whereby a given nation’s policing practices may influence policing in other nations (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, p. 53). So what does the literature on this issue suggest has undermined police legitimacy in the Western world and how might this inform us of the link between police legitimacy and memorialisation?

Gaining legitimacy was of central concern to the ‘new police’ in the first half of the 19th century in England (Reiner 1985) and the second half of the 19th century in Australia (Finnane 1987). Further, while police legitimacy is always to some extent fragile and situationally negotiated, the post Second World War period up to the 1980s was one of relative stability in police legitimacy. However, as Robert Reiner suggests, ‘the first element in the undermining of police legitimacy was the erosion of the image of an efficient, disciplined bureaucracy’ (Reiner 1985, pp. 64-5). Reiner’s work relates specifically to the British police force but many of the issues such as police corruption and misconduct, are transferable to the United States, (Weitzer 1995; Williams 2011); Canada (Murphy 2007); Australia (Haldane 1995, pp. 290-91; Lewis 1999) and the Netherlands (Terpstra & Trommel 2009). Regarding the British Police Force in the 1950s, Reiner claims that ‘in no other country has the police force been so much a symbol of national pride’ (Reiner 1985, p. 47). Thus, for many years this period, sometimes known as the ‘golden age’ (Reiner 1992, p. 761), was the benchmark for British policing.
However, the high social status was dependent upon the prevailing social and economic circumstances of the time. According to Reiner, such circumstances cannot be repeated again in Britain (1995, p. 126). There are many elements which Reiner argues led to the erosion of high public regard in the post 1950s period, such as increased crime rates and declining crime clearance rates. Poor police performance during this period can also be linked to out-dated training and recruitment methods (Reiner 1985, pp. 65, 75).

The following discussions examine the challenges to police legitimacy and various police responses to these challenges. Reiner argues that problems emerged when less emphasis was placed on two key areas of police work, which the public held to be of some value: the service role and preventive policing (Reiner 1985). The development of private security also presents ongoing challenges to police legitimacy. Private security companies provide more personnel than public police and perform many of the same roles challenging the idea of public police as the dominant protectors of society. The introduction of managerialism into police forces aimed to improve police legitimacy by creating greater efficiencies by implementing a corporate professional ethos. However, as discussed below, managerialism created a new set of problems. The idea of procedural justice was also introduced, with limited benefits, to many police organisations to improve public perceptions of police by encouraging officers’ adherence to policing protocols when performing required duties. Finally, alternative methods of enhancing police legitimacy, symbolic representations, is examined.

**Decline of the Service and Crime Prevention Roles**

The devaluing of the service role and preventative policing also had similar effects in other nations such as the United States and Australia. The service role might include duties such as attending community events, helping out with troubled youths, or the paternal nineteenth century example of waking people up for work. In Britain, the service role became devalued by lower ranking police who favoured the more ‘glorified’ crime fighting role and specialisation roles (Reiner 1985, pp. 61-82). Indeed, according to Jones and Newburn, by the 1960s in Britain the service or ‘helping function’ of the police was devalued by both the
public and senior police (Jones & Newburn 1998, p. 8). In the United States as well as other Western nations such as Britain and Australia, police motorcar patrols replaced foot patrols which further reduced contact with communities (Bratton 2005, pp. 472-73). Haldane, writes about this issue in Australia where once the policeman on his beat knew every business owner and checked every shop door in his area – he was by the 1980s ‘encapsulated’ in his patrol car (Haldane 1995, pp. 247-48). This change in police ethos caused some alienation from communities and thus became problematic for police legitimacy in Western nations. The service role was often enacted while the police were walking their beats. The police foot patrol was often seen by the public and police as pivotal to crime prevention. In Britain older police officers remember that the nature of policing was quite different when they were young – calling in on the elderly or the infirmed and ‘…maintaining the fabric of urban neighbourhoods’ (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, p. 196). On the contrary, some police didn’t remember the beat system as being all that effective. Many of these officers believed that much of ‘the beats’ so called successes had been subsequently mythologised/sanitised and the number of police on the beat was insufficient, and there was ‘“endemic” petty corruption’ (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, p. 199). Reiner suggests that ‘walking the beat’ increasingly fell out of favour with police officers. Foot patrol became ‘downgraded’ and was seen as a transitory position. Constables preferred to move on to specialist positions and reassignment to foot patrols was seen as a punishment (Reiner 1985, pp. 61-82).

The service and crime prevention roles were an important part of police/community relations, especially with the working and middle classes. Indeed the lowest socioeconomic groups, especially young unemployed men, young black men and other poor minorities were increasing in numbers and were not considered a priority for police public relations. Elements of the educated middle-class, alternative types such as homosexuals, drug takers, and radical artists, had also become increasingly estranged from the police. These middle-class elements were more likely to write about and publish their concerns which increased the politicisation of police issues (Reiner 1985, pp. 61-82). In most Western countries, civil rights movements and other civilian pressure groups began to lobby their respective governments to allow greater civilian involvement
in investigation of police malpractice in the late 1950s and early 1960s. In the United States in particular, the telecasting of inappropriate police behaviour at peace protests exacerbated negative impressions of the police to varying degrees. Peace protests involved broad cross-sections of the community and many law abiding middle-class citizens were experiencing firsthand what it was like to be treated inappropriately by some police officers. On some occasions clashes between demonstrators and police led to fatalities (Lewis 1999, pp. 33-5). A similar experience, on a smaller scale, was experienced in Australia during the anti-Vietnam War Moratorium March in May 1970 (Curthoys 1994).

Compounding these issues was the increased police training and equipping for crowd control. Firearm use also significantly increased during this period in Britain. These last two points helped to give the impression that the police were not so much a force for the people as they were coercive agents for the state (Reiner 1985, pp. 61-82).

Perhaps the most abrasive elements that Reiner suggests contributed to the ‘erosion of the image of an efficient, disciplined bureaucracy’, were the police corruption and scandals of the 1960s and 1970s. Police corruption was found to exist at various levels throughout the British Police Force. On the lower scale of corruption, many police from senior and lower ranks believed that adhering to ‘legal procedures’ interfered with police work efficiency. Once revealed, ‘police violations of legal procedures’, the inappropriate dealings with suspects and witnesses, become very much politicised in the 1970s (Reiner 1985, pp. 61-82).

The first major scandal, uncovered by The Times in 1969, involved the taped recording of conversations between detectives and criminals, proving detectives had close working relationships with the criminal underworld. This initial exposure lead to further revelations ‘of the systemic, institutionalised and widespread network of corruption, the so-called “firm within a firm”’ (Reiner 1985, p. 65). Two more corruption scandals emerged in the mid-1970s involving the Drug Squad and the Obscene Publications Squad. These and other scandals contributed to a decade-long period of public relations’ disasters which left a lasting negative legacy for the British Police.
Reiner’s account, above, of the decline of British police legitimacy is known as the ‘desacralisation’ thesis (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, p. 3). It is worth noting here that the idea about policing as a sacred task pertains much more to the idea of policing in the United Kingdom and Australia, than in the United States (Murji 2009, pp. 27-31). Returning to Reiner’s work, Loader and Mulcahy admit that there are compelling elements of Reiner’s arguments but that there are various shortcomings with the thesis. They argue that the symbolic projected power of the state to protect its citizens with a police force would not be easily dismissed. A nation’s police force is so firmly entrenched in the public’s psyche, that it would take more than a liturgy of complaints and accusations such as scandal, miscarriages of justice, or allegations of police brutality to swing the majority of the public against them (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, p. 46). Even then, one would have to suppose any such major public discontent would result in calls for police reform rather than abolition of the police force, proving that the idea of the sacred task of protecting the public remains an important public value. As Suchman puts it, ‘a hospital is unlikely to lose legitimacy simply because some patients die; however, it is quite likely to lose legitimacy if it performs involuntary exorcisms – even if all patients get well’ (Suchman 1995, p. 580). Loader and Mulcahy argue that it should not be assumed that the desacralisation process is an unstoppable one-directional force. Elements of the sacred could well exist within the public’s perception of the British police force and indeed someday may reappear. The two authors argue that the institution of policing is intrinsically connected to the public’s relationship with the fear of crime and disorder. Thus, it is unlikely that the police can ever be ‘entirely free of affectively-charged sentiments, allegations, and appeal.’ In addition, Reiner (1992, p. 779) argues that ‘[t]here can be no effective symbol of a unitary order in a pluralistic and fragmented culture’. It is likely then, if a pluralistic society values law and order, that significant elements of that society might cling to symbols of ‘order, security, discipline, and authority’, such as the police force (Ericson & Haggerty 1997, p. 34). Thus, it may be assumed that the construction of police memorials will augment these ideas, providing a permanent physical symbol listing the names of those who died trying to keep law and order. However, given the above, police memorials will most likely only appeal to those who already embrace the need for police.
One of the most significant problems in relation to police legitimacy is how to measure it. There are for example some very negative events in relation to early policing and in recent times in Australia, as mentioned above in relation to national memory. But how is it possible to make accurate judgments about how such negative memories effect police legitimacy in Australia today? Unfortunately, no current research exists on this issue in Australia and we must rely on British examples. For instance, Loader and Mulcahy questions Reiner’s measuring of public disapproval of the police in Britain. There is, they argue, a lack of clarification of the terms ‘public attitudes’, ‘consent’, ‘confidence’, and ‘approval’ in Reiner’s work. Moreover, Reiner makes no real attempt to explain the public support that has and does exist for the police in Britain. Reiner uses the term ‘haemorrhage’ to describe the loss of public approval for police – yet the British Crime Survey (2000) indicated, and other studies suggest, the approval ratings have remained relatively static (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, pp. 32-6). Indeed, the measuring of public approval for the police has been a problem for sociologists and criminologists since the first academic work on police by Banton appeared in the mid-1960s (Murji 2009, pp. 25-6).

Other theorists, such as Manning, see the central idea of the ‘sacred task’ of policing (that of controlling crime to protect the public and keep social order) as part of the problem of maintaining legitimacy. One of the primary themes in Manning’s book, Police Work: The Social Organisation of Policing (1997), is that police organisations have centred their legitimacy on the prevention, deterrence, control of crime and the punishment of offenders. The problem, Manning argues, is that the police do not and most likely cannot control crime (also see-Ericson 2005, pp. 215-21). Nevertheless, they are allocated significant resources in people and material and given considerable legal power in order to achieve the unachievable – the control of crime. Police performance is often measured (Johnston 1992, p. 53) by crime statistics which are not always an accurate reflection of reality and at times are misleading and open to manipulation. Negative crime statistics can potentially do much damage to police legitimacy. Thus, Manning argues, whatever claims the police do make, in relation to their role as crime fighters, they ‘are based on false accomplishments and their
legitimation rests on beliefs derived from inadequate or controlled information’ (Manning 1997, p. 29). Although Manning and Johnston were writing in the 1990s, problems relating to police statistics still remain. In recent times Victoria’s Chief Commissioner Simon Overland resigned two years before his contract ended over issues surrounding the release of politically favourable yet incomplete or unverified crime rate statistics (Gordon 2011). The spurious police claim of crime control that the police hold up as their ‘legitimating theme’, ‘in turn, limits them in their quest for public acceptance, for insofar as the public begins to understand the limits of the police as a crime fighting agency, the police will have closed off alternative views of their work…[such as] a special sort of social service agency, or a regulatory agency that controls economic matters through the application of the criminal sanction’ (Manning 1997, p. 29). Manning’s point here is that the police are caught between their old positions in society as the dominant public protectors and the limited ability to adapt. Williams argues in his article, on policing financial markets, that the police are not always capable of breaking into new areas that exist outside their traditional platform such as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police’s failure to provide effective surveillance of financial institutions (Williams 2008). Furthermore, the shortcomings and mistakes made by police are likely to be recorded by members of the public using the now ubiquitous smart phones and other devices.

Now, more than ever before, the mass media and new communications technology make it much easier for the public to make their own assessments about police effectiveness and behaviour placing added pressure on police legitimacy. Goldsmith, in his article *Policing’s New Visibility*, discusses how police work has always been in the public’s view (Goldsmith 2010). At first, observations of police work were mainly by actual observation - a primary view. The secondary view emerged with newspaper coverage of police activity. The secondary view has been made much more comprehensive via television and by more recent video sharing technologies. Both Manning and Goldsmith use the metaphor of police work as a ‘drama’ played out in the public’s view. Goldsmith argues that ‘the new constellation of video-sharing and social-networking technologies and related social practices…’ have meant that the police are no longer the only actors in the play nor do they control all the elements of the ‘stage
production’ (Goldsmith 2010, p. 197). His point is that the police’s much larger audience is more likely to not only witness but also record and disseminate improper police actions. Goldsmith’s supporting examples are the case of the fatal police assault on Ian Tomlinson at the London G20 demonstrations on 1 April 2009, and various alleged inappropriate police Taser usage at Vancouver Airport in October 2007, and in Queensland and Western Australia in 2009 (Goldsmith 2010, pp. 922-5).

The traditional police roles of service and crime prevention have undergone significant changes resulting in new challenges for police forces to reconfigure public perceptions of their purpose. If police cannot provide the service they once did or convince the public that they have crime under control then they must highlight other elements of policing to reassert their legitimacy. One such element is putting their lives at risk protecting the community; a necessary part of policing. Highlighting police fatalities through commemorative practices, circumnavigates around issues of police effectiveness to remind the public of the risks taken by officers to defend the values of law and order. Commemorative practices such as memorial building and remembrance days reiterates legitimacy by highlighting sacrifices made by police for the communities they serve. Communities that can witness policing actions with an unprecedented transparency. More too, police commemorative practices need to also remind the public that police are the dominate protectors of law and order in the face of increasing competition from private security companies.

**Private Security**

Another of the suggested threats to police legitimacy comes from the ever-increasing privatisation of security – known interchangeably as ‘private security’ or ‘private policing’. There is a great deal of literature on the subject of private security and much of the discussion highlights the tension between private and public policing. Zedner’s work on private security suggests that, far from being a new phenomenon, private security, private citizens, and the military were once the primary means of protecting people and property and keeping public order before the emergence of police forces in the United Kingdom in 1829 (Emsley
and subsequent forces in such nations as Australia (Finnane 1987) and the United States in the 1830s (Zedner 2006, pp. 81-2). The private security industry continued to develop alongside the evolving state-run police forces in the 1850s in England and America. It began with burglar and fire alarms companies and private detectives and private detective agencies. According to Johnston’s book *The Rebirth of Private Policing*, (1992, pp. 18-20) in America, the more successful detective agencies, such as the Pinkertons, became so well-networked across the country by the end of the American Civil War 1861-64, they resembled a national police force. Such agencies continued to grow and develop in the post-war years and beyond and were eventually also seen as a threat to public interest (Jones & Newburn 1998, p. 20), resulting in the ‘Pinkerton Law’ of 1893 which prohibited the federal government from hiring such agencies (Shearing & Stenning 1981, p. 231). Company police also emerged during this period often as a safeguard against the formation of trade unions. The security guard industry, as opposed to private investigators, began in America in 1926 (Johnston 1992, pp. 18-20). Private security and law enforcement has both historical and current prevalence which is why Zedner suggests that the public funded police have probably only ever maintained a ‘symbolic’ dominance rather a structural hegemony over policing (Zedner 2006, p. 82).

Twenty-first century security guards are still not considered the same as police although some have been given constabulary powers at various times and places (Jones & Newburn 1998, pp. 128-30). But there is considerable debate amongst academics regarding what exactly the difference is between private and public policing. Wakefield shows in her work on the cultural elements of private security that ‘there are fundamental differences that frame their respective objectives in terms of the masters they serve and the territorial, functional and legal scope of their mandates’ (Wakefield 2008, p. 662). In short, the police serve the state often under better working conditions than private security officers who work for companies. Private security firms often also have greater restrictions on the territory they work in. For example they may be restricted to just one shopping centre. The tasks of private security are set by the demands of the company they work for and their legal powers are often more restricted than regular police. Sarre and Prenzler largely agree that the above also relates to private policing in
Australia. They argue that the relationship between public and private police in Australia can be seen as complimentary to each other in some circumstances rather than a symbiotic relationship whereby both are part of one apparatus concerned with the same goals. The different operational modes and hostile attitudes towards each other at times, makes reconciling the disparities problematic (Sarre & Prenzler 2000). Sarre and Prenzler also agree with writers such as Manning (1997) and Loader and Walker (2001) who argue that there is a fundamental symbolic connection, between the police and the state, which private security does not have. That is the state employs the police to perform surveillance and coercion in the name of social order. Thus, policing is conceived as ‘a public good’ and a sacred task, whereas private security relates more to the protection and surveillance of private property (Loader & Walker 2001, pp. 9-10; Shearing & Stenning 1981). On the other hand, Johnston is much less confident that there is a clear dividing line between public and private policing. He argues that reducing private policing to the protection and surveillance of private property overlooks the vast array of other duties performed by private agencies. For example, agencies such as the British Transport Police blur the public private divide (Johnston 1992, pp. 214-24; Jones & Newburn 1998, p. 25). Schools, hospitals, universities, and office buildings often employ private security and employees and residents in these facilities often develop close working relationship with their private security guards. For example, at this University (Deakin University, Australia), the private security company performs a mixture of duties such as first aid, assist students and staff with room lock-outs, organising emergency maintenance on weekends, keeping rowdy residential students within limits, and the removal of trespassers, and the not so popular issuing of parking fines. Campus security or campus police dates back to the 1890s in the United States. In the post September 11 era, campus police have significantly expanded their duties and powers including full powers of arrest and investigation (Peak, Barthe & Garcia 2008). The expanding diversity of private policing roles and increased legal powers further blurs the distinctions between private and public policing. Along with the decline of the service and crime prevention roles, the ongoing competition from private security for the dominant place as protectors of law and order means public policing must find other ways in which it can distinguish itself. Police commemoration may help to highlight the risks police
take doing their duty but is this unlikely to reconcile communities’ needs to feel safe.

In recent years, the media often highlights any rise in crime rates in Western societies. Loader & Mulcahy argue that crime now pervades the life of the ordinary individual through an increased exposure to it via the media and public awareness campaigns such as those pertaining to violence against women or children. The police are under increasing pressure to manage the risk of crime occurring to the individual because of the individual’s heightened awareness of criminal acts. In other words the police are increasingly called upon to manage the public’s ‘fear of crime’ (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, pp. 21-3; Terpstra & Trommel 2009, p. 133). The increase in the public’s fear of crime and the inability of most Western police forces’ to meet public demands has resulted in a proliferation of ‘alternative modes of policing and security.’ Home owners, large and small businesses, government agencies, and mass transport providers turned to private security guards, CCTV, neighbourhood watch and warden schemes, and other alternative security measures (2003, p. 25). Thus, as most Western police forces do not have the resources to fulfil the public’s every security need, public policing has become increasingly pluralised – just one of many security options for public consumption (Wakefield 2008, p. 659).

The literature on private and public policing alludes to an underlying danger that one day the critical mass of public opinion might reach a tipping point, whereby the true limits of police crime prevention are realised. The public meaning of police work might be questioned and perhaps revised or totally replaced by private agencies or perhaps different government agencies. There have already been concerns about this expressed in the British media. There are proposals to give greater powers to private security guards at British hospitals, allowing them to hand out on-the-spot fines to drunken people causing trouble around health centres. The chair of the Police Federation of England and Wales argued that ‘The public should be greatly concerned about the gradual erosion of warranted police officers and the attempt to fill the gap with private security guards and police community support officers’ (Bond 2012). This, then, is the ultimate long term threat to police legitimacy – the phasing out of the police force as it is now known
– and the introduction of a multitude of private/government organisations each
designed to replace the various specific policing tasks (Loader 1999, pp. 383-84;
Manning 1997, p. 29). Most Western higher ranking police officers have already
conceded that public police forces are just one of many agencies dedicated to
policing and that private operators are necessary because state police forces do
not have the resources to meet public demands (Zedner 2006, p. 82). It is
conceivable that in the future public police forces might have their status further
reduced to the point where their connection to the state as a moral authority
becomes irrelevant. This is perhaps why it has become so important to reaffirm
the police linkages to the state – and one way of symbolising that is via
memorialisation and commemoration.

Police memorials remind both the public and governments that they are part of the
fabric of the nation and, importantly, are prepared to die for it. There is a gap in
the existing literature regarding the reciprocal relationship between those that
serve the state in dangerous capacities beyond soldiers. Private security
companies do not have the same social contract that the police have. The
government has no obligation to recognise or remember private security officers
should they be killed while on duty. So, while police forces may endure the
compromises involved in the transfer of many police duties and services to
private organisations, they are unlikely to easily relinquish their symbolic position
as the state’s official defenders of law and order. Private security companies
demonstrate little interest in memorialisation at least at a national level, nor is the
government obliged to remember their service. The police have the ‘drama’ of
police commemoration all to themselves at this time but such a position must now
be vigilantly maintained because certain economic and political forces such as
managerialism have emerged to keep police forces at a distance from
governments.

**Managerialism**

Managerialism is the idea that the police should be managed like a business and
seems to have first emerged in England in the early 1980s as part of the neo-
liberal reforms being implemented right across the public sector under the Margaret Thatcher Government. The reforms marked a turning point in police-government relations in England where the government no longer acted ‘for’ or ‘with’ the police ‘but upon them’ (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, pp. 286-9).

Essentially, managerialism is the adoption of businesslike aims, concepts and procedures in non-market public sector institutions and organisations such as the police. The key principles of managerialism relate to ‘utilitarian notions and values like efficiency, effectiveness and economy’ (Terpstra & Trommel 2009, p. 129). The adoption of managerial principles into police forces in some Western societies namely the UK, Australia, Canada, and the Netherlands, was meant to help redress the issue of declining police legitimacy. Senior police and relevant government officials hoped that an ‘image’ of more efficient and professional policing might help to restore some public trust and confidence in their respective forces (2009, p. 131).

Reforms based upon managerial principles were introduced to Australian police forces in the 1980s bringing about fundamental changes in governing Australian police (Palmer 2009). Frank Bongiorno argues that the 1980s were a time of ‘transformation’ for Australian politics, culture and economics (Bongiorno 2015). Darren Palmer’s work suggests that the introduction of managerial concepts such as consumerism, whereby the public are reclassed as customers, into Australian policing had mixed results and is an ongoing complex process. The tension between economic rationalism/managerialism and community service prompted Chief Commissioner Miller (1977-1987) to say: “the reality is that the true measure of police effectiveness is qualitative not quantitative”-“We need to remember we are in the people business” (Haldane 1995, pp. 314-15). For Reiner (1992, pp. 778-9) and Loader (1999, pp. 383-84) the adoption of managerialism into police forces probably had the opposite effect on legitimacy than hoped for. The police cannot compete successfully within a consumer market so the public’s trust in the police is not likely to be restored with managerial concepts or techniques and indeed distrust may be exacerbated. At the same time, the police lose their ‘sacred’ status as defenders of law and order to become competitors in the security market. Palmer agrees with Reiner and Loader to a certain extent but is cautious not to support the narrow idea that consumerism is the prime cause for
the loss of police legitimacy. He argues that, along with consumerism, police legitimacy is also undermined by a general decline in public respect for traditional authorities such as schools and organised religion, as well as the police. Moreover, the ongoing problems such as poor accountability, ‘malpractice and corruption’, and ‘institutional racism’ continually fuel the de-legitimisation process (Palmer 2009, pp. 287-301).

**Procedural Justice**

The discourse of declining police legitimacy in the United States has taken a somewhat different trajectory than in other Western democracies. The problem of lagging police legitimacy in the United States is closely tied to issues relating to procedural justice whereby legitimacy is gained by the right and fair behaviour of police officers toward the public. Much of the literature written on legitimacy and procedural justice has been pioneered by the psychology professor Tom Tyler and his many associates (Sunshine & Tyler 2003; Tyler 2003; 2004, 2006; Tyler & Fagan 2008; Tyler & Wakslak 2004). The concept of procedural justice has also been taken up by academics in the United Kingdom (Bradford & Jackson 2011) and in Australia (Murphy 2009).

To be effective in maintaining law and order the police must have as much public compliance and cooperation as possible. Tyler argues that the main motivation for people to obey and cooperate with the police is a belief that the police have legitimate authority to enforce the law. Moreover, he suggests that the degree of public support is dependent upon the general behaviour of the police during encounters with citizens. The more fair the police are perceived to be during their work the greater their legitimacy (Tyler 2004, pp. 84-6). According to Tyler and Wakslak (2004, p. 255), the components of what might be described as ‘fair procedures’ are one: ‘quality of decision making - perceived neutrality and consistency;’ two: ‘quality of treatment – being treated with dignity and respect, having one’s rights acknowledged;’ three: ‘trustworthiness – believing that the authorities are acting out of benevolence and a sincere desire to be fair’. Gau and Brunson suggest that:
… put simply, believing in the legitimacy of the police and of the criminal law leads people to internalise a moral obligation to obey the law. This framework stands in opposition to a purely instrumental, deterrence-based system of compulsory compliance predicated upon the threat of punishment for misconduct (Gau & Brunson 2010, p. 258).

There are a number of problems with the procedural justice theory. To begin with, the quantitative methodology used to substantiate procedural justice provides inconclusive results. Tyler and his various associates often used cross-sectional surveys and self-report surveys as part of their qualitative studies on procedural justice. As such, the authors admit that their conclusions are often tentative and experimental (Tyler & Wakslak 2004, p. 279). Moreover, many of the surveys used in procedural justice studies, such as Gau and Brunson’s, were conducted in disadvantaged areas with black or ethnic minority concentrations. Even if the police always acted according to procedural justice it is unlikely that any of those interviewed would actually change their mind and cooperate with police or cease criminal acts (Gau & Brunson 2010, p. 260).

Clearly, poor policing practices are unlikely to have a positive effect on police legitimacy. Steve Herbert argues that the procedural justice approach – treating citizens with fairness and respect – certainly has its place in relation to helping to restore police legitimacy. But overall his attitude toward procedural justice is more critical. He suggests that the procedural justice approach is somewhat over stated and ‘neglects the significance of other paths to police legitimacy’ (Herbert 2006, p. 498). The problem is here that he stops short of explaining exactly what these other paths are – aside from the police separating themselves as different from, and superior to, citizens in relation to crime fighting:

Herbert’s ‘larger point is that the liberal separation that Tyler and his associates endorse might, at least occasionally, run counter to public insistence on greater subservience, and perhaps imperil police legitimacy as much as enhance it. Similarly, the procedural justice model fails to consider how officers understand themselves as separate from society. Professionalism remains regnant in police
culture. Officers thereby see themselves as superior and authoritative actors in their encounters with the public (2006, p. 498).

The only recourses Herbert suggests are to train police not to feel superior or for societies to expect less of their police forces (2006, p. 500).

Adherence to procedural justice will not always be possible in all circumstances because even where it is applied, the chances are high that while protecting one element of society they will alienate another. In some instances, treating offenders with fairness and respect might offend the people they are trying to protect – they might be expecting a more robust treatment of the offenders (Herbert 2006, pp. 497-99). Herbert’s final suggestion is that perhaps people should expect much less from the police – they should be left to just chase the ‘bad guys’ (2006, p. 500). However, as Ericson and Haggerty argue, contemporary police officers spend ‘relatively little time dealing directly with crime’ (Ericson & Haggerty 1997, p. 19). Most police officers spend the majority of their time reporting their activities or preparing to report their activities. Thus, the central tenants of procedural justice, namely fairness and respect in contacts with the public, are unlikely to have much effect upon police legitimacy. The police are more likely to be found behind computers managing information to be recorded and synthesised as knowledge (Ericson & Haggerty 1997, pp. 19-21).

**Symbolic Representations**

For the most part then, as we come to the end of this discussion on declining police legitimacy, it seems that many writers see solutions lying outside the development of more efficient (managerialism) or nicer (procedural justice) police officers. Ellison and Smyth suggest that ‘official survey data fail to reflect the symbolic and representational dimensions of policing…There is abundant evidence that the police are viewed within a broader frame of understanding than their interpersonal skills, level of politeness or ability to respond to emergency calls’ (Ellison & Smyth 1996, p. 108). Ellison’s above suggestion relates to the Northern Ireland context, but it might also apply to the concept of procedural
justice and legitimacy and surveys relating to police behaviour in most Western nations. For example, policing under Apartheid in South Africa was not legitimated – in any sense – by procedural justice. The overarching issues in South Africa were that nationalism, religion and racism were central to the policing ethos. The concept of procedural justice would not have worked where police brutality was sanctioned by the police organisation (Brogden & Shearing 1993, p. 33). Indeed, Loader and Mulcahy, Ericson and Haggerty and Palmer agree with Ellison and Smyth that there is arguably more to police legitimacy than perceptions of effective policing. Police legitimacy also resides in ‘symbolic representations’ of the public good – as a tax-payer-funded ideal which stands in opposition to lawlessness and chaos.

There are important linkages here in relation to police legitimacy and connections to military narratives and memorialisation. Bradford and Jackson are exponents of procedural justice, but they also argue that people trust organisations and institutions on the basis of perceived shared salient values – the evaluation of narratives regarding the roles, intentions, goals and behaviours of the police force…People may trust the police not because of what they do (or fail to do) but rather because of who they are and the social narratives within which they are located (Bradford & Jackson 2011, p. 4).

The pivotal issue here is that if there was a perception within a given police force that public opinion was declining, and subsequently the force’s legitimacy was challenged, then would it not make sense for the agents of police remembrance to emulate elements of an already publicly accepted remembrance narrative such as Anzac in Australia or military commemoration generally for the United States and the United Kingdom?

Maintaining legitimacy is a complex task and being treated in a fair and transparent manner by an institution such as the police force is only part of the equation. People must also perceive that the institution shares ‘broadly similar moral positions’. Such moral alignments can be suggested in ways other than police contact. Rob Mawby and Steve Worthington’s work examines the use of
various media the police have used to improve their image (Mawby & Worthington 2002). Bradford & Jackson suggested media portrayals and fictional accounts of police in various dramas as examples of communicating moral alignments between the public and the police. They also point out that media communications and representations might also ‘challenge’ the idea of police fairness (Bradford & Jackson 2011, pp. 5-6). Thus, the media have the potential to do harm to as well as benefit police image. Memorials are open to interpretation and indeed reinterpretation according to the effects of various events and changes in social attitudes over time (Henneberg 2004, p. 2). However, memorials are a much safer and a more permanent form of communication than the capricious media.

**Conclusion**

The literature on war remembrance and police legitimacy form the parameters of an epistemological frame-work for this thesis. War remembrance literature situates the development of police remembrance within memory theory because the same three levels of memory - personal, collective, and national remembrance - can be seen at work in the development of police memorialisation. Personal and collective expressions of grief merge with the political need to reaffirm the police in Western democracies as the prime defenders of contemporary social values: they are the embodiment of the state. The public in countries such as the United Sates, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia highly value honouring dead soldiers and many symbolic links can be seen which connect the military and police in history and in commemorative practices. Police memorials and associated memorialisation and commemoration practices suggest a shift from the police as a profane bureaucracy to that of a ‘sacred’ entity by performing sacred duties (Manning 1997, p. 10): their ‘sacrifice’ an ‘occasion for a public, collective display of society’s view of itself’ (Manning 1992, p. 151). The remainder of the chapters in this thesis address the processes shaping the development of police memorials and memorialisation and commemoration practices – the narratives, arenas and agencies of translation from individual to collective memory – and the
place of these developments in shaping police legitimacy and the place of police in contemporary Australia.
Chapter Two: An Historical Overview of Australian Police Commemoration and Memorialisation

Introduction

This chapter examines the development of police commemoration and memorialisation in Australia. In broad terms, police commemoration and memorialisation occur through two techniques: dedicated days and dedicated sites. As indicated in the previous chapter, special days and special sites are central to commemoration and memorialisation because they provide annual rituals that reinforce remembrance and contribute to the maintenance of ‘active sites of memory’. The chapter examines first the emergence and practice of National Police Remembrance Day (NPRD), and Victoria’s Blue Ribbon Day which coincides with NPRD. Documentary records drawn from the printed press and parliamentary records will be utilised, in conjunction with interviews, to provide an initial chronology of the development of these commemorative days. Uncovering the origin of these commemorative days resonates with scholarly debates about whether collective remembrance is a creation of political and nation building processes or more closely tied to the social forms of dealing with loss and grief. Scholars such as Ashplant argue that military commemoration develops from complex combinations of all of these processes. Ashplant’s assertion is also evident in the development of NPRD, where the idea for the day comes from an individual officer trying to remember the name of a deceased colleague but then migrates beyond this ‘fictive kin’ to the agency of police senior executives who develop it into a national remembrance day. The annual rituals adopted on NPRD such as marching to memorial sites, the use of flags, the use of special music, reading out the names of the dead, the emphasis on service and sacrifice all reflect
existing military commemorative rituals. Perhaps the most evident connection between military and police commemoration contained in the press and political speeches, is the extent to which ‘high diction’, a special military commemorative language, is also used by reporters and members of parliament regarding police remembrance.

This chapter is limited to exploring commemoration and memorialisation beyond the Victorian Police memorial (see Chapter Three), highlighting the emergence of a range of commemorative practices and associated rituals, the emergence of the National Police memorial and the prominent increase in press reporting and political attention on NPRD and Blue Ribbon Day in the wake of terrorist attacks in the United States on 11 September, 2001. Press reporting and political speeches on Australia’s police commemorative days highlight sacrifices for the nation.

**National Police Remembrance Day and Blue Ribbon Day**

The first National Police Remembrance Day was instigated in 1989. The idea was solidified in 1988 at the Conference of Commissioners of Police of Australasia and the South West Pacific Region (hereafter Conference of Commissioners). During the meeting it was decided that an annual day be set aside for commemorative services to remember officers killed in the line of duty. The date chosen for the Remembrance Day was 29 September, the feast day of the Archangel Saint Michael, Patron Saint of Police. Since its inception, National Police Remembrance Day in Australia has developed as a mix of different police funerary practices, as described in Manning (1997) (discussed in Chapter One), and Anzac Day commemorative ritual practices.¹

The original idea to establish an annual police remembrance day emerged from an individual – now retired Inspector John ‘Bluey’ O’Gorman from Queensland Police - whose memory had failed him. According to Simon Kelly (Queensland

---

¹ Anzac Day, 25th April, is an annual military commemorative day celebrating Australia’s debut into military history as a federated nation in 1915, during The First World War. Australian troops joined a number of nations in the British led disastrous eight-month Gallipoli campaign against Germany’s ally Turkey. The annual commemoration has strong public support with thousands of people attending the Dawn Service and subsequent marches of current and past military units. Anzac day has gone through considerable development and critique over the years resulting in a more inclusive remembrance day for all who have suffered and died in all of Australia’s conflicts and military operations.
Police, Media and Public Affairs Branch), O’Gorman was driving from Wilcannia to Broken Hill in the mid-1980s when he became frustrated he could not recall the name of a police officer he knew who had been killed ‘a few years earlier’ (Kelly 2012). This is an excellent example of how an individual’s failing memory of someone who has died sometimes needs a collective framework or a relevant physical object such as a memorial, with inscribed names in order to support that memory. Commemorative events and associated memorials, often take on subsequent meanings and functions, but at their heart there is often the simple desire of the living to remember those who have died (Winter 1995). O’Gorman’s frustration at not being able to remember a name transformed into a passion to promote the idea of a special annual day to enable collective remembrance of officers killed in the line of duty.

O’Gorman’s idea found support from the delegates at the 1988 Conference of Commissioners (Kelly 2012). Agenda item 18 raised the issue of establishing a national remembrance day for Australian officers killed on duty. It was suggested that there was an increasing need to ‘reinforce traditional values and a sense of pride in serving officers’ in the face of ongoing reviews of ‘traditional policing methods to accommodate current community attitudes and combat rising crime rates’. This early discussion, which suggests a re-alignment with community attitudes, clearly links the development of an annual commemorative day to police legitimacy. Moreover, it was also suggested that the establishment of an annual commemorative day would help to encourage serving officers and their families to ‘honour the memory’ of officers killed doing their duty. Such a day would also ‘focus public attention’ on the dangers faced by the men and women of Australia’s police forces while carrying out their responsibility to ‘ensure public peace and good order’ (Vicpol Historical Services 1988). These further suggestions aim to reinforce two social values connected to police legitimacy, as discussed in Chapter One, ‘sacrifice’ for the community in the name of upholding law and order. It was recommended that parades be held on the day throughout Australasia and the South West Pacific Region. Each Commissioner was requested to approach their respective Police Ministers about the establishment of the police commemorative day for officers killed on duty. A representative for the Northern Territory suggested 29 September as an
appropriate date because ‘it was the Feast of the Archangel St Michael, who was all ways fighting evil’ (Vicpol Historical Services 1988). St Michael’s biblical history is as the ‘first of the seven archangels, leader of the Hosts of Heaven who defeated Lucifer when he revolted against God.’ St Michael is sometimes depicted as a ‘winged warrior’ who fights against the powers of ‘darkness’ and at other times he is depicted holding scales in relation to the ‘last Judgement’ (Metford J 1983, p. 170). In essence, St Michael seems quite an appropriate choice if not a militant and very catholic one. The delegates resolved that the 29 September be recognised as a suitable day of remembrance – to commence from 1989 (Vicpol Historical Services 1988).

Thus O'Gorman’s private desire to remember a deceased colleague was transformed into collective remembrance (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, p. 18). Later in the press, he identified three key elements of NPRD:

It's a national day held every year that is set aside to remember and acknowledge police who have died in the execution of their duty, and to also remind the families of police who have died that we haven't forgotten their family members. Thirdly, it's to remind the community the dangers the police face on a daily basis and that police have no hesitation in doing what needs to be done (Cairns Post Editorial 2002).

The Australian government did not immediately recognise the day. A search of the parliamentary debates (Hansard) found that the first official mention of NPRD in federal Parliament was ten years later in 1999. There is little commentary to suggest why the day took a decade to be mentioned in government. Daryl Williams, then Attorney General, was the first to speak of the annual commemoration in Parliament when the Member for Wentworth, Andrew Thomson, asked Williams if he could ‘inform the House whether any steps are being taken to mark this occasion?’ Williams’ response was to suggest that the police are not always ‘accorded the acknowledgment they deserve…’ and that some Australians take safety and security for granted. He went on to mention that a number of officers had been killed in the previous twelve months and the honour roll for all police officers who have died as a result of their duties was read out at a ceremony in Canberra. Williams also suggested that police
commemoration should be treated with the same reverence displayed toward Australian military service personnel:

    Police fight a war on a day-by-day basis against those who bring violence to society. The Australian people should consider police who risk their lives in the course of their duty with a similar sense of pride and thanks to that accorded to the men and women who have served this country during times of war (Williams 1999).

Amanda Vanstone, the then Minister for Justice and Customs, made a similar speech in the Senate on the same day. Interestingly, part of Vanstone’s speech had exactly the same wording as Williams’: ‘Police fight a war on a day-by-day basis…’ Vanstone also pointed out that some Australians took the police for granted and that most Australians expected members of the Australian police forces to confront ‘muggers’, ‘drug barons’, or board illegal shipping vessels without knowing if the crew were armed. Vanstone also mentioned the Federal Police deployment in East Timor (Vanstone 1999).

Both Williams and Vanstone stated the intention to build a national emergency services memorial in Canberra. On the same occasion, Senator Ian Macdonald, who was also involved with the initiative, announced the plans to build the memorial. Vanstone said the purpose of the national emergency services memorial is to:

    honour the men and women of emergency services of Australia, which includes the police services around Australia, who have lost their lives in the course of their duty. Like this day, the memorial will provide a focus to commemorate those who have fallen or perished while carrying out the important duties for the rest of us (Vanstone 1999).

This was the first mention of a national memorial which would honour police and emergency workers, but as discussed below, the concept would shift to a separate national police memorial. The suggestions for this kind of memorial are
announced on the established ‘invented tradition’ of NPRD where the focus is on remembrance and construction of a memorial appears as a logical progression.

NPRD was not mentioned again in Parliament the following year, 2000, but the topic returned with vigour in 2001, after the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001. Just a few weeks after the September 11 terrorist attacks and just prior to NPRD, on September 27, 2001, Senator Chris Ellison, Minister for Justice and Customs, led the way with a speech commemorating Australia’s ‘fallen officers’ and to ‘pay tribute to the work of police everywhere in Australia.’ Ellison read out an honour roll of eighteen Australian police officers killed while on duty either in Australia or on overseas posts in the South-West Pacific in the previous twelve months. He then read out all sixty-three officers killed or missing from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey Police Department, New York City Police Department and Court Administration officers (Ellison 2001a).

In Victoria, the Senior Police Chaplin, Jim Pilmer, suggested to Victoria Police a commemorative day to remember the police killed on September 11 in the terrorist attacks might be appropriate. This turned into an emergency services memorial service attended by some 14,000 people at the National Tennis Centre at Flinders Park, a large entertainment venue just outside Melbourne’s central business district. Retired Victoria Police member, Kevin Scott suggests this particular event might help explain the increased interest in NPRD in Victoria demonstrated in the media attention discussed below (Scott interview 2014).

This period was an important turning point in Australian police commemoration: the September 11 terrorist attacks helped raise the profile of police ‘sacrifices’ generally and Australian policing commemoration specifically. After the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Australian public looked to their security personnel, rather than the armed forces, to protect ‘our way of life’ against subsequent terrorist attacks. The death of so many officers from one event in the United States was a reminder that police at times put their lives on the line for the communities they serve. The day after his speech, Ellison released plans to build a national police memorial in Canberra (Ellison 2001b) rather than the previously announced emergency services memorial.
Before the establishment of the more public state and national police memorials, NPRD tended to be held at war memorials, churches or within the confines of the various state police academies. For example, before the building of the NSW State Police Wall of Remembrance, and the National Police Memorial, NPRD commemorations were held at places such as St Mary’s Cathedral College in Sydney (Simpson 1989). In the Australian Capital Territory they were held at the All Saints Church in Ainslie, Canberra (Canberra Times Editorial 1998). From the beginning the format for NPRD ceremonies were solidified by senior police administrators reflecting the dichotomy discussed in Ashplant’s work whereby memory agency is often approached by scholars as being either driven from the ‘top down’ or from the ‘bottom up’. Scholars such as Eric Hobsbawm, Terence Ranger (1983) and Benedict Anderson (1983) argue that the commemoration is often driven from the top down being ‘fundamentally political’ and ‘bound up with rituals of national identification’ aimed at promoting ‘social cohesion’ and ‘legitimising authority’. Whereas other scholars such as Winter (1999), might emphasise that NPRD was initiated from the ‘bottom up’ because it was O’Gorman’s idea to create a commemorative day to help remember lost colleagues, an idea that is associated more with personal grief, an expression of morning, rather than national identity. Ashplant’s work attempts to divert scholars away from the dichotomy of the top down and bottom up approaches, arguing that commemoration is a complex mix of both approaches (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004, pp. 7-15) an argument supported by the findings presented above: the initial idea for national commemoration began with an individual and was then taken up by a national agency in the form of the 1988 Conference of Commissioners.

The format of NPRD ceremonies has remained largely unchanged since 1989, the delegates to the 1989 Conference of Commissioners resolved to develop a common approach to the service in order to make it ‘a truly National Remembrance Day’ (Vicpol Historical Services 1989). Australian delegates were much keener on the idea of an annual remembrance day than delegates from New Zealand. At that time, New Zealand had had few officers killed as a result of their duty and had no plans to hold a ceremony in 1989. The various Australian state delegates considered several ideas about what the programme might be, including
which Christian denomination, if any, would hold the service, where would it be
held, who would present it, and whether there should be a band, hymns, special
guests, and particular readings. By the end of the discussion, the delegates had
decided on three steps towards unifying the inaugural service: ‘Adopt the Victoria
Police Requiescat as a police alternative to the Last Post; Adopt the police prayer
prepared for the 1963 Police Ecumenical Church Service, South Australia;
include the Victoria Police song ‘Uphold the Right’ as part of the ceremony’
(Vicpol Historical Services 1989). The Conference established the official
framework for NPRD ceremonies for the various states to adopt.

NPRD ceremonies generally begin with uniformed police marching, accompanied
by police bands, to the main enactment site; usually a church or a memorial.
Followed up by addresses by Police Chaplains, Police Commissioners and special
guests such as the partners or family members of deceased officers. One of these
addresses would include reading out names of any new police deaths from the
previous twelve months. Those who attend are usually uniformed officers, senior-
ranking police and government officials, and fellow workers from other
emergency services. Other elements include: the parading of Ensign Colour
Parties, which are uniformed officers with flagstaffs bearing various flags such as
the National and State flags, and the relevant state/territory Police flag; and the
laying of wreaths by various public services, police services and organisations
and other interested individuals and groups. Commemorative activities such as
marching to memorials, reading out names of the dead, trumpet calls, and the use
of flag parties, became part of police ceremonies only after the inauguration of the
annual ritual. In most respects, NPRD mirrors the kind of activities pertaining to
military commemoration such as Anzac Day and Remembrance Day. However,
these kinds of annual rituals were not entirely new to police due to their previous
and ongoing participation in military commemorative days which, considering the
close connection between the services, are a logical model to follow.

In some cases, police commemorative agency too closely resembled the military’s
causing some tensions. Since 1982 the trumpet call Requiescat (‘May they rest’)
has been the official police ceremonial tune, though it is sometimes played by a
bagpiper. Before the advent of NPRD, Victoria Police would gather for an annual
church service on Remembrance Day, 11 November or close to that date. The trumpet call *The Last Post* was played at these church services after the names of deceased officers for the previous twelve months was read out by the clergy and a minute’s silence observed for the dead (Vicpol Historical Services 1984). However, Bruce Ruxton, then president of the Returned and Services League, approached Mick Miller, Chief Commissioner of Victoria Police, to suggest that the *Last Post* was reserved for military ceremonies and not appropriate for police ceremonies. Miller, an ex-soldier, understood Ruxton’s concerns and requested Inspector Don Jarrett, Director of Music for Victoria Police, to compose a specific police trumpet call for use at police ceremonies (Miller interview 2015). Jarrett composed *Requiescat*, which has since been adopted as the official police trumpet call for all Australian police ceremonies including police funerals (Vicpol Historical Services 1984, 1989). For the most part, Australia’s military were tolerant of police appropriation of their commemorative concepts and activities. Nevertheless, Ruxton, an extremely influential figure at the time, discerned the need for a clear division on the matter of the trumpet call to ensure both services maintained separate identities, suggestive of the upper limits on police appropriation of military commemorative practices.

In sum, NPRD had a slow start initially but over time gained more recognition from both national and state governments. It is now a well-established practice for Australia’s police forces, but its public popularity is still underwhelming and in contrast with armed forces commemoration, there is little general public attendance at NPRD ceremonies. Nevertheless, the annual commemorations send clear messages to the public each year reinforcing the remembrance of officers lost doing their duty and service to the communities of Australia, legitimating the police as an essential part of Australian society. Remembering police deaths provided the impetus for the creation of the commemorative day.

While there was a clear attempt to standardise the NPRD across the nation, Victoria added an additional layer to NPRD. In 1998, Victorian Police Commissioner, Neil Comrie, said that ‘…police were so overwhelmed by the community support after the fatal shootings of Senior Constable Rodney Miller
and Sergeant Gary Silk that he decided to turn this year’s Blue Ribbon Day into an annual event that would coincide with National Police Remembrance Day’. According to the reporter Andrea Carson, this was fulfilling ‘…the wishes of Mrs Carmel Miller, Rodney Miller’s widow’ (Carson 1998). The Silk/Miller Trauma Receiving Centre at Dandenong Hospital was also established and would raise and donate $350,000 to the hospital over the following three years (Douez 1999).

Blue Ribbon Foundation was established in 1998 and formed from a number of other pre-existing committees dedicated to police remembrance. The foundation receives its annual income from a variety of business sponsorships, donations, and fundraising activities, including the sale of various merchandise such as blue-checkered ribbons, stickers, mugs, and Constable T Bear (plush teddy bear in police uniform). The foundation also receives a tax exemption from all monies raised and occasional government grants when applied for in relation to specific needs or projects. The Blue Ribbon foundation is similar to Legacy, an organisation that aims to remember soldiers killed while on duty and which provides support for the deceased service member’s family. The Foundation’s website states that: ‘The Victoria Police Blue Ribbon Foundation perpetuates the memory of members of the Victoria Police killed in the line of duty through the support of worthwhile community projects within Victoria’(Blue Ribbon 2014). The foundation commonly makes large donations to Victoria’s hospitals to fund medical equipment, or specific wards which are named after deceased officers. The ‘About Us’ page also highlights that 159 Victoria Police members have been killed in the line of duty and that 30 of them were murdered:

… which underlines the dangers police members face on a daily basis … as a grateful community we can take steps to honour their memory and ensure their sacrifice is acknowledged … (Blue Ribbon 2014).

Having outlined factors shaping the emergence of NPRD and Blue Ribbon Day we now turn our attention to exploring the broader meaning of remembrance days.
The Meaning of Annual Police Remembrance

NPRD and Blue Ribbon Day are the first elements to emerge as permanent rituals of police symbolic representation in Australia as distinct from the earlier plaques and memorials that are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Three. The meaning of these annual commemorative days is multifaceted. Manning’s work on police funerals suggests that police commemorative rituals go beyond remembering the dead. For police officers the death of a fellow officer and the funeral ceremony has ‘occupational derived meanings. They are evoked by the imagery of the ceremony, the collective acting out of the occupation’s mission, and the display of many of their most sacred symbols’ (Manning 1997, pp. 23-4).

Manning suggests the various meanings and themes that are evoked by the death and burial of a fellow officer are closely intertwined with how officers understand their ‘occupational role.’ The death of an officer in the line of duty reaffirms the sense of separation police feel from the sometimes adversarial and distrustful public. This sense of being separate from and in opposition to the public is especially exacerbated when an officer has been murdered or killed during dangerous activities such as in high-speed pursuits. Such deaths remind officers and the public that policing can be dangerous. This sense of danger reinforces a kind of isolation from the public, which is only overcome by the support and understanding from fellow officers, and police funerals are occasions where their solidarity and comradeship is made manifest.

While Manning is right to highlight the comradeship funeral rituals evoke, the development of NPRD ritualises the practice of remembering the dead on an annual basis, supplementing the random funerary ceremonies only occurring with the advent of police fatalities. Manning argues that ‘collective celebrations serve to recoat moral bonds, to elucidate the norms of the society, to symbolize deference and respect for the police as a moral unit’ (Manning 1997, pp. 23-4). However, funerary ceremonies are *ad-hoc*, whereas NPRD annually reinforces police cohesion, delivering positive messages about policing to the broader community whether or not a police death has occurred. Thus, elements of the purpose of police remembrance emerge as what Jones and Newburn call,
‘legitimacy mechanisms’ (Jones & Newburn 2002, p. 106). We are reminded here of Mulcahy’s (2006) discussion in Chapter One, on how commemoration was used as part of a legitimising discourse for the RUC. Dunnage also (Dunnage 2017a; also see Dunnage 2017b) examines the use of commemoration as a legitimising strategy to help reconfigure perceptions of the Italian police in the post-fascist era. The annual Italian police commemoration, Festa della Polizia (Police Day) recasts Italian police as defenders of democracy. The ‘public spectacle’ of military style marches, used during the fascist period, are re-fashioned to celebrate the ‘new democratic police’. The ‘institutional’ communication of ‘Police Day’ is aimed both internally towards police officers as well as the public (Dunnage 2017a, pp. 806-8). The annual messages from police remembrance personify police legitimacy. In the Australian context, the messages espoused on NPRD are that the police exist to serve the public, are paid for by public funds, support and uphold dominant public values such as law and order, and risk their lives and health for the greater public good.

All tiers of government – local, state and national - support annual police remembrance, as the public statements of federal ministers Vanstone and Williams suggest. State remembrance of an officer is part of the sacred contract between the Australian State and its service personnel. It is the same kind of reciprocal relationship the state has with its soldiers. Manning’s police funeral example highlights the effects of the mass attendance of officers and vehicles, the solemn ceremony, the collective display of concern and loss the fellow officers and other members of society experience at police funerals. Such displays serve to reassure serving officers that the state will remember them in the same way should they die in the line of duty. A recent example from the United Kingdom illustrates Manning’s analysis. The funeral of 23 year-old constable Nicola Hughes featured the mass attendance of uniformed police and was accompanied by rhetoric highlighting the dangers of policing and the risks voluntarily taken on by officers in the service of the nations’ citizens. Hughes and her fellow officer, 32 year-old Police Constable Fiona Bone, were murdered after attending a routine call to an address in 2012:
Thousands of police officers in their smart black dress uniforms and with their medals pinned to their chest lined one of Manchester's busiest streets in a striking show of respect for PC Nicola Hughes… the long, silent lines of police officers, many of whom had travelled from forces across the country, that offered the most moving tribute to the young officer… She understood that the unarmed status of British policing is not some tactical option, or us holding on to an historic tradition now out of date … [but] central to our commitment to the minimum use of force, to our relationship with the public and to serving citizens rather than controlling them as some arm of the state (Addley 2012).

In this quotation we see the rhetorical interweaving of two central elements of the ‘historic tradition’ of British policing: unarmed policing as evidence of minimal force, and a service independent of the state, both to be contrasted to contemporary criticism of excessive force (police killings) and state repression (racialised stop and search). Yet the funeral is constructed as a key moment for public display of support for police who have died on the job to confirm the police officer’s position in society. The honouring of the individual officer is intrinsically linked to the collective honouring of the force as a whole. Of course, there will be members of the community who will view the activities around police funerals and commemorations with a degree of cynicism or doubt. For Manning, this is all part of the broader drama of policing. For the most part, well-staged media presentations control public depictions of police funerals and commemorative events which reaffirm the ‘conventional meanings of police work’ (Manning 1997, p. 25). However, police funerals are not annual events. The actuality of police deaths dictates the timing and limits the direct grieving to funeral ceremonies. While in some countries, such as the United States, police deaths on duty are highly regular, this is not the case in countries like Australia. Furthermore, an annual day facilitates fundraising activities which the Blue Ribbon foundation fundraising activities which are then applied to localised ‘purposeful’ memorials such as hospital medical equipment. As these memorials are embedded in local activities and utilised on a daily basis they can be viewed as active sites of memory, constantly communicating police sacrifices. More
generally, the introduction of memorials and annual commemorative days provided a platform for the ongoing remembrance of police.

**Press Coverage National Police Remembrance Day**

Police commemorative events need good media coverage to be effective in the public arena. This section examines press, material on NPRD from its inception in 1989, until 2013. The press material is examined here in order to explore the extent of the press coverage, changes in reporting frequency, observations on reporting styles and trends including the degree in which ‘high diction’ is utilised. Increased press coverage in the later years reflects some measure of the public’s interest in NPRD but also, as the annual day, memorials and commemorative sites became more public, the press had better access both to the individuals attending and to the available imagery, rituals and ceremonies.

Like the acknowledgement of police service and sacrifice by the Australian government, the press coverage of NPRD got off to a slow and intermittent start. NPRD seems to have remained mostly an in-house police event for the first decade. Out of the four bigger state and national papers, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, *The Age*, *The Australian*, and *The Canberra Times*, only the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Canberra Times* published articles covering the inaugural NPRD. Indeed, the coverage between these four papers for the following decade (1989-98) amounted to just eighteen articles. Admittedly, this is a small press sample, obtained from microfiche, with only two states, one territory and a national newspaper. However, results do not initially improve even in searchable press databases such as *Newsbank* where just six articles were found in 1999 growing to eleven in 2000. There is, however, a noticeable increase in reporting on the NPRD after the 11 September terrorist attacks in 2001 (the attacks also sparked increased interest in federal parliament). There were thirty articles across the nation in 2001 growing to almost eighty articles in 2002. On average, sixty-two articles were published per year between 2002 and 2012. For the last decade then, NPRD has enjoyed good local and state reporting with some
articles published up to three weeks in advance and some up to a week after 29 September.

NPRD press articles changed little since 1989 in relation to their nature and format. The first two articles appearing in the *Canberra Times (Canberra Times Editorial 1989)* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* in 1989, were both modest in size and scope but remain largely indicative of the format for reporting on NPRD ceremonies, which continues to the present time. The format usually mentions the names of the officers most recently killed and the difficulties that their families have faced since their deaths. In the first *Sydney Morning Herald* article, Chief Police Reporter, Lindsay Simpson interviewed Constable Joanne Ward on the loss of her husband Constable First Class John Hedley Ward (Simpson 1989). *The Canberra Times* editorial mentioned the murder of Assistant Commissioner Colin Winchester. Historical state lists from the first available records of the names of the police dead are also commonly included. Simpson (1989) included a list of the fourteen officers listed on the memorial plaque at the Goulburn Police Academy. In later years, Australian Federal Police who died serving overseas as peace keepers or in liaison roles were also mentioned (Cronin 2000).

The reporting of the first NPRD did not suggest any significant deficit of police remembrance up until 1989. For example, the press coverage leading up to and reporting on the Welcome Home Parade for Vietnam Veterans in 1987 focussed on this belated form of recognition some fifteen years after the war had ended. However, nothing was said about the fact that it took some one hundred and fifty years for a day to be set aside for police recognition. There is no apparent evidence to suggest any prior desire emanating from the public to include a police remembrance day in the national calendar. Like Vietnam Veterans Remembrance Day, NPRD was initiated from within the serving members’ community and the NPRD emerged from an individual’s desire to remember a deceased officer’s name and perhaps too, from a general feeling of public neglect from within the force.

In his speech at a 1995 NPRD ceremony, The New South Wales Police Commissioner, Anthony Lauer, suggested that previous NPRD ceremonies had
been small events attracting little public attention. Lauer’s comments supports what the press research has already indicated relating to the lack of public interests or awareness in NPRD. Commissioner Lauer said the day had been given ‘special prominence’ due to four police fatalities in that year (Harris 1995). In light of Lauer’s claim that NPRD received ‘special prominence’, it should be noted, that *The Australian* was the only significant newspaper to publish an article on NPRD in 1995.

Trudy Harris, reporting for *The Australian*, said: ‘despite the revelations on the NSW Royal Commission, not all police officers are corrupt. National Police Remembrance Day honours those whose dedication cost them their lives.’ This article was the first to explicitly mention allegations of corruption in a report on the NPRD. The Reverend Harry Herbert also made the connection at the Goulburn Police Academy in 1997 contrasting corruption to service and sacrifice: ‘…headlines surrounding the Police Royal Commission had dented public confidence in the police, but “every reasonable person” realised the difficulties faced by those in service’ (Clennell 1997).

By 2002, police notice an increase of public participation at some annual events. At Blue Ribbon Day in Melbourne in 2002, Chief Commissioner Christine Nixon was moved to say: ‘There is no denying that we are the people's police and it's times like this that prove just how highly police are thought of by Victorians’ (*Mornington Peninsula Leader* Editorial 2002).

In one Queensland police station, an officer told the press that:

members of the public dropped into the station to shake hands and thank us for the job we do. Residents and businesses generally wanting to show their support made numerous phone calls to local police stations. [One officer noted:] In my 11 years as a general duties police officer I have never encountered such support (*Gold Coast Bulletin* Editorial 2002).

Press reporting of annual police remembrance days has raised public awareness of police deaths and the risks members of the Australian police forces face. However, it is difficult to measure the impact of such days on police legitimacy.
Segments of the Australian public increasingly expressed their appreciation of police in the wake of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks and press reporting consistently provides good coverage. Since then, while the NPRD press profile improved, it is still well short of the magnitude of public support and prominence the military enjoys on Anzac Day, Remembrance Day and other military commemorative events.

**Military Reflections**

As discussed in Chapter One, the police and the military share many common bonds because they both share the task of defending the community albeit in different ways. It is perhaps not surprising then that their commemorative activities have commonalities. Indeed, at various times and places in Australia’s history, many police and in particular senior police were ex-military up until the Second World War (Finnane 2005; Haldane 1995; Palmer 2012). Police uniforms and roles are clearly defined as distinct from the military from the twentieth century. However, the development of special police military type units and also the adoption of military hardware and the deployment of police into war zones as peacekeepers blur many of these distinctions. These ideas are explored in works such as Jude McCulloch’s book *Blue Army* (McCulloch 2001). Michael Salter also discusses the blurring of distinctions in his article on military technology and policing, where he argues that ‘since the mass media became saturated with heroic images of the warrior cop in the 1980s, police have exhibited a strong attraction to military fashion, tactics and hardware.’ Moreover, there is ‘a longstanding trend towards the militarisation of policing in Australia and overseas’ (Salter 2013). While the post Second World War trend was to demilitarise the police by introducing non-military commanders, less military-like uniforms, and moving away from military titles, from the 1980s there emerged a reversion to elements of militarism within policing. This is also evident in the development of police memorials and other remembrance activities mirroring military commemoration such as marching, the use of flags and the rhetorical highlighting of sacrifice.
When it comes to police commemorative and remembrance activities and events, the rhetoric published in the press and from politicians, civic leaders and the various related organisations, discussed below, clearly link the police and the military. In addition, sporting events such as, the special Australian Rules Football (AFL) game on Anzac Day and the annual AFL Blue Ribbon Cup, held in remembrance of constables Silk and Miller, murdered by gunmen in 1998 (discussed in Chapter Four) commemorates both military and police deaths. The three important elements of NPRD, as set out by Inspector John O’Gorman above (p. 4), are very similar to the main elements of Anzac Day. Indeed his comments ‘…that police have no hesitation in doing what needs to be done’ suggests some mythologising which is also typical of Anzac Day rhetoric (Cairns Post Editorial 2002). The rhetoric from some members of the Australian Parliament on the first NPRD made explicit connections between soldiering and policing. The parliamentary speeches by Williams and Vanstone cited above set the tone for police commemoration that from the outset has military connotations. Williams and Vanstone state ‘police fight a war on a day-by-day basis against those who bring violence to society…’ This perception continued well into the twenty-first century. On NPRD 2001, the then Governor General, Peter Hollingworth, described Victoria Police personnel as ‘imbued’ with the same values which are often associated with Australian soldiers in relation to the Anzac legend such as ‘courage, valour, bravery, self-sacrifice’ (Hollingworth 2001). The Victoria Police Chaplin Jim Pilmer, at the funeral of Senior Constable Anthony Hogarth-Clarke in 2005, stated that the constable’s death was ‘in the spirit of Anzac’; and all officers who ‘sacrifice their lives do so’ in the same spirit (Associtation Journal Editorial 2005). In 2008, Minister Tony Zappia (South Australia) argued that: ‘when the men and women of our defence forces enlist, we quite rightly commend them for putting their lives on the line in order to make our lives safer. Likewise, so do the men and women of the police departments of our nation’ (Zappia 2008).

The Northcote (a Melbourne suburb) Returned and Services League (RSL) erected and paid for a special flagpole and plaque ‘to recognise the service police performed in the community’. Northcote RSL President John Farrell, said: ‘it was a reflection of the unique relationship between the police and the RSL. There is a
kinship in regards to services, there is a kinship there with the police and the armed forces…’ (Northcote Leader Editorial 2000). Bacchus March RSL members swapped ‘poppies’ for ‘blue ribbons’ to help raise money for Victoria Police Blue Ribbon Day’ (Melton Leader Editorial 2001). This final example makes the connection clear. In 2012, the Northern Territory Police Commissioner John McRoberts, stated: ‘National Police Remembrance Day is the police equivalent of Anzac Day. It is a day when all members of the Northern Territory Police both serving and retired, their families and the wider community should pause and reflect on the dangers of police work and those Northern Territory Police Officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice’ (The Drum 2012).

When we look more closely at the early days of NPRD we can see there were similar aims and purposes to military commemoration: to remember the dead; to re-affirm to the national community the value of the service; the dangerousness of the occupation; and the need to support grieving family and friends. Some of these aims implicitly support police legitimacy such as the value of service in a dangerous profession. The links with military commemoration are hardly surprising given the similar nature of the work and the propensity for martial ceremony both services demonstrate. The building of memorials and the enactment of rituals around them is now also a commonality between the two services. While these examples are indicative of the shared narratives of sacrifice, there is also a similar propensity to distinguish between types of casualties.

**Police and Military ‘Casualties’**

Police and military memorialisation and commemorative practices most often concentrate on the deceased casualties because one of the overt purposes of police memorials is to remember the sacrifices of the dead by placing names on the memorials. Non-fatal casualties are often mentioned at commemorative services but are not memorialised in the same permanent way that the dead are. Thus, we can see that police memorials speak more to the ‘ultimate sacrifice’ than service. In relation to war, the term ‘casualty’ includes fatalities as well as any physical or psychological injuries service personnel incur. There are always many more physical or psychological injuries in combat than there are deaths. However,
Alistair Thompson’s work on First World War veterans reveals that it is the dead that are most often remembered in military commemorations. The physically wounded and psychologically injured are downplayed or overlooked; their names are rarely listed on war memorials (Thomson 1994). In contrast, Police Chaplain Gordon Bradbury suggests, in a press report, that NPRD is about more than those who have died. However, like war memorials, police memorials list only those who have died on duty:

The senior constable was not killed in the line of duty but the line of duty killed him. Injured while protecting the community, the officer never recovered from his pain and was unable to return to work. To ease his suffering he turned to alcohol and painkillers which eventually killed him… Tragically the officer's story was all too common… A culmination of painkillers and alcohol took their toll on his health and he died… But his story is not uncommon… Police Remembrance Day isn't just about people who have died in dramatic circumstances… but [also] those who died from the day to day trauma of policing… Police witness the worst of humanity… We watched the tragedy of the New York terrorist attacks on television and it had a profound impact on everyone… in lots of ways the NSW police witness that sort of thing day in and day out. Trauma is trauma and every day trauma eats away at individuals (Bradbury quoted in Woolage 2001).

In reality, physically or psychologically injured service personnel often receive less attention at police and military commemorative services. Furthermore, although seriously injured service personnel have had their lives irreversibly changed, perhaps discharged from service, and endure continued suffering throughout their lives they are not memorialised like those who were killed. Retired Senior Victoria Police Chapin, Jim Pilmer, thinks there is room for improvement regarding the recognition and remembrance of non-fatal police casualties but is not sure exactly what such remembrance might entail. However, Pilmer does not think building more stone monuments is the answer. He argues:

…If you think of those members who were injured in that explosion a few weeks ago who will have injuries for the rest of their lives, severe
scars, a couple of those members have quite life altering injuries. You would have to say that they will eventually fade away into the background and their service and sacrifice won’t be remembered… There is varying degrees of that of course. There are some members who try to scale a fence and almost castrate themselves because they are not fit (Pilmer interview 2014).

Pilmer explained that the degree of injuries could differ greatly with some receiving minor wounds from various activities and those who come off their motorbikes, lose a leg thus ending their service. This can be very difficult for those who see the police service as their only vocation ‘… and we don’t sort of recognise that or respect it. Many police define themselves by their role, when they leave they lose something of themselves and their identity starts to fritter away’. He suggests that police ‘probably need to recognise service more than death or injury on memorials’ (Pilmer interview 2014).

Deceased police members are treated differently to non-fatal casualties because only the names of the dead are listed on police memorials. Benedict Anderson suggests that ‘dying for one’s country, which usually one does not choose, assumes a moral grandeur’ (Anderson 1991, p. 144); the ‘ultimate sacrifice’. Pilmer suggest the focus of police memorialisation could be broader and more inclusive of the different kinds of damaging effects police service can inflict upon officers. As previously mentioned, memorials that do not list the dead are potentially more inclusive because individuals and the specific effects on them, from the dangers of policing, are not highlighted.

**Dangers of Police Work**

The early policing scholarship highlighted the manner in which the idea of the dangerousness of police work is central to the formation of the police officer’s ‘working personality’ (Skolnick JH 1966) or broader police culture (Reiner 1985, p. 87). As Reiner suggests, there are dangerous jobs where the risk of a work

---

2 January, 2014: three Victoria Police officers were critically injured from an explosion after responding to a disturbance in a second story flat in Melbourne.
related death might be higher than police work. The risk of injury to police from members of the public varies from place to place but the risk is always present. Their position as an authority figure exacerbates the danger (Reiner 1985, p. 87). The risk of death and injury are closely associated with both military and policing work. Both services tend to play down such risks when it comes to recruiting documentation but in contrast highlight them during annual remembrance days (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, p. 5). Recruitment efforts might be curtailed if organisations like the police and military graphically highlighted the potential dangers recruits might have to experience. At times, the Police Association and police unions highlight the problem of violence against police to pursue better wages and working conditions. The battered faces of two officers injured in the line of duty appeared on mobile billboards around Melbourne to bolster public support for better wages and conditions (Levy 2011; Wilkinson & McArthur 2011).

Highlighting the risks faced by police officers also became a common trend in press reports and political speeches made in relation to NPRD (Age Editorial 1997; Canberra Times Editorial 1989, 1998; Clennell 1997; Debus 2008; Ellison 2001a; Keenan 2010; Simpson 1989; Williams 1999). Generally, the dangers of the profession are remarked upon after reports of an officer’s death. The loss of an officer is often placed in the context of how many police have been killed in the last year or over the state or nation’s policing history. For example, in 1998, the Australian Federal Police Commissioner Mick Palmer mentioned the killing of Senior Constable Rodney Miller and Sergeant Gary Silk in August of that year as an example of the kind of dangers police officers face (Newman 1998). In 1999, Palmer reiterated the dangers of policing and added that ‘… it was sometimes easy for people to under-estimate or even ignore the risks police frequently faced in upholding the law’ (Webb 1999).

There was, however, one statement by Sergeant Garry Dunne, Trustee of the Police Association of NSW, which seems to run counter to what developed in subsequent press reporting on the NPRD. In the context of funding and the dangers of police work: ‘Sergeant Dunne said that it should never be the expectation of the community that a police officer should place his life in danger
and pay the ultimate price’ (Simpson 1989). Senator Tate suggests something quite different in his 1989 speech in Canberra: ‘… there could be no better models than those police officers who have chosen a career of danger and peril in order that we might live in a civilised society’ (Canberra Times Editorial 1989). A few years later, NSW Police Commissioner Ryan, suggested that the sacrifice made by police killed while on duty was: ‘… the foundation stone on which the community places its faith in our police service’ (Clennell 1997).

Many press article titles, from various press outlets, suggest that volunteering for the police force is signing on to put one’s self in danger. Putting officers in danger with the expectation that some might be killed seems to be the epitome of the ‘ultimate sacrifice’. For example, headlines such as ‘Death came in the Line of Duty’ (Riley 1990); ‘Tribute to Officers killed in the Line of Duty’ (Lamont 1998); ‘Policeman’s Lot Pondered as Fallen Remembered’ (Webb 1999); ‘Police Pay Tribute to Lives Sacrificed’ (Lane 1999); ‘When real life is their life-or-death’ (Macarthur Chronicle Editorial 2002), suggest that facing the danger of death or injury is the police officer’s ‘lot’. In their work on murdered and assaulted Victoria Police, Gavin Brown et al (1994) suggest that ‘police murders are the nadir of policing’ (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, p. 4). They argue that the potential for the deliberate killing of police and the occasional public realisation of that fact significantly contributes to the ethos of police organisations. Moreover, the deliberate killing of police officers reduces a public’s confidence in safety and security. That is, many people feel that if the police are not safe then who is (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, p. 5)?

However, the commemoration and memorialisation practices create the political spaces for alternative or competing narratives. At the first NPRM ceremony, Sergeant Dunne suggested that mere acknowledgment of the dangers police face ‘does not go far enough’. Dunne raised the issue of adequate funding and support for police to minimise these dangers (Simpson 1989). In later years, the issues relating to the dangers of the job persist as this 2011 headline suggests: ‘Victoria Police just Dying to Do Well’ (Howe 2011). In this article, Victoria Police senior management are accused of being out of touch with the risks the lower ranks face on a daily basis: ‘the chief commissioner is paid the highest salary; the constables
most often pay the highest price’ (Howe 2011). In this way, rather than police unity we see the classic division between ‘street’ and ‘suite’ cops (Reuss-Ianni & Ianni 1983).

In later NPRD ceremonies this sentiment remained largely focused on the tragic loss and sacrifice. The Queensland South-East Region assistant Commissioner Kathy Rynders said 130 officers had died in Queensland while serving and the police service acknowledged they had paid a price far too high: ‘We acknowledge the dangers police face every day while carrying out their duties… Danger is an inevitable part of policing’ (Albert & Logan News Editorial 2002). One young constable had no regrets about becoming a police officer but admitted that: ‘every job has the potential to blow up in your face … Every situation you go to, you never know who's on the other side of the door.’ Kingaroy Sergeant Ron Reynolds recalled three deadly situations in twenty-two and a half years of service. In one situation, he stood between a man waving a machete and a knife at the man’s intended target. While incidents like that sometimes made Sgt Reynolds question his policing future, he said his ‘heart was still in it’ (Walsh 2002).

While we have focussed on the dangers to police, there is also the issue of dangers caused by police, such as police shooting of citizens, discussed in Chapter Five. In short, some citizens claim too much focus is on the dangers police face and too little written about the dangers police create at times during their work. For one Northern Territory citizen the statistics published in the Northern Territory News were incomplete because they did not include the number of deaths that the police had caused in the period since 1883 (Friel 2000). Dragana Kesic et al discuss the dangers of police encounters with mentally ill people and the high percentage of citizen fatalities that occur from these encounters (Kesic, Thomas & Ogloff 2010). The damaged caused by policing in Australia or by the Australian military on overseas deployment are never mentioned at commemorative ceremonies. This is because speeches at remembrance days focus on the positive elements of these services requiring the forgetting of events with negative connotations as well as remembering actions
that edify the services. An important part of this process is the language adopted by the press and politicians on these commemorative days.

**High Diction**

One of the ways that police and military deaths are elevated above ordinary citizen deaths is the use of ‘high diction’ in political rhetoric and press reporting. There is the tendency to use high diction when describing police fatalities in the same way that Paul Fussell (1975) describes the use of high diction in relation to military deaths. For example, instead of using words such as ‘killed’ or ‘dead’ the words ‘fallen’ or ‘ultimate sacrifice’ are used elevating the concept of an ordinary to death to dying for a greater cause such as the nation and softens the language to make it less confronting. Fussell explains that for at least two decades before the First World War, readers were accustomed to this special diction associating it with ‘the quiet action of personal control and Christian self-abnegation (“sacrifice”), as well as with more violent actions of aggression and defence.’ The main literary influences on this generation were the works of George Alfred Henty, Rider Haggard, Robert Bridges and Alfred Lord Tennyson. By the end of the War, few persisted with high diction in their private letters or common language because the harsh realities of that conflict largely quashed such romanticism. Nevertheless, Fussell was surprised at the resilience of the old language, as it was still evident in some late war letters and poems (Fussell 1975, pp. 22-4). The longevity of the language is still evident in military commemorative speeches and memorial inscriptions. High diction was largely absent from the two initial press articles on NPRD. The *Sydney Morning Herald* and *Canberra Times* articles use the words ‘killed’ and ‘dead’ in relation to police officer fatalities. However, from 1997 high diction phrases start to appear in the press: ‘fallen colleagues’, ‘fallen comrades’, and ‘fallen honoured’, ‘fallen police’, ‘fallen officers’, or ‘the fallen’. The ‘ultimate sacrifice’ or ‘supreme sacrifice’ (*Canberra Times* Editorial 1998) are also high diction phrases common to many press articles on NPRD. ‘Feloniously slain’ (*Herald Sun* Editorial 2001) is a high diction term particular to policing which denotes that the officer was murdered.
High diction is also evident in *Hansard*, political speeches and press releases. For example, some extracts from a speech made by Member of Parliament, Nola Marino³, made are typical examples of Parliamentary high diction: ‘ultimate sacrifice … reflect on the sacrifices they have made while serving the community… honour fallen colleagues …’ (Marino 2011). Like Anzac Day, NPRD singles out, honours and makes sacred the deaths of those who sacrificed their lives in the nation’s service. The special language of high diction helps to distinguish between those who died serving the community as police or soldiers and those who died ordinary deaths. It is evident from these samples of press coverage and political speeches that high diction is common to both military and police commemorative language.

In sum, this overview chronicled the development of police commemorative days and the political and press responses to it. The examination showed that since the late 1980s, Australian police commemoration has evolved from individual orientated and *ad hoc* police funerals and military remembrance ceremonies, to developing its own well-established and clearly separate annual rituals. Remembrance of officers killed in the line of duty is important for many serving officers and their families both in relation to dealing with grief and for recognition of the continual risks taken by police on behalf of the community. However, as with military commemoration, police commemoration often highlights fatal casualties over survivors who have been injured and traumatised. The special language, ‘high diction’, describes these deaths as ‘ultimate sacrifices’ suggesting death as the worst possible outcome from the potential dangers of police work. Moreover, that these deaths are sacred because they occurred performing the scared task of protecting the community. Press reporting and parliamentary speeches equate police deaths with military deaths attaching the same sacred value and need for government and public recognition. Thus, police commemorative practices that emerged after 1989 solidified into annual public rituals around a host of relativity new memorials at police sacred sites that begin to be built a decade later (1999).

---
³ Member for the Forrest electorate.
The Australian National Police Memorial

The Australian National Police Memorial was dedicated on Police Remembrance Day 2006. National memorials, be they military or otherwise, represent a nation as an extended community. Like most memorials of this size and stature, its emergence was the culmination of significant funding and human effort, including some twenty years of ‘Police Union lobbying’ (Williams 2006b). It was Prime Minister John Howard, who consented to a national police memorial in 2001. Senator Chris Ellison (Minister for Justice and Customs) announced the decision to construct the National Police Memorial in the same year. The idea to build such a memorial emerged from the Australasian Police Ministers Council. According to Ellison’s press release, the ‘Council’s resolution to build the memorial was fully supported by the Commonwealth Government and all [the governments from the] States and Territories. Ellison said that the memorial would be a significant and lasting symbol to honour those police officers who have given their lives to protect the Australian community from harm’ (Ellison 2001b).

The site for the memorial was chosen and announced in 2004, having already taken into account pre-existing and numerous military and non-military memorials and buildings of national significance in the national capital. According to Jim Lloyd (Minister for Local Government, Territories and Roads), the memorial site at King’s Park, near the National Carillon, was chosen because it was in keeping with development of that area for commemorating ‘non-military sacrifice, service and achievement’ (Ellison & Loyd 2004). The estimated cost of $2.4 million was ‘to be shared equally by the Australian and State and Territory Governments and Police Associations; $800,000 from each branch of Government and $800,000 from the Police Associations’ (Ellison & Loyd 2004). Development of the memorial involved input from an inclusive range of police services and public servant stakeholders. The Australasian Police Minister’s Council (APMC) formed a representative Steering Committee ‘to oversee the funding, design and construction of the memorial’ (Design Competition 2005). The Steering Committee was made up of six senior police executives and one senior executive from the National Capital Authority (NCA) that consulted with
‘all Australian police services, the Police Federation of Australia and Police Legacy organisations’ (Ellison & Loyd 2004).

Brisbane firm Fairweather Proberts Architects (Williams 2006a) designed the memorial which was chosen from 77 design proposals submitted for the National Police Memorial Design Competition ran by the National Capital Authority (NCA), which also managed the development of the memorial on behalf of the APMC. The competition was open to all professional design companies and individuals with suitable interests and qualifications and involved a $15,000 first prize (Design Competition 2005).

Submissions needed to address various stipulated guidelines pertaining to the memorial’s purpose, form, design intent and symbolic and heritage context. Under the subheading ‘The Fallen’, the competition materials stated that the names of the more than 700 dead officers also needed incorporation into the memorial with provision for many more names. In this way, the design guidelines had already established the positioning of the memorial as needing to adopt a materialisation of high diction. The written design materials assert that: ‘…the Australian public is very sensitive to the loss of police service personnel. In many instances there is a national public grieving process involved. This memorial will provide a national focus for those affected by this ultimate sacrifice’ (Design Competition 2005).

Thus, the purpose of the memorial is to commemorate all Australian police officers (including Federal Police)

who have been killed on duty or have died as a result of their duties and recognise the police contribution to the Australian community…[including elements of policing such as]: courage, duty and integrity; the perpetual need to serve the community; its unpredictable nature; the strength, unity and common purpose of police; and its local, national and international aspects’ (Design Competition 2005).

The printed guidelines, further expanded these concepts for the designers. In particular, the memorial’s design themes had to incorporate the courage needed to
face the dangers of police work, and the honour, integrity and camaraderie of police officers. The guidelines also suggested the memorial must represent the connections between policing and the public’s ‘evolving values’ through ‘an interpretation and celebration of the vital role of police men and women within, for and with the support of the Australian community. Memorial design proposals should reflect that role, being welcoming and also providing a sense of security for the community’ (Design Competition 2005).

Prospective designers were given considerable scope in relation to artistic methods and materials that could be used. However, some restrictions regarding to the degree of abstractness in the memorial’s design were stipulated. For example the guidelines suggested that the memorial’s design ‘should not be totally abstract…the memorial may be perceived to be abstract from a distance but must be visually and intellectually accessible to lay people on closer inspection’ (Design Competition 2005). Writing on war memorials, Winter argues that abstract design ‘could express anger and despair’ but was not a common feature of First World War memorials because it was not conducive to the healing process (Winter 1995, p. 5). Given the choice, most Australian Vietnam Veterans state a preference for traditional memorial forms such as statues or weapons. These types of traditional symbols are more direct representations of military occupations considered to be more accessible for many veterans (Linke 2009). Despite the guidelines, the Police Memorial is devoid of traditional representations and appears to be ‘totally abstract.’

The national panel of judges described the final design as having ‘…the potential to create a powerful symbolic statement, which would challenge common preconceptions of the memorial wall’ (National Memorial 2005). The chosen design features a 27m long, 2m high wall with 1200 small cast bronze ‘touchstone’ plaques, with some 730 inscribed with the names of dead officers (Williams 2006b). Walls of remembrance have become common as a memorial design possibly because they are a practical way to display the names of the dead. Indeed, walls of remembrance are features of the South Australian, West Australian, New South Wales, and to a degree the Victorian State police memorials. The National Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington has inspired
many war and non-war memorials since its construction in 1982. Washington’s Vietnam memorial has over 50,000 names of dead solders engraved onto a black granite wall, which descends into the earth in a ‘V’ shape. Relatives and friends of the dead often touch the names, and in doing so see their reflection – which provides a symbolic connection with the deceased (Hass 1998). The New South Wales State Police Memorial, emulated the Washington memorial by utilising the reflective qualities of black granite.

The National Police Memorial is sunk into the ground. However, instead of using the visitor’s reflection in black granite to connect the living with the dead, the National Police Memorial utilises touchstone plaques. The area in front of the National Police Memorial wall is a downward-sloping granite floor engraved with comments and quotes from deceased officers, surviving family members, and fellow serving officers. These comments are connected to the names on the touchstone plaques via diagonal lines carved into the floor (Williams 2006b). The designers suggest that:

> on moving towards the touchstone wall the visitor moves slightly deeper into the earth and arrives at a flatter more comfortable space where a sense of enclosure and safety is experienced. …Here the warmth and texture of the wall invite a touching where the visitor can experience a physical connection to one who has been lost (Proberts Architects 2005).

Perhaps one of the most poignant aspects of the memorial is the presence of some 500 blank touchstones waiting to be filled with the names of officers who will be killed on duty in the future.

Just as memorial site location is central to understanding military memorials and their ability to become active sites of memory, the site chosen for the memorial at King’s Park reflects the national commemorative intention for the memorial. It takes its place alongside other national commemorative sites, such as the Emergency Services Memorial, and the National Carillon. It is only a short walk to Anzac Parade and the Australian War Memorial, the nation’s war commemoration precinct. The memorial’s designer had to ensure their designs did
not detract from the current installations and the bush-like plantings and
landscaped surroundings of King’s Park. The King’s Park site is also part of the
Parliament House Vista and is on the Commonwealth Heritage List. King’s Park
is part of the Central Basin Parklands, which the city’s designer, Walter Burley
Griffin, designed as a continuous waterfront public domain (Design Competition
2005).

A connection between one of the older sites of Griffin’s plan, Old Parliament
House, and the new police memorial was evident at the memorial’s dedication.
The National Police Memorial dedication began with 700 uniformed police
officers from all of Australia’s police forces, marching from the Old Parliament
House to the memorial site. At the site, the uniformed officers formed an honour
guard at the foreshore of Lake Burley Griffon, to receive Prime Minister John
Howard who arrived at the dedication on the police launch Ron Grey, which
represented the oldest form of policing in Australia (Williams 2006a). A water
operations officer from each jurisdiction accompanied him on the vessel. As
nightfall began, police aircraft commenced a flyover and the Prime Minister
started his speech. After acknowledging the pain and loss of the bereaved
families, friends and colleagues, the Prime Minister ‘spoke of a society which had
taken its police services for granted’ (Williams 2006a). In short, he suggested that
whenever there is an accident, a disaster, a crime, or other disturbances such as
anti-social behaviour, then Australians expect the police will always be there.
Thus, the Prime Minister was suggesting gratitude from the Australian
community was lacking. He argued that ‘on an occasion such as this, the entire
community should recognise and give thanks to the dedication and integrity and
the commitment of Australia’s police in protecting and in helping others’
(Williams 2006a).

The dedication featured the usual ceremonial elements common to most memorial
dedications, such as the presence of police chaplains, flag parties, and placing of
wreaths. Representatives of the various police unions and associations, state
premiers, and police ministers for all states and territories, and police
commissioners for the respective police forces placed wreaths at the memorial
wall. The Prime Minister also laid a wreath on behalf of the nation, accompanied
by two eight-year-old children who were the relatives of deceased officers. Other children of deceased officers also played prominent roles in the ceremony when they accompanied police chaplains to place lit candles at the wall’s base. On completion of the national memorial as an established remembrance site, Chris Ellison stated that:

the memorial will become a unique place for commemoration of and reflection on Australian policing and will recognise the significant Police contribution to the Australian community… The Memorial will recognise the unique nature of policing duties and the dangers that all police face every day… It will become a significant and lasting symbol to honour police who have made the ultimate sacrifice (Ellison & Loyd 2004).

Mark Burgess, a memorial Steering Committee member, and Chief Executive Officer of the Police Federation of Australia stated that ‘…it won’t be just police visitors – it’ll be visitors from all walks of life. And when people see the number of names, the inherent dangers of policing will hit home to them, as will the sacrifices police make every day’ (Williams 2006b). Jim Pilmer argued that the memorial helped all Australian police to think of themselves with a ‘national identity rather than a state one…It took some of the parochialism out of local police forces…states and territories…and put policing on a national level…for the symbolic reasons that it was close to the houses of parliament, and in Canberra…but it meant that there was a unity of policing across the nation…and that was a good thing’ (Pilmer interview 2014).

**Concluding Comments**

Significant police commemoration and memorialisation in Australia began in the late twentieth century and continues to develop. The idea for a national commemorative day emanated first from an individual police officer who saw a need for a special annual day that would help facilitate police and public remembrance of officers killed in the line of duty. The narrative utilised was quasi-military, particularly in the use of high diction. Australasian Chief
Commissioners supported and developed the idea into a national remembrance day with its own annual rituals that in many ways reflect and borrow from pre-existing Australian military commemorative activities. So although NPRD can be seen as developing from both the bottom up and from the top down, its final incarnation was one that was largely dominated by the higher echelons of police executive management. NPRD closely shadows military commemoration with marches to memorial sites, and with the use of the special commemorative language, high diction, by politicians and press reporters.

The Australian federal government acknowledgment and support was, initially lukewarm, but significantly increased after the September 11 terrorist attacks as the Australian public looked increasingly to non-military public services for protection. The Australian government reinforced these notions by consistently acknowledging NPRD and helping to fund police memorial building. The media also significantly increased reports on NPRD after the September 11 terrorist attacks and developed particular formulaic stories emphasising the service and sacrifices made by police.

As symbolic representations of policing, memorials serve as a permanent public reminder of the dangers police face in order to help keep the public safe. Police memorialisation, commemoration and remembrance attempt to strengthen the relationship between police and the community, which is at the heart of police legitimacy. However, despite significant increases in public awareness and acknowledgment, the public popularity of police remembrance still falls far short of the kind displayed toward the Australian military services.

World events, such as the September 11 terrorist attacks, nationalistic sentiment propagated by various state and federal governments, the Western emphasis on commemoration and remembrance have all shaped the emergence of police memorials in Australia in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Local communities also continue to memorialise those police officers that were important to them and these local expressions, often-small memorials, exist alongside expressions from larger collectives such as the national memorial. Indeed, it was local sentiment in response to the killing of Victoria Police officers
that has largely driven police memorialisation in Victoria, which we now examine.
Chapter Three: Victoria Police Memorialisation

Introduction

The previous chapter provided an overview of how police remembrance and memorialisation produced dedicated days and dedicated sites of remembrance. The chapter examined the development of National Police Remembrance Day and Blue Ribbon Day and the National Police Memorial and how these special days and memorial appropriated military commemorative customs. Politicians and the press, and to a lesser degree the general public, increasingly acknowledged police remembrance. What emerged was a national remembrance framework in which police from all Australian states and territories now participate.

This chapter examines in detail the development of Victoria Police memorialisation, commemoration and remembrance from its beginning in the late nineteenth century until current times. As this chapter identifies, the analysis of police memorialisation benefits significantly from detailed historical research concerned with the longue durée, contextualising the emergence of the state memorial examined in detail in Chapter Four. Although official annual police remembrance did not emerge until the late 1980s in Victoria, examining the antecedent memory work reveals a significant amount of ad hoc and reactionary remembrance nuances particular to police commemoration in this state. The focus for this thesis is specifically on memorials and collective remembrance and commemorations that transcend individuals and funerary practices to deliver positive messages about policing to the public. To that end, this chapter examines, in the Victorian context, one of the key themes: that of appropriating military customs to honour lives given in service to the state.

Victoria Police memorialisation begins officially in 1880 with the creation of the Mansfield Police Memorial, twenty-seven years after the Victorian Government passed the Police Regulation Act that established Victoria Police in 1853. The
memorial is dedicated to three police officers killed by notorious bushrangers, the Kelly Gang, at Stringybark Creek, near Mansfield in 1878, which is further discussed below. Central to this chapter is the long-standing symbiosis between the memorialisation of these three police officers and the ongoing contestation from ‘counter-narratives’, of sacrifice pertaining to the historically romanticised ‘Kelly gang’ and their criminal activities in North Eastern Victoria, known as the ‘Kelly outbreak’. The Mansfield Police Memorial signals more than just the beginning of police memorialisation in this state. It was also one of the first memorials to honour men who ‘fell’ in service to the state, a term most often associated with military memorials in Australia. The 1880s were a time when the Australian colonies were looking for Australian heroes to define the emerging national character. Dying for King and country was part of the early social values in the colonies and thus, the memorial is linked to early remembrance practices, hinting towards how the nation will come to honour its military dead by listing the names of the ‘fallen’ on public memorials. Death in service to the state is a salient social value in Australia, but remembrance of the officers’ deaths at Stringybark Creek is contested by remembrance of the man who killed them. Ned Kelly, leader of the Kelly gang, was a convicted criminal – a ‘cop killer’ who, for reasons discussed below, also became a broadly accepted Australian ‘folk hero’. The ‘agents of memory’ have fought a long-running ‘history war’ over who the heroes were at Stringybark Creek, either the police or Ned Kelly. In the end, the protagonists in this history war, through literature, memorialisation, commemoration, re-enactment and other forms of agency, such as folk songs, film and television, have transcended the historical dichotomies creating a symbiotic remembrance of Kelly and the police he killed. Highlighting remembrance of one without evoking remembrance of the other is not possible. Moreover, both the police and Kelly have become part of the nation’s founding myths. For what eventually emerged as national characteristics were reviled by the merging of two iconic myths: the ‘Digger myth’ relating to Australia’s brave volunteer soldiers from the First World War, and the bushman myths relating to the resourceful, egalitarian early pioneers.

Some of the first examples of this symbiosis emerging are evident in the development of Victoria Police Museum from 1902. Victoria Police Museum,
although not a memorial, is a site of remembrance and has a specific purpose to convey the ‘material culture’ of policing through the displaying of objects and artefacts associated both with policing and criminals. The museum is an early example of police memory work, but was initially developed as an aid to police training and not open to the public except on special occasions. The success of these special exhibitions led to a permanent public museum. From the museum’s beginning, exhibits relating to the Kelly outbreak have been, and still are, main attractions. Showcasing the story of the Kelly outbreak provides an opportunity for Victoria Police to provide its perspective of events but necessarily evokes remembrance of its nemesis, Ned Kelly.

As previously discussed in Chapter Two, military commemoration is an important part of Australian national identity and police remembrance has close connections to military remembrance. This close relationship is demonstrated in Victoria with the emergence of special police known as Shrine Guards. The Shrine Guards were specially recruited in 1934 to protect the state’s most important military memorial, the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance, dedicated initially to the State’s First World War dead and now honouring all of the State’s war dead in all conflicts. The examination of these officers and their activities provides an important example of how police have appropriated some elements of military commemoration. Created to specifically guard the shrine, and partake in military commemorations, the Shrine Guards, by osmosis, have also become a standard feature of police annual remembrance ceremonies, rituals and other commemorative activities.

Honouring those who have died in service to the state is one of the central elements of police remembrance practises and the death of some officers, often in tragic circumstances, has inspired construction of most police memorials discussed throughout this thesis. However, the second police memorial constructed in Victoria was dedicated to the service of some of the state’s earliest policing formations, known as pioneer police, rather than to the death of any particular officers. The Pioneer Police Memorial was dedicated at the site of one of the first police stations of the 1850s, known as the Dandenong Police Paddocks, in Melbourne’s outer eastern suburbs, on 27 February 1972. This
memorial is an example of police memorialisation without the catalyst of a tragic police death.

Annual police remembrance and commemorative rituals involving memorials did not emerge in Victoria until the late 1980s when Chief Police Commissioner Mick Miller (1977-1987), helped formalise police commemoration by initiating the creation of the first official ‘Deaths of Serving Members’ list. The list of deceased officers formed the first honour board displayed in Victoria Police Headquarters. These early lists were also used in the next significant police site of memory, the Victoria Police Chapel, dedicated in 1988. This impressive chapel contains the names of all Victoria Police who have died on duty in various circumstances, and also offers the families of deceased non-sworn members the opportunity to have their loved one listed as well. The chapel is known as the spiritual heart of Victoria Police remembrance and is an ‘active site of memory’ being utilised for various annual and one-off commemorative events and remembrance ceremonies, including police funerals. However, although all faiths are welcome in the chapel, it is a Christian church and some police members, of other faiths, might feel uncomfortable in this environment. Moreover, the chapel is located on the police grounds of the Police Academy and lacks the kind of public access which was later desired to enact annual police remembrance events as public spectacle. The following year, 1989, was the first National Police Remembrance Day and the Victoria Police Chapel formed the nucleus of the ceremonies until the later development of the state memorial.

The deliberate killing of two young police officers in 1998 was the catalyst for the emergence of the state’s official police memorial in 2002. Full discussion of this memorial, and the events leading to it, is reserved for Chapter Four. However, the deaths of these two officers also inspired an unsolicited privately funded police memorial to both honour the two officers and all other officers who died in the line of duty. The Necropolis Police Memorial was entirely funded by the private company which owned and ran the Springvale Botanical Cemetery, the site of the memorial, in the outer South Eastern suburbs of Melbourne. Victoria Police were consulted during the memorial’s development and took part in its dedication ceremony. In essence, this memorial served not to facilitate large public
ceremonies but was designed as a place for families, colleagues and friends of the deceased to grieve and contemplate. Victoria Police were invited to become a partner in the construction of this memorial but declined the offer because it had police personnel working on developing its own state police memorial and was searching for a prominent public location to construct it, as discussed in Chapter Four.

At this point we return to the developing symbiosis between Victoria Police remembrance and the Kelly legacy. In 2001, Victoria Police constructed a second memorial to honour the three officers killed at Stringybark Creek in 1878. This time, the memorial was constructed in bushland near the site of the shootings. Part of the motivation to construct this memorial was an attempt to reconcile the two diverging stories of the Kelly outbreak, bringing the descendants of the three deceased police officers and of the Kelly gang together to honour the loss of lives. The inscription on this memorial was carefully chosen not to be inflammatory and suggests that the officers were ‘killed’ in a gunfight rather than ambushed and murdered. However, the spirit of reconciliation was short lived. Ned Kelly continued to be lionised in literature, in film, in exhibitions and was honoured by being included in the opening of the Olympics in 2000. The reaction from Victoria Police was to reassert the ‘right’ remembrance of Kelly as a criminal and murderer of police. 2003 was the 125th anniversary of the shootings at Stringybark Creek and the 150th anniversary of Victoria Police. With considerable public support a three day festival of police remembrance was held in Mansfield and surrounding areas including art exhibitions, parades and for the first and only time, the new police recruits, from the police training academy, were publically sworn in at the new Stringybark Creek memorial.

The symbiosis showed no signs of abating by 2011 when the Victorian Government provided $88,000 of taxpayer’s money, to identify the skeletal remains of Ned Kelly. At around the same time, the dishevelled grave of a forgotten police hero was re-discovered in a Melbourne cemetery highlighting the fact that many police graves were in a dilapidated condition. Victoria Police complained to the government demanding something be done about the poor condition of many police graves given that so much money had been spent on the
bones of a ‘cop killer’. The result was positive for the police, at this phase of the
symbiosis, because the government established the Police Graves Memorial Fund,
which meant ongoing funding to maintain police graves. Ironically, if not for the
expenditure on Kelly’s bones, the police graves may never have received ongoing
maintenance funding. The new funding was used to repair many police graves
including the headstones of the three officers killed at Stringybark Creek, which
were vandalised in the 1960s. The three graves were re-dedicated after their repair
in 2013. However, the spirit of reconciliation shown in 2001, was no longer
evident at this ceremony and subsequent events demonstrated that the symbiosis
was, unlike the protagonists of 1878, alive and well.

Victoria’s First Police Memorial 1880

The Mansfield Police Memorial is in the main street of Mansfield, a small
Victorian town in the foot hills of the Victorian Alpine region. It was constructed
specifically to commemorate the shooting deaths of three police officers: Sergeant
Michael Kennedy, Constable Michael Scanlan, and Constable Thomas Lonigan,
who were killed during an exchange of gun fire with the Kelly Gang: Ned Kelly,
his brother Dan Kelly, Dan’s friend Steve Heart and Ned’s friend Joseph Byrne.
The incident took place in bushland near Stringybark Creek, in the Wombat
Ranges, 36 kilometres from Mansfield, on Saturday, 26 October 1878.
The lead up to this incident, the Kelly family story, is complex and highly contested with multiple versions of the story from popular historians and academics (Carey 2000; Clune 1954; Kenneally 1969; McQuilton 1979; Meredith & Scott 1980; Molony 2001; Seal 2002; Webb 2017). In short, the Kelly family and their relations, the Quinns, were well known horse and cattle thieves. They were poor Irish Catholic families living on the fringes of otherwise mostly law abiding functional farming communities of North Eastern Victoria. There was however, at this time, sectarian and class based social tensions between the wealthy land owners, often English Protestants known as Squatters, and the poorer often Irish Catholic farmers known as Selectors. Kelly’s criminal life, it is often argued, was a direct result of these social tensions; he being an Irish Catholic family living on the fringes of otherwise mostly law abiding functional farming communities of North Eastern Victoria.

---

4 Squatters were wealthy immigrants mostly from the English gentry, who were the first to claim large tracts of, what was Aboriginal lands, in Victoria. They were given the right by the government to ‘stake out’ large farming and stock stations in order to develop the colony’s interior lands. Selectors were the poorer workers who provided the labour for these stations but were eventually given the rights to select small parts of these larger properties to start smaller farms to help provide for themselves. Tensions between the Squatters and Selectors often revolved around Selectors choosing the better tracts of land from what was available.
Catholic victim of police corruption and oppression (McQuilton 1979). Policing in Victoria was still in its infancy at this time and the officers received little training; many were susceptible to corruption, alcoholism, and were perceived by poor Irish farmers to be largely acting in defence of the wealthy Squatters’ interests (Haldane 2009). Ned Kelly was in trouble with the law from a young age and he was no stranger to jail by the time of the Kelly outbreak when he was in his mid-twenties. His relations with the police were further complicated towards the final years of his life because a local police officer, Constable Alexander Fitzpatrick, was attempting to court his sister, Kate Kelly. The situation turned violent at the Kelly residence on the night of 15 April 1878, when Fitzpatrick arrived to arrest Dan Kelly for stock theft. According to the Kellys, Dan agreed to go peacefully with the officer after he finished his meal. The story becomes unclear at this point due to so many contested versions, but Fitzpatrick allegedly behaved inappropriately towards Kate. The Kellys, including the Mother, assaulted the officer and Ned allegedly shot him in the wrist. From this point, in fear of justice, Kelly and his gang fled into the heavily forested mountains near Mansfield and adjoining regions to evade capture (McQuilton 1979). Two heavily armed groups of police officers were sent by the government into the Mansfield bushlands in October 1878, to track the gang down and bring them to justice. The gang were made aware of this fact through their informants. However, the Kelly gang found one of the police parties, four officers, first near Stringybark creek where the gang killed Kennedy, Scanlan and Lonigan but the fourth, Constable Thomas McIntyre, escaped to tell his version of the events to the authorities (McQuilton 1979).

Brought down by various gunshot wounds, despite his now famous homemade armour, Kelly was captured by Victoria Police after a spectacular firefight at Glenrowan on 28 June 1880, committed to trial on 28-29 October, and hanged on 11 November of the same year. Prominent Australian historian, Manning Clark, suggests Kelly ‘lived on as a hero, as a man through whom Australians were helped to discover their national identity’ (Clark 1995, p. 390). Indeed, there are some Australians today who relate to Kelly’s anti-authoritarian, anti-police, violent and racist views. The Kelly legacy is a common thread throughout the
The contested remembrance of these events fall into two main polarities. On one hand the police are remembered as being killed by criminals in a cowardly ambush. On the other hand the three police were remembered as being killed in a fair fight with heroic Irish outlaws forced into crime by an oppressive, corrupt government and an equally corrupt paramilitary police force.

As Martin Flanagan puts it:

The Kelly story is one of profound ambiguity. People who have loud and obvious opinions on it are usually either partisan, or haven't read enough. There is virtually no turn in the entire story for which there is not, at least, two versions. In many places, there are four or five (Flanagan 2001a).

For instance this includes the myth that Dan Kelly escaped and survived the final stand of the Kelly Gang at Glenrowan and lived into old age in Queensland (Terry 2012, pp. 129-44). According to journalist Mike Hedge, respected Australian historian Malcolm Ellis described Kelly as: ‘one of the most cold-blooded, egotistical and utterly self-centred criminals ever to have decorated the end of a rope.’ Many others, Hedge argues, are more inclined to support Clive Turnbull, another well-known Australian author and social commentator, who suggests Kelly is ‘the best-known Australian…our only folk hero’ (Hedge 2011).

It is not the aim of this thesis to establish the truths of the Kelly outbreak. Indeed as, Russel Ward, an eminent Australian historian, states in his foreword to Graham Seal’s academic work (Seal 2002, p. viii), establishing the ‘facts’ of the Kelly story has become less important than explaining and tracing ‘the growth of the Kelly legend’ in Australia. Kelly’s legacy is facilitated by a number of unusual factors ensuring its continued resurfacing throughout Australian history. The iconic imagery of the homemade armour used in his last stand with police at Glenrowan made from old ploughshares for himself and his three gang members (Clark 1995, p. 388), was immortalised by the Australian artist Sidney Nolan in a series of paintings first exhibited in 1948. Kelly also dictated the Jerilderie letter
at the scene of one of the gang’s bank hold-ups documenting his justifications for his criminal activities as a reaction to repression by an uncaring and prejudiced government and police force. Contested remembrance also abounds about the idea that Kelly should be remembered as a legitimate revolutionary not a criminal, because of claims made by writers such as Ian Jones (2003) that Kelly was attempting to start a republic in North East Victoria. This claim is challenged by writers such as Doug Morrissey (2017), who argues that Kelly was a self-interested career criminal who’s aspirations as a revolutionary were largely spurious. Nevertheless, the broader Australian public largely accept the version of events put forward by those such as Jones (Seal 2002, p. 13). Seal explains that part of the reason for the acceptance of the popular story rather than what might be the truth has antecedents reaching back to the legend of Robin Hood. Ned Kelly, Seal argues, takes his place at the end of: ‘…a long tradition of popular bandit heroes, stretching back to legendary Robin Hood and embracing the images of seventeenth and eighteenth-century British highwaymen, American outlaws, and Ned Kelly’s celebrated Australian predecessors, Jack Donahue, Ben Hall, and Frank Gardiner’ (Seal 2002, p. 13).

It is conflict with bushrangers that gives rise to the Mansfield Police Memorial, the first public police memorial in Victoria. It is an unprecedented public expression of gratitude to Victoria Police that was funded by donations from the people of Victoria with some assistance from the New South Wales public and Police. The dedication took place on Thursday 22 April 1880, just 18 months after the incident, while the Kelly Gang were still at large (Hageman 1878; Monument Australia). Captain Standish, the Chief Commissioner at the time, was reportedly emotional making his unveiling speech, deeply thanking the people of the Mansfield district ‘for the generous sympathy which prompted them to erect this handsome memorial in honour of the brave men who were murdered…’ The fact the Kelly Gang had not been caught at that stage must have been a source of discomfort for Standish because both the death of the officers and the failure to capture the perpetrators was ultimately his responsibility. He felt compelled to make some mention of this in his dedication speech:
of the many combined causes which have prevented the capture of these cowardly assassins this is not the occasion to speak. I will merely express a hope that the day is not too far distant when justice will be satisfied [sic] (Vicpol Historical Services 2009).

To erect a memorial so quickly after such an event is remarkable. Memorials of this size and quality, funded by public subscriptions, typically take years to complete. The call for monetary subscriptions was published in The Argus, a Melbourne newspaper, just one month after the event and raised £800 for the construction of the memorial (Monument Australia). Morrissey suggests that the people of the Greta and Glenrowan districts were neither all poor, nor all Irish Catholics and the majority were not supporters of the criminals who robbed them of their horses and cattle (Morrissey 2017). Thus, monetary support for the memorial was likely obtained from a broad spectrum of law-abiding citizens from Victoria and NSW. The Argus suggested that the public should demonstrate ‘sympathy’ to the officers killed in the line of duty and inspire ‘other members of the police force and other branches of the public service’ to face the dangers involved in bringing the Kelly Gang to justice. If more lives were to be lost fighting the gang, then those involved should know that ‘their efforts in the public service will not be unfeelingly ignored’ (Hageman 1878).

The Mansfield Police Memorial has enjoyed a lasting significance for Victoria Police. The graves of the three officers killed at Stringybark Creek are in the nearby Mansfield Cemetery and these, too, are considered important sites of memory. The addition of a memorial at Stringybark Creek in 2001, at the site of the shooting, completed a precinct of police remembrance in the Mansfield area. Victoria Police now consider these sites as ‘sacred land’ (Nicholson 2003). The quiet ambience of Mansfield police memorial sites contrasts sharply with the giant Ned Kelly statue and other tourist attractions at the site of the Kelly’s last stand at Glenrowan, Victoria. Despite their comparatively low profile, the Mansfield sites of remembrance provide examples of community engagement and support for Victoria Police memorialisation and legitimacy from an early on in Victoria’s European settlement history.
The rapid emergence of the Mansfield Police Memorial in the wake of the ‘Kelly Outbreak’ demonstrated considerable public support helping to bolster flagging police legitimacy. The rise and fall of public support for police can often be linked to the public’s perceptions of its own safety and the deliberate killing of police often challenges that sense of security (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, p. 5). Haldane argues that the aftermath of the Kelly Gang incidents which lasted for two years (1878-80), were not good for Victoria Police’s public image. The events led to the Longmore Royal Commission which investigated the police performance before, and during the pursuit of the Kelly Gang. Captain Standish was forced to retire after 22 years in the force and several other senior and lower ranking police, were either reprimanded or sacked for various inadequacies. Haldane suggests the Longmore Commission may have been unfair in some regards because it focussed entirely on ‘the actions and personal failings of individual policemen and ignored more general social, economic and political considerations’ at the time such as class and sectarian divisions mainly between the ruling English Protestants and working class Irish Catholics, and an under resourced police force (Haldane 1995, p. 95).

Finnane argues the Kelly Outbreak ‘… seems to be the failure of the Australian colonial police forces to adequately deal with the bushrangers which solidified their poor standing in “popular memory”’ (Finnane 2005, p. 63). He goes further to indicate that the Victoria Police dealt with the Kelly gang ‘so poorly … that they became the laughing stock of many in the colonial populace empathising with the superior bush skills of the bushrangers.’ The main problem seemed to be with police ‘training and staffing’. Australian Colonial police were often drawn from the English gentry with ‘a military or British/Irish police background’ (Finnane 2005, p. 64) and they were no match for the young criminal bushmen. The Commission found that the ‘Kelly outbreak was rooted in police actions that “weakened that effective and complete surveillance without which the criminal classes in all countries become more and more restive and defiant of the authorities”’ (Haldane 1995, p. 95). In other words, police legitimacy suffered due to the poor skills of many officers at the time. This benefited the Kelly gang which enjoyed considerable community support while at large. Nevertheless, the monetary support for the Mansfield Police Memorial suggests significant support
for police as well alluding to a divided community, many members of which did not support Kelly.

The Mansfield memorial forms part of the symbiosis between Victoria Police and Kelly remembrance and it also goes beyond this connecting to broader commemorative frameworks relating to the nation’s identity formation. The police memorial at Mansfield was one of the first memorials to start the tradition of memorialising deaths in service to the state, which is often attributed to war memorials in Australia. The subtext of the Mansfield memorial was a ‘call to duty’ with the promise of due recognition if death ensues and this is also a key feature of war memorialisation, a process which began in Australia 30 years before the police memorial was built in Mansfield. However, according to Ken Inglis (1998), the Australian authority on memorialisation, the first war memorial built in Australia was in Hobart, Tasmania in 1850, commemorating the men of the British 99th Foot Regiment, part of the British Australian garrison which was sent to New Zealand from 1845-46 to take part in the British colonial war against the Maoris. Their memorials are in the Australian landscape, but the men who ‘fell’ from the 99th Foot, were British soldiers not Australians. This is an important distinction because although Australians saw themselves as part of the British Empire at the time, they were also developing a separate identity as Australians. Inglis uses the ‘high diction’ term ‘fell’ in his discussion of Australian colonial memorials to allude to the period in history when high diction (Fussell 1975), emerges and ‘fell’ described men who died in battle for King and country. From the mid-nineteenth century, many in the Australian colonies felt it was unfortunate that there were no ‘fallen’ from the Australian colonies to commemorate at that time. Many had ‘faith in war as the unique social regenerator’ as espoused by the poet, Alfred Tennyson (Cited in Inglis & Brazier 1998, p. 15). Australia needed to regenerate its convict and colonial past into something acceptable to enter the ‘world stage’ as something more than a collection of colonies. The Australian colonies federated in 1901. Nevertheless, the war which is argued to have helped forge Australian national identity did not emerge until the First World War (1914-1918), when Australia could finally some count 60,000 ‘fallen’ and the nation came together to mourn as a grand collective populating the landscape with war memorials. Returning to the late nineteenth
century, Australians were still looking for those they could call ‘the fallen’, someone who died for the greater good, representing the ideal of the brave well governed society they wished to be. The Australian colonies were not involved in any wars until the Sudan in 1885, so the ‘fallen’ were initially found in Australian civic conflicts and disturbances. The memorialisation of two early incidents of civil strife in colonial Victoria, the Eureka Rebellion at Ballarat and the ‘Kelly Outbreak’ near Mansfield, hinted towards the way the future nation would memorialise its dead by listing names of the dead on memorials and evoking high diction.

According to Inglis, after the Maori War memorial in 1850, the next Australian memorial to honour Australian men that ‘fell’ in the nineteenth century were not war memorials but memorials relating to civic strife. The Mansfield memorial pre-dates any Australian military memorials commemorating Australian ‘fallen’ although high diction is not used on its inscriptions. An early civic memorial, erected by a private citizen in 1856 in the Ballarat cemetery, to the dead rebel miners of the Eureka Rebellion, was the first to use high diction for Australians who ‘fell’: the inscription reads ‘Sacred to the Memory of Those Who Fell’. In 1879, the Victorian Government built a more substantial memorial in the cemetery listing the names of both the dead miners and British soldiers killed at Eureka, but the main civic and more public Eureka monument was not completed until 1886 (1998, pp. 14-21). However, the rebel miners died fighting against the state and the British soldiers died fighting for it (no Victoria Police were killed at Eureka). Thus, Eureka memorialisation attempts to straddle a dual purpose, whereas the officers memorialised at Mansfield were clearly employed by the state and died for it. Arguably, the tradition of memorialising those that gave their lives for a greater cause began in Australia with the memorial to the Eureka Rebellion and the Mansfield Police Memorial, before the emergence of war memorials in the Australian landscape.

Further still, the police who were memorialised at Mansfield, can be linked to the Anzac tradition whereby the volunteer citizen soldier was honoured for risking their life in war in defence of the nation. Seal argues that the formation of Australian national identity was not a straightforward matter and is riddled with
contradictions and schisms relating to long running tensions about whether the nation was British or Australian. In the First World War, Australian identity began to take on a stronger form after the military landings at Gallipoli in 1915, when the ‘Digger Myth’, based upon the often inflated performance of Australian soldiers, emerged as one of the central elements of Australian national identity exemplified at Anzac Day commemorations (Inglis 1965; Seal & Nile 2004). Seal writes that:

Anzac Day … displays the contradictions of the invented tradition of militarism, sacrifice and national duty and the spontaneous folk traditions that produced the iconic figure of the digger with his larrikinism, his drinking and irreverence (Seal 2002, p. 157).

Ken Inglis suggest that what emerges as part of the national character in the wake of the First World War, was a mixture of the supposed military prowess of Australian soldiers and their patriotism and the pre-existing bush legends. The myth attributed a natural fighting ability to the Australian soldier because it was claimed, incorrectly, that most came from the bush and were skilled at living off the land, fighting both the tough climate, landscape and the native inhabitants (Inglis 1965, 1988). In light of this, Kelly can also be linked to the Anzac tradition because the mythology surrounding him also straddles contradictions in Australian national identity. He is remembered as both romantic bushman hero and as a criminal with a convict heritage. Thus, both the police and Kelly form part of national identity; the police represent sacrifice and national duty and Kelly represents the rugged anti-authoritarian bushman. Resolving the contradictions in Australian national identity is an ongoing process, exacerbated by subsequent waves of immigrants who relate little to these Anglo-Saxon concerns (Seal 2002). Nevertheless, both police and bushrangers are inextricably linked to the nation’s identity formation and the ongoing contestation between remembrances of the two feed into the symbiosis put forward in this thesis.

The Mansfield Police Memorial was an auspicious start to police memorialisation in Victoria but no further significant police memorials were built until over a century later despite the deaths of over 100 officers in that time. Police
remembrance continued in an *ad-hoc* and inconsistent manner, such as police funerals and small memorial plaques to deceased officers until the late 1980s with the development of the Police Chapel of Remembrance and the annual ritual of National Police Remembrance Day. Nevertheless, there was some memory work done with the development of the Victoria Police Museum coming to fruition in 1902, and in 1934 Victoria Police established the Shrine Guards a special section of officers formed to permanently guard Victoria’s State War Memorial. On the 130th anniversary of Victoria Police there was the construction of a ‘Pioneer Police’ memorial dedicated to the service of the antecedent police units all of which will be examined in the following sections. The next three sections examine each of these developments.

**The Victoria Police Museum 1902**

In her work on public museums in the United Kingdom, Lucy Noakes suggests that museums play a significant role ‘in the construction of a public sense of the past. Museums provide one of the principal means by which people can gain access to the past and a special historic legitimacy is conferred upon events and objects (Noakes 1997, p. 93). For example, the Australian War Memorial (AWM) in Canberra has dual roles as both a memorial to commemorate the dead and a museum of Australia’s war involvement. The AWM is the site of national remembrance ceremonies on Anzac Day and Remembrance Day as well as other national military anniversaries. The names of all Australian military deaths from all conflicts involving Australia are listed on the internal courtyard walls of the AWM. The vast array of military hardware and other displays are woven together by hegemonic national narratives emphasising service and sacrifice to the nation. In a similar vein, the Victoria Police Museum displays and narratives also function as a remembrance tool for the history of Victoria Police, which necessarily involves a degree of storytelling about how some of its members died performing their duty for the state. The way museums tell history is often dependent on their governance and stakeholders (Buffington 2012; Caimari 2012). Some museums are less inhibited than others when it comes to the kind of narratives and objects they display. The Australian War Memorial and the
Victoria Police Museum have significant government stakeholders representing both the military and policing. These institutions are generally uninterested in presenting challenging, unflattering or negative historical narratives of these organisations. For example, the Australian War Memorial museum displays and narratives are unlikely to deviate or challenge hegemonic concepts such as ‘mateship’ or Australian military prowess.

The Victoria Police Museum is located within the Victoria Police complex in the World Trade Centre in Melbourne’s Central Business District. According to Laura Parker’s (Parker 2010) brief history of the museum, its story is one involving a number of false starts and changing purposes. Using various sources such as press material, interviews, and Police Life articles, Parker provides an overview of the museum’s development as part of a broader discussion of its crime-scene photographic collection. Her work builds on police historian Ralph Stavely’s chronology of the museum’s history in the 1990s (Stavely 1996). These works both indicate Victoria Police did not embrace the police-museum concept as enthusiastically as it might have considering the organisation’s deep colourful history (Haldane 1995).

The idea for a police museum first emerged in 1902. Superintendent Thomas O’Callaghan proposed the idea, basing it on the police museum in Scotland Yard in England which was used for educating new police recruits and was not open to the public. The Victoria Police Museum began in the same way as the English example and was located in an office at Russell St. police headquarters in Melbourne and was initially closed to the public. The display items were chosen for the edification of new officers; to help them garner an understanding of crime in Victoria. Murder weapons, some still bloodstained, were chosen for their ‘gruesome interest’. Other items, such as counterfeit currency, safecracking equipment and other implements were carefully arranged to demonstrate the ‘taxonomy of crime’ (Parker 2010, p. 11). The museum had closed by 1922. The continued collection and storage of more artefacts re-emerged in 1934 at the newly constructed police-training depot, on St Kilda Rd. Melbourne. It stayed closed to the public except on special occasions, its main use being to help with
police training and to send the clear message to the new recruits that ‘crime does not pay’ (Parker 2010, p. 14).

Ned Kelly featured in the museum before it was later opened to the public. In 1945, The Argus ran a story on the police museum, describing Ned Kelly’s armour as museum ‘Exhibit Number One’. The museum featured other famous criminals, such as the notorious gangster Squizzy Taylor (1888-1927). There is the suggestion that criminals must be part of these museum narratives to demonstrate what police do: ‘as there can be “no show without Punch,” there can apparently be no show without Ned’ (Testro 1945). The Argus story is a reminder of the symbiotic nature of Victoria Police remembrance and the remembrance of significant criminals. It is difficult to describe the history of Victoria Police without some discussion of the criminals the service has brought to justice.

Victoria Police realised the public relations potential of the police museum after the unexpected success of a public exhibition showcasing material from the museum’s collection on March 24 1956 at the Police Headquarters auditorium. The exhibition was successfully repeated in the town of Morwell in South Eastern Victoria later that year. The monies raised for charities, and the popularity of these public exhibitions made it clear that ‘the collection could extend beyond the education of police personnel’ (Parker 2010, p. 15). From 1956, the annual Royal Melbourne Show included the Police Exhibit, which by the mid-1960s was attracting some 53,000 visitors. Kelly Gang memorabilia, including the genuine suits of armour, was one of the most popular exhibits. The public also liked viewing other weapons and tools used by police and criminals such as the safecracking equipment, crime-scene photographs and other pieces of evidence. Police recruiters also attended and members of the public made frequent enquiries about police careers. By 1991, these and other exhibits were given a permanent museum site at the then Russell St Headquarters in Melbourne, which in 1995 moved to the Victoria Police Centre, in the World Trade Centre Complex, Flinders St, Melbourne. As the museum’s initial site at the Victoria Police Centre was not conducive to public access, it was moved several times until its current and permanent location was secured on the concourse level of the World Trade Centre Complex on 4th October, 2007 (Parker 2010, p. 18).
Part of the museum’s purpose is to demonstrate the ‘material culture’ (Saunders 2004) of Victorian policing history. Various artefacts relating to Victoria policing, such as different forms of evidence from past cases, weapons and equipment used by both police and criminals, are displayed at the museum with interpretive text from the Victoria Police perspective. As mentioned above, museums such as the AWM omit narratives that might be demeaning to Australia’s military past. In a similar vein, the Victoria Police Museum is careful about how criminals, like Kelly and his gang, are represented in the museum’s displays. Victoria Police and many community members would not take well the museum portraying Kelly as heroic. Anecdotal evidence suggests not every Victoria Police member agrees with displaying Kelly Gang armour in the museum, but without this and other items criminals employed, the museum could only tell half the story and the symbiosis would be incomplete.

The displays at the Victoria Police Museum substantiate the notion of reciprocal remembrance between law enforcers and breakers. In 2005, The Herald Sun ran a story titled ‘Armour Comes Home’ (Editorial 2005, p. 14) which described the return of Dan Kelly’s armour to the Victoria Police Museum from the Old Melbourne Goal where it had been on loan. It is now displayed encased in glass ‘side-by-side’ with the armour of Steve Hart, another Kelly Gang member. This is part of the museum’s allure, even though its overall purpose is not to commemorate criminals in the same way police memorials commemorate the loss of slain police officers. While both the Police Museum and police memorials function as remembrance tools, memorials, such as the Victoria Police Memorial, are specifically designed as sacred places facilitating the ceremonies and rituals pertaining to commemorating the dead. Yet Victoria Police were an important part of the rituals and ceremonies of war commemoration, long before regular police commemorative events emerged. The development of the Shrine Guards is an explicit example of the close connection between police and military remembrance and commemoration in Victoria.
Guarding Melbourne’s Shrine of Remembrance

The Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance was dedicated on 11 November 1934 by the Duke of Gloucester. The people of Victoria commissioned the shrine to commemorate the State’s dead from the First World War. Located in the Domain, just outside the city’s central business district, the shrine’s architecture is based upon the ancient Greek Parthenon and stands as Melbourne’s most significant monumental structure. Victoria Police have provided ongoing security for the shrine from the commencement of its construction in 1927 (Stavely 1995). The shrine is not a police memorial but police involvement with this military commemorative site is an early example of the connection between military and police remembrance. For although police casualties are not commemorated at the shrine, police play an important part in the various commemorative ceremonies enacted at the site, such as on Anzac Day 25 April and Remembrance Day 11 November, when the guard parades in the company of Regular Army and with police and military bands (Hyde & Davies 1993). One of the most unique elements of the Shrine Guard is the adaptation of a distinctive military style uniform worn by the duty officers at the shrine. Importantly, it becomes apparent over time that the Shrine Guards, in their military uniforms, begin partaking in police remembrance ceremonies and events such as National Police Remembrance Day at the Victoria Police Memorial which is located within one kilometre of the shrine.

According to Stavely’s history of the Guard, Victoria Police provided initial security at the Shrine of Remembrance construction site from 1927 to 1933 (Stavely 1995). Once it was largely completed in 1933, the state government requested that Chief Commissioner Tom Blamey provide security at the site until the issue of permanently protecting the shrine could be resolved. One police guard was stationed at the shrine from February 1933. However, this proved to be insufficient due to reports of ‘petty vandalism’ of the structure. Thus, from June to July 1933, discussions on how to resolve the shrine’s ongoing security needs ensued between the Victorian Premier, Stanley Argyle, and the Federal Minister for Defence, Senator George Pearce, and Chief Commissioner Blamey. Argyle’s opinion was that military guards should be employed for the shrine’s security.
needs because the connection between the shrine and Australia’s First World War army, known as the Australian Imperial Force (AIF), should be maintained by deploying currently serving AIF veterans where available, wearing the old AIF uniform. However, Pearce believed that military personnel would be impractical guards because they lacked the power of arrest. His suggestion was that members of Victoria Police, who were also veterans of the AIF, should be selected for the role of shrine guarding. In keeping with the AIF connection, these officers would be provided with AIF uniforms and accoutrements for performing the role of Shrine Guards (Stavely 1995).

It was agreed that Victoria Police should have the role of guarding the shrine but finding suitable serving police officers would be more complex. At the time there were very few serving police officers who were AIF veterans and even fewer willing to perform the task. Younger officers did not find the role of shrine guarding appealing, nor were they qualified, having not served during the First World War. Suitable candidates could be recruited from the general community but would be over the official recruiting age. Blamey also wanted these officers to be able to perform normal policing duties. The solution was to amend the Police Regulations act to enable the recruitment and training of older men to serve as Shrine Guards (Stavely 1995).

The recruitment of Shrine Guards, according to Stavely, began with significant public and media interest. There were 250 applicants, and of these, 14 highly decorated veterans were chosen to enter Victoria Police and complete the training. Only one of these recruits failed to meet the assessment requirements. Thus, the Shrine Guards were recruited and commenced duty on 21 August 1935. The Guard’s first military style ceremonial duty occurred on the same day when the ‘entire guard turned out to present arms as the [Victorian] Governor, Lord Huntingfield, returned from an interstate trip’ (Stavely 1995).

It is the wearing of a military uniform to perform a policing function that makes the Shrine Guards a unique and explicit example of the adaptation of military custom, hinting toward the eventual crossover of these customs into policing commemoration. The Shrine Guards’ uniform and accoutrements, supplied by the
Department of Defence, included a .303 First World War vintage military rifle and bayonet. This weapon was for ceremonial and display purposes and was never loaded. The uniform itself went through a number of developments to arrive at its current incarnation. According to Stavely, records of the guards’ uniform development are incomplete but they initially wore old AIF infantry uniforms with the guardsmen’s registered police number on both collars, police buttons, and the police badge on the slouch hat. In 1945, the Guards were also provided with contemporary summer army uniforms. However, there is no record as to why the uniform changed to one resembling (not exactly replicating) that worn by First World War Australian Light Horse. This change occurred in 1959 with the inclusion of an ostrich-feather plume inserted on the turned-up side of the slouch hat (Stavely 1995). To highlight the symbolic and communicative dimensions of the uniform, it is only worn during daylight hours; the guards wear normal Victoria Police uniform at night (Hyde & Davies 1993).

The need for the shrine’s protection was reinforced in 1971 when vandals, possibly peace activists, assaulted and hospitalised the duty Shrine Guard and defaced the shrine. Large letters spelling the word ‘PEACE’ were painted on five of the shrine’s front columns and two large anti-nuclear signs were also painted.
on right and left pillar supports. During a press interview, according to one guard, the shrine was defaced with Nazi swastikas a few years beforehand (Sinclair 1971). Thus, the need for the Guard continued but recruitment became more problematic over time as the AIF veterans passed away or became too elderly to maintain the role. By 1980, the 45 sworn members of the Guard were all ex-service men of some description but not veterans of the First World War (Hyde & Davies 1993).

The most significant change to the Shrine Guard occurred in 1990 due to ‘a combination of time, money [issues] and a dearth of those with a military background’ (Murphy 1990). Victoria Police relinquished the Guard to Protective Services Officers (PSOs). PSOs are part of Protective Services Unit, a subsidiary of Victoria Police, formed in 1986 to perform specialist security services, freeing serving officers from non-essential duties such as guarding courts, State Parliament, Government House, the Shrine, and public transport. PSOs are provided with lesser training at the Police Academy than sworn members and their powers of arrest come under the legislated ‘citizen arrest’ authority (Vicpol 2017). The Shrine Guard of today is based on the 1990 model and is made up of PSOs, only some of whom have some kind of military background, though the wearing of the military uniform remains (Murphy 1990).

There are no records saying exactly why Shrine Guards have been appropriated into Victoria Police commemorative activities. The first recorded appearance at a police commemorative event was in 1994 at the rededication ceremony of the Mansfield Police Memorial, discussed below. Shrine Guards also participated in the opening ceremony of the Victoria Police Memorial (2002), discussed in Chapter Four, and have been part of the annual Police Remembrance Day ceremonies there ever since. The inclusion of Shrine Guards at police remembrance activities acknowledges that police and military services share a close connection as defenders of the nation. Even though, as discussed in Chapter Two, the borrowing of military commemorative traditions was not always accepted by military ‘carriers of memory’. For example, Victoria Police were asked by the Returned and Services League (RSL) to desist from using The Last Post bugle tune at police remembrance ceremonies. There has been no such
public objection by the RSL in relation to police utilising the Shrine Guard military-style uniforms, specifically issued for military commemorations, at police remembrance ceremonies and activities. That the Guards are utilised at both military and police remembrance ceremonies demonstrates an acceptance of the military/police commemorative crossover by these two services. This reflects the common bond existing between these two services whose personnel choose to risk their lives and health in defence of the state. The advent of the Shrine Guards sets the precedent whereby police are accepted as part of military commemorations, and by osmosis paves the way for elements of military commemoration to be used in police remembrance as it later develops.

Shrine Guards are now part of the fabric of Victoria’s military and police commemorations of lives given in service to the state and nation. This is often expressed on Victoria’s military and police memorials by engraved lists of the dead. The one exception for Victoria Police remembrance being the Pioneer Police Memorial, the second police memorial to be built in Victoria dedicated to police service more so than sacrifice.

**Early Police Memory Work: Pioneer Police Memorial**

**1972**

So far, we have discussed that Victoria Police have been memorialised at Mansfield in the 1880s, exhibited in a police museum from 1903 and have demonstrated connections to military commemoration in the form of Shrine Guards from 1934. However, evidence of earlier police memorialisation which incorporated commemorative events beyond memorial dedication ceremonies is limited. One early example from 1972 commemorated one hundred and thirty years of policing in Victoria, paying homage to the early police units. Prior to the establishment of Victoria Police in 1853, ‘pioneer police’ was the generic term, which included various law enforcement functionaries such as Port Phillip Police, which existed from 1837-1852. The base for the first Victoria police force was established at Narre Warren near Dandenong in 1836 under Captain William Lonsdale (*The Sun* Editorial 1972). The site is now known as the Dandenong
Police Paddocks. In 1971 the Knox, Dandenong and Berwick Councils erected a $400 obelisk on the site of the barracks occupied by the first Native Police Force in the 1850s, although it was not dedicated until 1972 (Pakenham Gazette Editorial 1971). The obelisk is 30 inches high (72.2cm) and features a 27 inch (68.58cm) brass plaque (The News Editorial 1972) ‘which describes the development of the police since 1836’ (The Sun Editorial 1972). Stuart Bliss, is a good example of an active agent of memory. A senior detective with Dandenong Police, as well as the secretary of the Police Museum and foundation member of the Police and Dandenong Historical Societies, Bliss researched the Police Paddock’s history. He worked with the Knox, Dandenong and Berwick Historical Societies to organise the dedication ceremony and other events relating to the unveiling of the memorial and the establishment of the site as a public reserve (The News Editorial 1972).

The public dedication ceremony for the Dandenong Police Paddocks and memorial took place on 27 February 1972. Local press described the ceremony as a ‘gala ceremony’ because it involved a number of attractions, such as police re-enactors, including native police, in period uniforms and music from the Victoria Police and Dandenong municipal bands. For dramatic effect, the Fifteenth Field Regiment, Royal Australian Artillery provided a three salvo salute to the early pioneer police (The News Editorial 1972). Police Commissioner Jackson started the proceedings and he joined the Rural Dean of Dandenong, Reverend E. M. Eggleston, in reciting the Lord’s Prayer followed by a dedication hymn. The inclusion of Christian religious elements at police remembrance ceremonies remain as part of current day police remembrance practices. By this time, Christian religious elements, were well solidified as part of military commemorative ceremonies on Anzac Day and Remembrance Day. Christian religious elements still remain a strong correlation between military and police commemorative practices. Jackson unveiled the memorial and Eggleston then dedicated the paddocks as a national reserve. Jackson said that ‘these early police earned our gratitude and respect for the way they founded the great force we are today.’ Other guest speakers included Ministers for Dandenong, Scoresby, and West Gippsland (Police Life Editorial 1972).
This example of police memorialisation and the commemoration of one hundred and thirty years of policing in Victoria represent two of the few early Victoria Police remembrance activities. Such remembrance ceremonies tended to be planned as one-off events with no official procedure common to ritualised annual commemorative ceremonies common today. There were similarities with contemporary remembrance activities, such as using police re-enactors in period dress, and various solemn religious overtones during the dedication. The presence of the Police Commissioner and other dignitaries was common to most public ceremonies of this kind. The military connection with policing was evident with the active presence of the Royal Australian Artillery and police bandsmen playing *The Last Post* on an original 1861 police bugle. These connections perhaps reflect on a time in the nineteenth century when police officers were only appointed after serving in the artillery. Perhaps the most notable contrast to later forms of police memorialisation was that the Pioneer Police Memorial was not constructed in reaction to the deliberate killing of any police officer, as was the case with most other Victoria Police memorials. Rather it was a memorial to service more than sacrifice and the local community demonstrated significant involvement without police death to incentivise participation. The 130th remembrance activities exemplify the public’s willingness to show support for Victoria Police’s service which is a tangible measurement of police legitimacy. Individuals like Stuart Bliss seem to have driven such events and he was the ‘agent of memory’ in this case. There are no records of other ceremonies taking place at this memorial. This was a one-off event and there was no indication, at that stage, of police remembrance becoming anything more formal or regular. But this was about to change significantly in the latter part of the 1970s when a new active agent of memory arrived in the institutional space of the office of chief commissioner.

‘I’m sorry Sir, there’s no file’: Re-Constituting Victoria Police Remembrance

Victoria Police Chief Commissioner Mick Miller took office in June 1977 and on his first day he asked a staff member how many previous commissioners occupied his Russell St. office. Miller thought it was the kind of information staff would
have at ‘their fingertips,’ but this was not the case. The staff member returned before
long saying ‘I’m sorry Sir, there’s no file.’ Miller’s request puzzled the staff member
who asked him for clarification and Miller replied, ‘Can’t you see it? If we don’t know
where we have come from, how can we see where we are going?’ (Miller interview 2015).

Miller was ex-military and believed that knowing its own history was essential for
any organisation; he remembers thinking ‘here was an organisation that did not
know its own history’ (Miller interview 2015). He also wondered how many
valour awards Victoria Police had issued and who the recipients were. He
requested another officer to look through Victoria Police and Police Association
files and records which also produced nothing. Miller thought to himself that ‘this
was getting worse … we don’t know … who our heroes were.’ Miller’s solutions
were to assign an officer, Bob Haldane, to write a comprehensive history of
Victoria Police (Haldane 1995, based on his PhD research for Victoria Police) and
to assign several officers and other Victoria Police staff to compile lists of all the
Victoria Police Valour Award recipients and all those who had died in the line of
duty. Miller reflected that these tasks seemed ‘monumental’ to his staff at the time
(Miller interview 2015).

There was no official state-sponsored Victoria Police memorialisation when
Miller became Chief Commissioner. Any existing memorialisation was in his
view ‘haphazard – ad hoc’. If memorialisation occurred, local communities
inspired it when something happened to ‘their policeman’ (Miller interview
2015). Reflecting years later, Miller wondered why the importance of
memorialisation had not occurred to his predecessors. In the same way, a state
memorial had not occurred to him at that time but he did make manifest the first
honour boards for valour awards, and listing the names of those who had died on
duty, which were displayed in Victoria Police Russell St. Police Headquarters and
the Police Association head office. These early honour boards provided impetus
for developing the Police Academy Chapel as Victoria Police’s first official
memorialisation and commemorative site (discussed below) since the Mansfield
memorial was erected in 1880.
Miller’s initiatives in the area of police remembrance and commemoration in the late 1970s and 1980s established a steady momentum amongst successive Chief Commissioners. For Victoria Police remembrance, Miller, along with members of the Police Association, were key agents or to use Rousso’s term ‘carriers of memory’ (Rousso 1991). For as Winter and Sivan argue, ‘agency’ is the key element in the construction of collective remembrance – there are those who act and those that don’t act (Sivan & Winter 1999). Miller’s agency provided part of the foundation from which Victoria Police remembrance was constructed.

The Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance 1988

The Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance was the second major site of remembrance after the establishment of the Mansfield Police Memorial in 1880 and was dedicated to officers who died in the line of duty by the then Chief Commissioner of Police, Kelvin Glare on 13 November, 1988. The Chapel of Remembrance is situated within the Victoria Police Chapel on the Victoria Police Academy grounds, in Glen Waverley, Melbourne. Victoria Police purchased the site in 1972, which was formally Corpus Christi College, owned by the Catholic Church Archdiocese of Melbourne after its construction in 1959. The Chapel was rededicated for worship in 1974 and police personnel, their families and other members of the community currently use it for various religious services, such as baptisms, weddings and funerals (Vicpol Pamphlet no date). The Chapel has been the key venue for significant police funerals, at times attracting significant media attention.

Upon entering the Victoria Police Chapel, the grandeur of the mixed Byzantine architecture is quite striking. The nave is fourteen meters wide and twenty meters high. The Chapel has many traditional Christian religious symbols and features, including stained glass windows, a large central altar, and a 2.8-meter-long wooden cross behind the central altar. When the visitor moves a third of the way toward the front of the nave, two other separate smaller chapels become visible to the left and right of the altar. The left chapel, often called the pink chapel because of the pink stained glass lighting, is the Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance.
Along the walls of The Chapel of Remembrance are Honour Boards listing all Victoria Police officers who have died in the line of duty on small brass plaques. A separate board lists the names of officers who were ‘feloniously slain’ and separate plaques also commemorate the military service of police officers in the two World Wars, The Korean War and The Vietnam War (Vicpol Pamphlet no date); (Photos and notes taken from site visit).

The Chapel on the right side of the main altar, often known as the blue chapel because of its blue stained glass lighting, is the Memorial Chapel of Prayer or the St Michael Chapel. As discussed in Chapter Two, St Michael is the patron Saint of policing and the Saint’s annual feast day, 29 September, was later chosen for National Police Remembrance Day. The centrepiece inside the Memorial Chapel of Prayer is a large bronze police badge displayed above an altar. Retired Police Chaplain Jim Pilmer, stated that this Chapel is utilised to help fill some important gaps in police commemoration and remembrance, including recognition of good service by sworn and non-sworn members, such as those working in forensics and in administration. Additional plaques are added on the request of family members and for a nominal fee of approximately $80.00 (Pilmer interview 2014).

According to Pilmer, the Police Academy Chapel is seen as the spiritual focal point of the Victoria Police. Each plaque in the memorial Chapel has a corresponding entry in one of the memorial books providing the details of each officers’ death. This kind of detail in book format is not practical for public sites like the Victoria Police Memorial (Pilmer interview 2014).

The multi-faith issues within the police force have become particularly significant at the Chapel as Victoria Police has become increasingly multicultural in recent decades. In interview Pilmer stated:

We really see the chapel as a multi-faith chapel. It’s still got the cross up over the altar, and it’s still got candles on the altar and is still very much a Christian worship space…Orthodox Jews would not go into a space like that. But still we offer it as a place of reflection for people of any faith. It’s certainly not rigidly Christian.
However, Pilmer also explains that if a non-Christian officer of was to be killed, conducting a ceremony at the Chapel might be problematic for some family members who might not want to be in a Christian environment (Pilmer interview 2014). Religion plays an important part of life at the police academy and in remembrance ceremonies.

The establishment of the Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance provided for the first time a site of remembrance for all deceased members. Yet remembrance activities conducted at the chapel restricted public access. Although the Mansfield memorial was three hours’ drive from Melbourne, it had better public access and Victoria Police re-dedicated it to all members who died on duty in 1994.

**Reactivating and Rededicating the Mansfield Police Memorial 1993-94**

Until the introduction of the state memorial in 2005 the Mansfield memorial was the only significant Victorian police memorial open to the public and the link to the Kelly Gang events guaranteed public interest in any policing commemorative activities occurring there. Police re-enactments and wreath laying at the memorial took place at the 1993 Mansfield Mountain Country Festival. During the festival the fatal shooting of the three police officers at Stringybark Creek was re-enacted on the median strip in the town centre. A wreath-laying ceremony followed at the memorial, including an honour guard of uniformed police, some dressed in nineteenth century uniforms and dignitaries included Deputy Premier and Police Minister Pat McNamara, and Chief Police Commissioner Neil Comrie. Such re-enactments reminds us of Manning’s point about policing as drama (Manning 1997, pp. 6-7), whereby Police organisations attempt to impose particular versions of structure and meaning upon their respective communities by various forms of symbolic communication. They also try to filter or control other organisations such as the media which might conflict with the conveyance of the police’s own particular messages. As Manning suggests ‘The police reflect on and seek to manipulate the collective impressions their audiences accept’ (1997, p. 10). In this case, Victoria Police were attempting to present the drama of the fatal
shooting of the three officers at Stringybark Creek from the police perspective – evoking the salient value of sacrifice for the community and reactivating awareness and interests in the Mansfield memorial.

Military connections were also evident at the ceremony reinforcing the idea of sacrifice for the nation. Shrine Guards marched with their distinctive uniforms closely resembling that worn by the Australian First World War Light Horse (mounted infantry). As discussed above, the emergence of the Shrine Guards in the 1930s, were an early indicator of the crossover between military and police commemoration in Victoria. On this occasion they had travelled some 300 kilometres from the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance to take part in the Mansfield police commemorations. At this ceremony the Guards demonstrated a further appropriation of an old military custom known as ‘the lone charger’ which involves the parading of a riderless horse with empty riding boots reversed in the stirrups representing a soldier killed in battle (AWM 2015; Mansfield Courier Editorial 1993b). This adaptation of military custom was also employed by Victoria Police in a ceremony with much less pageantry, in 1980, as part of the 100th anniversary of Kelly’s execution (Seal 2002, pp. 139-40). The appropriation of this military custom is a clear example of police symbolically representing their dead officers as soldiers lost defending their nation.

In the following year the Mansfield Mountain Country Festival on 29 October, 1994, Chief Commissioner, Neil Comrie, unveiled a memorial plaque at the Mansfield Police Memorial re-dedicating it to all Victoria Police members who had been ‘feloniously slain in the performance of their duty’ (Victoria Police Gazette Editorial 1994, p. 23). No additional names were added to the memorial but the re-dedication made the Mansfield memorial unique as the first to commemorate all Victoria Police officers killed deliberately while on duty. As discussed above, the Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance was the first site of memory to record all of Victoria Police killed on duty but this was in a broader sense including those killed in accidents, it also included recognition of service by sworn and non-sworn members making it a more inclusive site of remembrance than at Mansfield. The re-dedication of the Mansfield memorial to include all
those officers who had been ‘feloniously slain’ reinforces the idea that the officers were not killed in a fair fight but ambushed and murdered by Ned Kelly.

Figure 3: Rededication Plaque added to the Mansfield Police Memorial in 1994. Photo Courtesy of Mansfield Police Station.

The Necropolis Police Memorial 1999

As with the Mansfield Police Memorial, and the Victoria Police Memorial discussed in Chapter Four, the murder of police officers inspired the construction of the Necropolis Police Memorial, a fully private and unsolicited demonstration of public support for Victoria Police. The Necropolis Police Memorial is located in the Springvale Botanical Cemetery, once known as the Springvale Necropolis. The historical cemetery was established in 1901 and is the largest of the eight cemeteries within the care of the Southern Metropolitan Cemeteries Trust. The 169 hectare (422 acre) site features landscaped gardens, well established trees, water features, and just under thirty-thousand roses (Necropolis 2014). The police memorial at the site consists of a large irregular shaped granite rock set into a low, tiled, concrete base lined with small bronze plaques with the names of the 137 deceased officers who had died on duty. The list of names was supplied by
Victoria Police and an asterisk on the plaque denotes that the officer was feloniously slain (Association Editorial 1999). A large Victoria Police insignia badge is placed toward the top of the rock. Below the insignia badge is a slightly smaller plaque with the following inscription:

This memorial stands as a tribute to those members of the Victorian Police Force who have given their lives in the line of duty and in service to the people of Victoria.

May we build upon the foundation of their sacrifice and commitment to “UPHOLD THE RIGHT” (the motto on the Victoria Police Badge – relating to the idea of upholding the law) (Monument Australia).

Two flag poles are set just behind the memorial and slate paving extend into a twenty-metre procession way surrounds the rock feature. Well-kept garden beds and two niches flank the procession way half way along, accommodating two park benches. These benches were provided for family, friends and colleagues of the deceased for quiet contemplation. Winter (1995) discusses the importance of war memorials as places to grieve and this element has been included by the creators of the Necropolis Police Memorial.
Chief Commissioner Neil Comrie dedicated the memorial on 29 September, 1999, at a ceremony conducted by Reverend Jim Pilmer. Unlike other significant police memorials that were funded and controlled by Victoria Police, it was designed and fully funded by the Necropolis Trust, although Victoria Police was frequently consulted during its development. Astec Quarries donated the granite rock and Arrow Bronze donated the commemorative plaques and the Victoria Police insignia badge (Hennessy 2014). The police memorial was specifically developed to honour the deaths of Senior-Constable Rodney Miller and Sergeant Gary Silk, (see Chapter Four), and all Victorian officers who have died on duty since the police force began in 1853. Chief Commissioner Comrie said the site would also ‘provide police members, and their families and friends, with a private and spiritual place in which they could pay their respects’ (Association Editorial 1999). In this sense, Victoria Police viewed the Necropolis as internally focused for use of police and family and friends rather than for public commemoration, in part because planning was already under way for the development of a public state police memorial.

Together, the Mansfield Police Memorial, Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance and the Necropolis Police Memorial provide three significant sites of remembrance. Why then was the Victoria Police Memorial needed? There are a number of points to make here. Firstly the Mansfield memorial was in a public space but was a significant distance from Melbourne and ceremonies would require considerable logistical organisation and travel cost, limiting its’ functioning as an active site of memory for Victoria Police and Victorians generally. At best it was a limited effort of public engagement and limited also by the singular focus on particular deaths than a symbolic representation and communication of all the sacrifices made by Victoria Police. Secondly the Christian symbolism at the Police Chapel may be unsuitable for the different ethnicities and faiths of bereaved police families and the broader community that is increasingly inter-faith or non-denominational. Thirdly, the Chapel is located on police grounds, so is not a fully public memorial. Fourthly, the Necropolis Police Memorial and the Victoria Police Memorial, were both conceived around the same time in late 1998, but the latter took longer to produce. In one of their early meetings in 1998, the Victoria Police Memorial Committee received
information that the Necropolis in Springvale was considering a police memorial on their own grounds. The Committee supported the idea but saw this as a ‘separate’ initiative to Victoria Police’s, and was uninterested in contributing to its construction at this site (Vicpol 1998).

All three memorials lack public visibility and or public access and the ability to integrate memorisation and commemorative practices in the public domain in a way that Manning (1997) describes the public spectacle of official police funerals. Victoria Police were therefore determined to erect a memorial in a location that was prominent, accessible and in open public space to convey a message of connection between the organisation and the Victorian public. Then Inspector Kevin Scott suggests:

the Academy does not hold the same significance as the Victoria Police Memorial because [the latter] is a public place where people go and reflect. The Academy is where people train which has different cultural values (Scott interview 2014).

Pilmer adds that:

we have got to do things that create community cohesions not separations. I guess we could say that the [State] Memorial on St Kilda Rd expresses that sort of cohesion regardless of faith background (Pilmer interview 2014).

Community cohesion was also initially part of the motivation to build another memorial relating to the Ned Kelly incidents. Again the symbiotic relationship between Victoria Police and Kelly emerges with the construction of a police memorial at Stringybark Creek near the site where he shot three Victoria Police officers in 1878.

Stringybark Creek Memorial 2001

The Stringybark Creek memorial was dedicated in 2001 at the site of the shooting of the three officers Kennedy, Scanlan, and Lonigan in 1878. The memorial is a
1.5 metre rock with a commemorative plaque set into the face. Senior Detective Peter Clifford from the rural town of Benalla and Senior Sergeant Bruce Klinge from Mansfield developed the idea to construct the memorial. Part of their motivation was to foster a spirit of ‘reconciliation’ between Kelly supporters and Victoria Police, as the neutral text on the Stringybark memorial suggests the incident involved a gunfight rather than an ambush (Flanagan 2001b). The memorial’s plaque lists the names of Kennedy, Scanlan, and Lonigan, followed by: ‘Killed at Stringybark Creek on 26th October, 1878, during the execution of their duty in a gunfight with a group of men later known as the “Kelly Gang”’. In contrast, the commemorative plaque, dedicated in 2008, for Constable Scanlan at the Benalla Police station reads: ‘Feloniously slain on the 25th of October, 1878. He was ambushed and murdered by members of the Kelly gang at Stringybark Creek. Also Murdered were Sergeant Kennedy and Constable Lonigan’ (Monument Australia). The linguistic difference is important here because ‘killed at Stringybark creek…in a gunfight’ leaves the incident of the officers deaths open to interpretation whereas ‘feloniously slain…ambushed’ clearly states that the officers were murdered. Both of these memorials were instigated by Victoria Police, which demonstrates that contested remembrance also existed within its ranks.

The dedication ceremony at Stringybark Creek began with a lone piper and colour flag party and three riderless horses representing the deceased officers, followed the pipes and flags, again indicative of the appropriation of military rituals. However, the speeches had the tone and rhetoric consistent with reconciliation. Descendants from the three troopers killed and the Kellys attended the ceremony. The two main speakers were Acting Deputy Commissioner of Police, George Davis, and a descendant of the Kellys, Leigh Olver, an art teacher from Werribee Secondary College.

Martin Flanagan’s report said Davis remonstrated that ‘an attack on the police is an attack on the community it serves’. Davis also used the opportunity to say how much policing had changed since the 1800s and that this memorial:
is a demonstration of our society's quality for forgiveness and generous mutual support that descendants of the slain police, and of those who killed them, are together today to commemorate the lives lost. In other societies such slayings could result in century-old wounds that refuse to heal (Flanagan 2001b).

Olver reinforced that one hundred and thirteen years of being ‘caricatured and misunderstood’ is the one thing that the descendants of both the killed police and the Kellys have in common (Flanagan 2001a). The photograph caption accompanying one of Flanagan’s reports stated: ‘United: Senior Constable Michael Kennedy, great-grandson of Sergeant Michael Kennedy, who was killed by Ned Kelly's Gang at Stringybark Creek, shakes hands with Lee Olver, a descendant of Kelly’ (Flanagan 2001b). The spirit of reconciliation surrounding the dedication of this memorial was to be short lived as the Australian public continued to lionise the controversial bushranger.

**Reasserting the ‘Right’ Remembrance**

Ironically, Ned Kelly was one of the many Australiana symbols chosen to feature at the opening of the 2000 Olympics. The display featured a number of people dressed as characterisations based on Sidney Nolan’s Ned Kelly oil paintings. To many Australians, the inclusion of Kelly’s armoured image at such a global event might have seemed harmless enough considering its general acceptance as an Australian icon. Indeed, the opening of the 2001 ‘Ned The Exhibition’ in the old Melbourne goal occurred within days of the Stringybark Creek Memorial dedication. In addition, just a week prior to the opening of the exhibition Peter Carey won a Booker Prize for his historical fiction of the Kelly Gang (Carey 2000; Richardson 2001). By contrast, one member of Victoria Police took some exception to the use of the Kelly image at the Olympics. Senior Sergeant Bruce Klinge, the officer who helped instigate the Stringybark Creek memorial, described it as the ‘glorification’ of a criminal (Police Association Journal Editorial 2003). Klinge was so ‘disgusted’ that he was inspired to organise a 125th anniversary event in honour of the three officers incorporating the Mansfield and
Stringybark Creek police memorials. Klinge’s reaction further signifies the contested symbiotic nature of Kelly and Victoria Police remembrance and its strong connection to memorials.

In 2003, the 125th anniversary of the shooting deaths of the three Victoria Police officers at Stringybark Creek coincided with the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Victoria Police. There was a significant amount of community support for both events in the Mansfield and Benalla regions. Benalla held a three day ‘remembrance festival’ in September 2003 commemorating the 150th anniversary of Victoria Police. The festival events included a ‘Call the Cops Art Exhibition’, a ‘Past and Present’ exhibit at the Botanic Gardens, a street parade and other community entertainment (Nicholson 2003). Much of what happened at this festival, emulated the region’s 1980 commemorations for the 100th anniversary of Kelly’s execution in 1880. The region’s tourist industry capitalised on ‘Kellyana’ marketing the area as ‘Kelly Country’. However, the state government and Victoria Police were less interested in these commemorative activities. Victoria Police held a low key ceremony at the Mansfield Memorial where Kellys were not mentioned. The government released a commemorative envelope commemorating the 1880 siege at Glenrowan but came under criticism for glorifying Kelly from both the Queensland and Victoria Police Associations (Seal 2002).

Klinge was determined that Kelly would not be the centre of attention at the 2003 police commemorative events. He organised a public swearing-in ceremony for that year’s Victoria Police recruits from the Police Academy, incorporating the Mansfield and Stringybark Creek police memorials. Klinge sought to honour the officers and ‘to create awareness among the [new] recruits that they’re joining an extended family and as a family, we never forget’ (Police Association Journal Editorial 2003). These events would also send a clear message to the public that the real heroes of that day in 1878 were the police officers. Chief Commissioner Christine Nixon expressed this sentiment in her speech at the Mansfield Police Memorial where she unveiled another commemorative plaque to the three slain officers as part of these events (Police Association Journal Editorial 2003).
The 22 recruits were officially sworn in to Victoria Police on the Mansfield police station front lawn with the Mansfield Police Memorial located in the background across the road. Connections between the police and the community, and the shared value of life given in service, which is a central tenet of police legitimacy, were highlighted during this ceremony. Chief Commissioner Nixon, Mansfield Mayor Don Cummins, the recruits’ families, various members of Victoria Police and the general public mostly from the local region were in attendance at the ceremony. Kelly descendants were invited but none replied officially and it was uncertain if any turned up. The event was an historic moment for Victoria Police because normally, swearing-in ceremonies were held within the Victoria Police Academy Chapel rather than a public setting. Nixon told the recruits they ‘were the future of Victoria Police and the Victorian community’ (Police Association Journal Editorial 2003) and indicated a public swearing-in ceremony:

was a good way of bringing the community and the police together…it was nice that these recruits were able to make their commitment to the community out in the community (Nicholson 2003).

After the ceremony, the recruits marched through Mansfield’s main street to the Mansfield Police Memorial where Nixon unveiled a new plaque in honour of Kennedy, Scanlan, and Lonigan.
The recruits were then taken to the Stringybark Creek memorial some thirty kilometres from Mansfield where lunch was served before a memorial procession led by pipers emerged from the forest of eucalypts, followed by a number of nineteenth century police re-enactors in historical uniforms leading three riderless horses with reverted empty boots in the stirrups, representing the three officers. The bush procession ended near the memorial where Barry Port, Australia’s last remaining Aboriginal tracker, laid a wreath. Port represented the involvement of indigenous trackers who pursued the Kelly Gang (Police Association Journal Editorial 2003). For Klinge, this was a symbolic moment for the new recruits who would begin their police service ‘on the 125th anniversary of events where three members’ careers were tragically cut short’ (Nicholson 2003). The historical significance of this was poignant for some of the recruits, while for others simply the idea of being sworn in at the earlier public ceremony in Mansfield buoyed them (Police Association Journal Editorial 2003). Nixon hoped this event might start a tradition whereby the swearing-in ceremonies would be held publicly in different parts of Victoria (Nicholson 2003). However, this was not to be the case and the ceremonies reverted back to the Victoria Police Academy Chapel confines.

These isolated commemorative events highlight the importance of the ongoing memory work, work that has to be done in order to shape police collective remembrance in ways that enhance the idea of the sacred element of policing. Such commemorative processes and associated activities are pressed into reinforcing police legitimacy. Remembering the police dead plays a pivotal role in attempting to build symbolic connections with the community based upon the notion of sacrifice and to reinforce these ideas for police recruits. Police memorials were central to these commemorative events, providing a physical focal point for ceremonies, and symbolising the democratic ‘value’ of individuals volunteering to risk their lives for the community: the ultimate legitimacy. The graves of the officers killed at Stringybark Creek, situated in Mansfield cemetery, would be the scene of other commemorative events in subsequent years in the shadow of the national cultural reverence towards Ned Kelly.
However, the harmonisation of symbiotic differences is not always achieved through commemoration and memorialisation. In 2005 The Stringybark Creek Police Memorial was vandalised with some forty bullets being fired into the name plaque causing considerable damage (Wilkinson 2005). This might have been just random vandalism but in the following year the names of the officers killed at Stringybark Creek listed on the Victoria Police Memorial, were also vandalised, presumably, by Kelly sympathisers. Considering the sacred nature of police memorials vandalism like this might be described as a kind of iconoclasm. The symbiotic theme continued in 2011 as debates in the press about the expenditure of state funds to identify Ned Kelly’s remains while various Victoria Police graves were found neglected.

**Bones and Graves 2011**

Police grave headstones are also considered memorials. Ironically, while many police graves had become neglected over the years and some were forgotten, the bones of a bush ranger led to the repair of many police headstones. The following discusses how identifying Ned Kelly’s bones led to the establishment of the Police Graves Restoration Fund and the re-dedication of the graves of the officers killed at Stringybark Creek as well as the remembrance of another officer shot while on duty in 1910. Once again demonstrating the symbiotic relationship between Ned Kelly and Victoria Police.

The exact whereabouts of Kelly’s remains was a mystery for many years. His bones had been removed from their original burial place at Old Melbourne Gaol and were reburied in Pentridge Prison in 1929. Eighty years later his bones were exhumed with the remains of twenty-four other prisoners on Pentridge grounds and stored in the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (VIFM). In 2009, Tom Baxter, a West Australian farmer, handed in what he believed to be the skull of Ned Kelly to the VIFM. This created a problem for the Old Melbourne Gaol museum because it held what was understood to be Ned’s skull on display for

---

5 The Old Melbourne Gaol was built in the mid-1800s and was where Ned Kelly was hanged. Pentridge Prison replaced this earlier gaol in 1929.
many years (Smith 2011). The existence of two possible Kelly skulls prompted a coronial investigation into what happened to Kelly’s remains after his execution, and to establish which skull was his and whether his bones were among the skeletal remains of twenty-four executed prisoners the VIFM also held (Smith 2011).

It took two years for a dedicated team from the VIFM, led by Professor David Ranson, to complete Mitochondrial DNA testing, to establish generational connections, between various remains and Leigh Olver, a great grandson of Kelly’s sister Ellen Kelly. The conclusive results showed that neither of the skulls belonged to Ned Kelly. However, DNA from one of the skeletons was a perfect match with Olver and further proof was found in the examination of the bones using CT scanning, X-rays, pathology, odontology, medical records and other historical accounts. The bones contained bullet fragments and injuries consistent with wounds Kelly sustained during the gunfight with Victoria Police at Glenrowan (Smith 2011); (Lunn 2011). However, a bigger question remained after this discovery and sparked another round of press debates about Kelly’s place in Australian history and identity. As Stephan Lunn, writing for the *The Australian* newspaper, pointed out: ‘now that Ned’s found what do we do with him?’ (Lunn 2011).

Kelly’s family, the Benalla local council, Victoria Police and affiliated bodies all had conflicting ideas about what should happen to Ned’s remains. Kelly sent a request to the governor of the Melbourne Gaol the day before his execution asking that his body be given to his friends ‘that they might bury it in consecrated ground’ near his mother in the Greta cemetery but there were concerns that a marked grave might have ongoing vandalism or security issues (McArthur 2011). The Benalla local council thought a Kelly grave might be a significant tourist attraction drawing income to the local area. In contrast Greg Davies, president of the Victorian Police Association, was concerned that Kelly’s grave might become ‘a shrine where the feeble-minded can go and lionise someone who clearly doesn't deserve to be’ honoured (Lunn 2011). Heritage Victoria, the State Government and Kelly’s family all agreed with Davies and made it clear that ‘his grave should not become a shrine for devotees of the bushranger’ (McArthur 2011).
On 8 September, 2011, Attorney-General Robert Clark released Kelly’s remains back to his descendants (McArthur 2011). It was still another two years before Kelly’s remains were eventually buried after a funeral on 18 January, 2013, at St Patrick’s Catholic Church at Wangaratta, 133 years after his execution. Monsignor John White presided over the service that was attended by some 300 family members and hundreds of members of the public (Dow & Cram 2013). Kelly was buried in the Greta church yard where his mother, several siblings, and other family members are buried in unmarked graves (Psaltis 2013).

The public attention towards Kelly’s bones provoked Victoria Police to enquire how police graves could be neglected when so many resources were given to identifying a convicted ‘cop killer’s’ remains. These concerns were not unfounded. Kelly’s legacy will be most likely an ongoing nemesis for Victoria Police regarding remembrance of the State’s past. A significant proportion of Australians see Kelly as a national folk hero and are prepared to sideline his murdering, robbing and kidnapping. As Müller suggests people ‘… have a grand memory for forgetting’. Deliberately omitting or marginalising historical events that don’t support accepted grand narratives is part of the collective remembrance process (Müller 2002, p. 281). The marginalising of Kelly’s crimes began early. Tim Lloyd, of the *Adelaide Advertiser*, reported some 32,000 signatures were gathered to have Kelly reprieved from his execution in 1880. Lloyd also spoke with Diane Gardiner, who once managed the Old Melbourne Goal museum. Gardiner recalled the museum receiving flower wreathes annually on the eleventh day of the eleventh month in remembrance of Kelly’s execution (Lloyd 2011).

Public debates endured in the later months of 2011 over the possible construction of a Kelly memorial and his inclusion as one of the 100 Greatest Country Australians in *The Weekly Times* series (Blog Herald Sun 2011; Letters *Weekly Times* 2011). Public opinion was predictably divided over these proposals with many opposed to spending tax payers’ money on a ‘cop killer’ memorial and his eventual ranking at number six in the top ten Australians (Lanigan 2011). Australians were as divided in their opinions of Kelly in the twenty-first century as they were in the nineteenth century. In the end, writes Baz Blakeney, the reason Kelly’s legacy has survived in a society often resisting mythologising
individuals, is because it is such a ‘cracking story’ (Blakeney 2011). However, the Kelly story also overshadows other stories pertaining to Victoria’s policing history.

**Forgotten Hero**

The Victorian Government is obliged to remember police who have died serving the community but not bound to remember the death of criminals. However, the Victorian Government considered the identification of Kelly’s remains important for all Australians. The allocation of resources to the various government agencies involved in the identification of his remains cost tax-payers $88,000 and took around twenty months. Yet, soon after the positive identification of Kelly’s remains, Constable David Edward McGrath’s grave was inadvertently found by Detective-Sergeant David Reilly, buried ‘under weeds, rubble and scrap timber at Melbourne’s Coburg cemetery’ in early September 2011. Reilly discovered the grave while looking around the cemetery for some of his own ancestors’ graves (Wilkinson 2011). The significant contrast between remembrance of a convicted murderer and a police officer is again demonstrated reflecting the skewed symbiosis.
McGrath was killed in a gunfight on October 1, 1915, at the Trades Hall building in Melbourne’s central business district along with two other criminals attempting a getaway, having been discovered trying to break into the safe. John Jackson, Richard Buckley and Alexander Ward had successfully broken into the safe several months before. An officer walking the beat interrupted their noisy second attempt and a number of officers were called in for back up. McGrath and two other officers entered the building via a window and soon confronted Jackson and Buckley, as they were trying to escape. Approximately 20 shots were exchanged during the firefight and McGrath was hit by two rounds fired by Jackson and died at the scene (Johnson 2015, p. 128). Other officers wounded both Jackson and Buckley before their capture in the Trades Hall yard while the third offender was captured without a fight (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, pp. 77-9). McGrath’s actions were worthy of remembrance but the state, over time, forgot him.

The discovery of McGrath’s unkempt grave upset Victoria Police and its associated organisations the Blue Ribbon Foundation and the Police Association,
in the context of the resources spent on Kelly. According to a *Herald Sun* article, Reilly claimed the grave was in a disgraceful state: ‘it needs to be fixed as a matter of urgency. We’ve got to have more respect for the dead than this’. Neil Soullier, Chief Executive of the Blue Ribbon Foundation, said the graves’ condition was an ‘embarrassment’ considering National Police Remembrance Day, which commemorates all police killed on duty, was to be held at the end of that month. Greg Davies, Secretary of the Victoria Police Association, said it was:

upsetting and distressing to find that the Government would spend so much money identifying a convicted murderer’s remains, yet allow this situation to continue…We’d like to think they’d spend a fraction of that amount to provide a suitable final resting place for a man who was murdered while protecting the community (Wilkinson 2011).

McGrath’s great nephew, Geoff Lugg, a retired police sergeant, came forward to the media the day after the discovery of the unmarked and dishevelled grave. He had spent eighteen years with Victoria Police and it was his great uncle’s story that inspired him to join. Lugg and his family did not know where his great uncle was buried and were ‘shocked’ to find that his grave was in such an ‘irreverent’ condition. Davies put forward the idea of forming a police graves commission to ensure the maintenance of police graves, making a direct comparison and link to the institutionalised way military ‘heros’ are remembered. Davies argued:

we have a War Graves Commission to make sure our war heroes are not neglected. Police who died protecting the community should be treated in the same way (Wilkinson 2011b).

The Victorian Government acted quickly either out of concern or embarrassment that some police graves had long been neglected. Just under a month after the discovery of McGrath’s neglected grave, ‘Deputy Premier and Minister for Police Minister, Peter Ryan, announced the Victorian Government would establish a dedicated *Police Graves Memorial Fund*, to ensure the grave sites of officers killed in the line of duty were maintained’ (DOJ Press Release 2011). Having just attended National Police Remembrance Day, Ryan pledged $50,000 to put right
six graves identified as in need of repair and for the ongoing maintenance of all other graves of Victorian police who ‘died in the line of duty.’ Until this point, family members maintained most of the 157 police graves in Victoria. The fact that some graves had fallen into neglect is a reflection of the ‘shelf life’ of collective keepers of memory (Winter 1999), who were largely immediate family members, friends and colleagues many of whom had long died when McGrath’s grave had been re-discovered (Enfield 2015). Many of the names of the deceased officers were recorded on the Victoria Police Memorial or in the Chapel of Remembrance, as well as in works such as *In the Performance of Duty* (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994), which tell the stories of Victoria Police members killed on duty. However, the grave-sites were forgotten largely because there was no official or unofficial program to maintain them. They were not tied into the larger commemorative practices that draws individual remembrance into broader collective remembrance. In an undirected manner, the individual graves were mostly small scale-sites, localised sites of memory, dependent upon the limited agency of family friends and ‘fictive kin’, to remember and maintain them. The creation of an official state funded memorial fund brought these smaller sites of memory into the larger collective remembrance and memorialisation work.

Minister Ryan argued the establishment of the *Police Graves Memorial Fund* is an important:

> mark of respect to these members who died in uniform and a message to their families and the broader Victorian community that these officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice will always be remembered (DOJ Press Release 2011).

McGrath’s grave was the first to be restored via the new fund (Kaila 2012).

Finding Kelly’s remains and discovering McGrath’s neglected grave are further evidence that the relationship between the two processes of remembrance are symbiotic. However, it seems unlikely the *Police Graves Memorial Fund* would have been established so quickly if there was not so much time and money spent identifying Kelly’s remains. The fund was also used to repair the headstones of the three officers killed by Ned Kelly. The symbiosis emerges again as the three graves were re-dedicated in 2013.
Re-dedication of the Mansfield Police Graves 2013

The re-dedication of the graves of Sergeant Michael Kennedy, Constable Michael Scanlan, and Constable Thomas Lonigan, occurred on 24 October, 2013 during a ceremony held at the Mansfield cemetery. The spirit of reconciliation evident in 2001 at the Stringybark Creek was again missing here. These graves had been in disrepair for many years, having sustained significant vandalism during the 1960s. Restoration of the graves was completed to a high standard but evidence of the broken masonry is still visible especially on the tombstones of Kennedy and Scanlan. Members of the local Mansfield council, Police Minister Kim Wells, and Police Commissioner Ken Lay (Money 2013) attended the ceremony which involved Shrine Guards, mounted officers from Victoria Police Historical Society dressed in period uniform, a bagpiper and a number of other uniformed officers in current dress uniform. Added to this were an indeterminate number of descendants of the deceased officers and members of the general public. Judging by photographs of the occasion, there appeared to be under one hundred people in attendance (Victoria Police 2013). The sentiment seemed clear to a reporter for The Age: ‘This was no place for fans of Ned Kelly’ (Money 2013).

Debates surrounding the Stringybark Creek incident were highly partisan on this occasion. Part of the inscription on Lonigan’s grave set the tone: ‘murdered by armed criminals’ (Victoria Police 2013). Michael Kennedy’s great grandson, Leo expressed his dismay at how many Australians had made an ‘icon’ of Kelly while Deborah Tunstall, Lonigan’s great-great-granddaughter, said the ceremony ‘finally brought justice’ to the three officers. The way this was done was not mentioned (Money 2013). Ken Lay made a number of comments reflecting on how Kelly’s legacy has detracted from the remembrance of the three officers who had arguably become ‘pawns in a long-running debate about the meaning of Ned Kelly and the “cultural adoration”’ of his gang’s activities that ‘detracted from’ the ‘sacrifice’ of Kennedy, Scanlon and Lonigan. Remembrance of the three officers became mere ‘footnotes to the lives and excesses of those who killed them’ (Herald Sun Editorial 2013). For Lay, all officers who had died doing their job ‘hold a sacred place in Victoria Police History’ (Money 2013).
At face value, Lay’s arguments are understandable. It must be disconcerting to some members of Victoria Police that large segments of the Australian community hold Kelly in higher regard than the officers who had pledged to protect the community. However, if Ned Kelly did not occupy such an elevated position in the public’s remembrance, perhaps the graves of Kennedy, Scanlan, and Lonigan might have remained neglected and forgotten like McGrath’s. It is unlikely many Australians would be able to name an officer who bushrangers killed in the nineteenth century or other officers killed by criminals in the twentieth or twenty-first centuries. Though Kelly’s popularity is lamentable, the argument can be made that, if not for this popularity, the three murdered officers might not even have made it as ‘footnotes’ in history, as Lay suggests.

Local awareness of Kennedy, Scanlan, and Lonigan’s graves was enhanced by their refurbishment and re-dedication in 2013. On 30 May 2015, Mansfield locals replaced the May Bush which was removed during the refurbishment process as its roots were damaging Kennedy’s grave (Mansfield Courier Editorial 2015).

The May Bush had special significance relating to the loyalty shown to the Crown by the Royal Irish Constabulary at an incident at Castlepollard, Ireland, in 1831. The new bush was grown from an original cutting sent from Castlepollard, Ireland in 1878, and planted with a commemorative plaque near the entrance to the Mansfield cemetery that was opened at a small ceremony (Zierk-Mahoney 2015). Now visitors are reminded of the officers’ graves on entering the cemetery.

In a final reminder of the ongoing contested memory surrounding Kelly and Victoria Police, on 3 July, 2016, The Blue Ribbon Foundation dedicated a $200,000 emergency ward to Kennedy, Scanlan, and Lonigan as part of a deliberate ‘campaign to end the glorification of Ned Kelly.’ The reporter described this as the ‘latest development of the Ned Kelly history wars’ (McCallum 2016).

The symbiosis of Victoria Police memorialisation largely solidified after the discovery of Kelly’s bones. Although Victoria Police and many community members lament Kelly’s popularity, his remembrance feeds into the remembrance of police officers killed in the line of duty, lives sacrificed for the community,
symbolically communicating and enhancing police legitimacy. However, remembrance of Kelly is also evoked, albeit from the police perspective, whenever the three officers killed at Stringybark are commemorated. While Victoria Police memorials and gravesites were given greater public exposure and on-going funding for maintenance due, in part, to remembrance of Ned Kelly, remembrance of the bushranger remains a prominent part of police history at Victoria Police Museum.

**Concluding Remarks**

The memorialisation and commemoration of Victoria Police began in 1878 and developed gradually over the following one hundred and fifty years. The contested remembrance of Victoria Police and the Kelly Outbreak created a symbiosis to parts of Victoria Police memorialisation and remembrance. The ‘agents of memory’, for both sides of the Kelly story dichotomy, assert their respective approaches and perspectives through many available means, including memorials, facilitating a symbiotic remembrance of benefit to all sides. The totality of the differing perspectives of this story, one way or another, perceive all the protagonists as heroes. Heroes that are linked into Australian national identity narratives. The sum of the above research suggests police appropriate military commemorative customs because they already see themselves as part of this kind of commemoration. Indeed the Shrine Guards show that they are connected to military commemoration. Nevertheless, the association of Victoria Police remembrance with the much extolled Anzac traditions can be beneficial to police legitimacy by equation to the concept of sacrifice for the nation.

The Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance and the Necropolis Police Memorial show there is more to police commemoration than building memorials in the landscape to remind the public that police risk their lives for the communities they serve. These sites of memory focus more on facilitating the grieving process from loss and the sacredness of human lives. These sites are more often places for ceremonies for the greater policing family, the spouses, children, parents, siblings and extended networks of friends, family and colleagues of the deceased officers.
The Necropolis memorial in particular, shows that care for the remembrance of Victoria Police also exists in the community it serves. Here the community demonstrated acceptance of and connection to Victoria Police. Such demonstrations are some of the few tangible measurements of police legitimacy.

Death resulting from service to the Australian community has salient value. Today, police engage in symbolic communication through institutionalised rituals and commemorative practices such as National Police Remembrance Day and local sites of memory such as Mansfield and Stringybark Creek. Highlighting the death of officers at memorials and commemorative events reminds the public of the sacred element of police work, that of risking life and health protecting the community, or what might be described as the ‘ultimate legitimacy’. The following chapter demonstrates how two poignant police deaths became the catalyst for the creation of the Victoria Police Memorial.
Chapter Four: The Victoria Police Memorial

Introduction

The previous chapter examined the significant developments in Victoria Police remembrance over the course of 122 years from the opening of the first police memorial in Mansfield in 1880, to the construction of the Victoria Police Memorial in 2002. Elements of the history and memorialisation of policing in this state are intertwined with the legacy of bushranger, Ned Kelly, producing a symbiotic remembrance linked to Australia’s founding national bushman myths and the Anzac tradition. The commemorative practices of Victoria Police also identify strongly with the nation’s military traditions both appropriating customs and contributing to military ceremonies. Honouring those who risk and lose their lives for the nation is central to remembrance of both the military and police. The
Mansfield Police Memorial and the Victoria Police Memorial were both conceived to honour officers deliberately killed in the line of duty. The initial conception, for the Victoria Police Memorial was a direct result of the killing of two young officers, Senior-Constable Rodney Miller and Sergeant Gary Silk in 1998, fully discussed below. Yet both memorials take on much larger commemorative mantles than remembrance of two or three officers. This chapter examines the Victoria Police Memorial’s developmental history, based on, interviews, press articles, and documents from the Memorial Committee, Melbourne City Council, and the National Trust files.

As discussed in Chapter One, there is a theoretical dichotomy in the literature on military commemoration which often attempts to separate the explanation for the emergence of war memorials into either the ‘state centred’ or ‘social agency’ approaches. Ashplant, Dawson and Roper attempt to close this dichotomy arguing that public expressions of remembrance such as memorials are necessarily a combination of both approaches (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004). This later conceptualisation largely reflects current scholarship on memorialisation (Blair, Dickinson & Ott 2010). Ashplant, Dawson and Roper suggest a three layered approach to the study of the politics of memory by examining the ‘narratives’, ‘arenas’ and ‘agencies’ of articulation. The development of the Victoria Police Memorial can be located within this theoretical analysis affirming that elements of both the ‘state centred’ and ‘social agency’ concepts influenced the construction of this memorial.

The grief and concern shown by the Victorian community over the Silk and Miller killings initiated a momentum Victoria Police and their supporters harnessed to construct a public memorial honouring all past sacrifices, while guaranteeing a place of remembrance for future lives lost. The initial public push for this memorial is observed in various ‘arenas’ of articulation demonstrating what Winter (1995) and Bodnar (1991) would describe as significant ‘social agency’ from the ‘bottom up’. The public expressions of grief, recorded in the press and ‘talk back’ radio, centred on the lost officers and the families they left behind. Local councils proposed placing plaques on the site where the officers died. The officers’ separate police funerals were the biggest held in Victoria
involving a total of 4000 people at each ceremony, spilling out of the Chapel of Remembrance, where they were held. The uniformed police honour guards lined the streets for two kilometres, reminiscent of the public ‘spectacle’ described by Manning in relation to police funerals (Manning 1997).

Decisions about what the memorial would commemorate was in the hands of the Victoria Police Chief Commissioner and the Executive Command. Thus, although the initial impetus for the memorial was from the ‘bottom up’, its ultimate purpose to commemorate all Victoria Police who had died on duty came from the ‘top down’. The ‘official’ police remembrance focussed on the ‘sacred’ dead, the ‘narrative’ used in discourses of Australian national identity. Remembering the sacred dead also demonstrated publically the connection and shared values between police and the Victorian community, the key component of police legitimacy. The final site of the memorial, near Government House also ‘officially’ reinforced Victoria Police as part of the governing structure. Importantly, the military connections discussed throughout the thesis solidify with the choice of the memorial’s site close to the heart of the state’s military commemorative precinct centred on the Shrine of Remembrance. Locating the police memorial at this site also facilitated the public ‘spectacle’ of police remembrance practices with the annual march traversing part of the same route taken by military processions on Anzac Day.

The final design of the memorial derived from a number of sources. The Memorial Committee gathered initial ideas from members of Victoria Police and the public, by way of an invitation through the press. These design submissions can be seen as ‘vernacular’ expressions largely focussing on grief, loss and connections to the community highlighting service duties and there was a marked preference for ‘traditional’ memorial designs such as statues or effigies of police. The Memorial Committee found some of these vernacular design suggestions useful. However, the final design was chosen from professional submissions and was an abstract monumental structure rivalled in size only by Victoria’s main nearby military memorial the Shrine of Remembrance. The Victoria Police
Memorial funding came from official sources, those being Victoria Police, the Department of Justice, the Community Support Fund and Melbourne City Council, sparing the project from the uncertainties of public subscription. With the design chosen and the funding secured, there seemed to be little to stand in the way.

Then unexpected resistance emerged from the National Trust, an agency of articulation, which disagreed with both the site and the design. Perhaps most surprising to the Memorial Committee, was that the Trust’s objections were supported by the Returned and Services League (RSL), the hegemonic ‘agents of memory’ for Australia’s military. This shows the complexities involved in establishing public sites of memory. Yet resistance to the memorial soon evaporated due to the concerted will of the stakeholders and a lack of public support for the objections. The manifestation of this construction is a symbolic representation of policing, a message clear to the public about necessity of sacrifice in keeping law and order and the obligation to remember the ‘fallen’.

**Conception of the Memorial**

It is the night of 16 August, 1998, and two Victoria Police Officers approached a suspect vehicle on Cochrances Rd, Moorabbin, in Melbourne, as part of Operation Hamada. The Operation investigated a number of restaurant robberies in Melbourne’s South Eastern suburbs. Killed instantly, as he approached the vehicle, Senior-Constable Rodney Miller, received a gunshot to the head. His partner, Sergeant Gary Silk, although shot in the abdomen, managed to return fire at the offenders, dying shortly after from his wounds (*Stonnington Leader* Editorial 2002b).

Press reports, police periodicals, and interviews with Victoria Police members serving at the time, support the idea that the Silk and Miller shootings started the momentum to build a State memorial to all Victoria Police who die on duty. As was noted in the press reports, the death of these two officers was preceded a
decade earlier by a similar incident whereby two young officers, Constables Steven Tynan and Damian Eyre were shot and killed in an ambush in Walsh Street, South Yarra, Melbourne in 1988. The earlier shootings are part of a broader discussion in Chapter Five about possible reasons why the state police memorial did not emerge earlier in history and is mentioned here briefly, to illustrate part of Victoria Police’s response to the Silk and Miller deaths reported in the presses. The Tynan and Eyre shootings had a devastating effect on Victoria Police (Stonnington Leader Editorial 2002a). In some cases, the shooting of Silk and Miller re-visited the grief of the Tynan and Eyre shootings. For example, the-then Victoria Police Chief Commissioner, Neil Comrie, said ‘I’m sure the vivid memories of the Walsh St murders 10 years ago readily come to mind’ (Mickelburough 1998); and in another article ‘…painful memories came flooding back of Walsh St where constables Steven Tynan and Damian Eyre were killed on October 12, 1988’ (Herald Sun Editorial 1998b). However, despite these and other previous police deaths, it was the Silk and Miller shooting which appeared to galvanise Victoria Police and significant segments of the Victorian public to support a perpetual memorial to police killed in the line of duty. As noted in Chapter Two, the killing of these officers also moved Police Commissioner Neil Comrie to make Blue Ribbon Day an annual Victorian event coinciding with Police Remembrance Day.

The idea that Silk and Miller shootings facilitated the creation of a Victoria Police memorial was due mostly to the significant amount of public support and ‘outpouring of grief’ in their wake. In the following days, the public began responding to the incident, with hundreds of people telephoning Victoria Police ‘to offer donations of money, welfare and flowers’ (Mickelburough, Cogdon & Giles 1998). The Herald Sun reported that ‘thousands of… Victorians, including friends, colleagues and strangers, responded to the tragedy with flowers and offers of help’. Mourners blanketed the site in flowers and police stations state-wide received flowers and phone calls offering help (Cogdon 1998; Mickelburough et al. 1998). Numbers of ‘memorial messages’ were sent into the Herald Sun from friends, colleagues and family (Thom 1998). Flowers were left on the service desk of the St Kilda Police Station where Gary Silk was based. They were sent
with an emotional card from one of the local prostitutes who described Gary as a ‘good copper’ (Hamilton 1998). A local family living across the road from the incident laid flowers at the site:

We've brought these flowers as a mark of sympathy for the two dead officers, but we also want their colleagues to know how much we respect them for the job they did that night and for the work they do every day (Buttler & Ryan 1998).

Reporting information relating to the officers’ deaths, including some 5000 calls to Crime Stoppers by late August (Mickelburgh 1998b), demonstrates the extensive public cooperation during the investigation. One person, appalled by the officer’s deaths, said that it was a shame that such demonstrations of ‘public support and co-operation with the police in maintaining law and order were not likely to last’ (McDonald 1998).

Sporting clubs from Victoria’s most popular spectator sport, Australian Rules Football or Australian Football League (AFL), honoured the deaths of Silk and Miller. The Hawthorn AFL club, honoured Silk who had been a member for many years, wearing black armbands at a match against Geelong on Sunday 23 August (Mickelburgh et al. 1998). Miller was a member of the Richmond AFL club and the players wore black armbands in his honour. On the same weekend (22-23 August), AFL players from Collingwood, Essendon, Western Bulldogs, Geelong, North Melbourne and St Kilda also wore armbands. Carlton Football Club’s opening banner read: ‘Carlton Football Club supports the Victoria Police Force’. The Victorian Amateur Turf Club (Buttler 1998) handed out some 2000 blue ribbons at the Sandown and Caulfield horse-race meetings. A commemorative annual AFL game is still played today in the officers’ honour.

Miller had just become a father, which no doubt added to public outpourings of sympathy. Gary Silk’s father urged people to donate to the James Miller fund set up for the education and welfare of Rodney Miller’s son. A Memorial Foundation was also set up by 20 August for initiatives to perpetuate the memory of all
officers who had been killed doing their job (Anderson 1998). By the end of the following month, $86,100 had been donated to these two funds (Mickelburough 1998b). Moreover, according to the Senior Police Chaplain at the time, Jim Pilmer, the Silk and Miller families were respected in the community, maintaining quite high profiles for some time after the incident, so people witnessed their grieving (Pilmer interview 2014).

Gary Silk’s funeral took place on 19 August, 1998. Manning (1997), suggests elements of the community become disconcerted about the current status of law and order when police are deliberately killed like Silk and Miller. The appearance of uniformed officers *en masse* at police funerals is a reassuring powerful symbol of the coherent force assigned to maintain ‘formal social control’. Like military ceremonies, police funeral ceremonies also use the spectacle of synchronised actions such as saluting, and marching and coordinated mass movements of personnel and vehicles in a symbolic message of strength and unity. Silk’s funeral was, to that date, Victoria’s biggest police funeral with approximately 4000 people in attendance at the Victoria Police Academy and a two kilometre uniformed honour guard stretching along Mount View Rd. outside the Academy grounds. Another service ran in tandem filling St David’s Anglican Church, in Moorabbin (Mickelburough & Giles 1998a). The congregation at the Academy included people from distant locations such as Turkey and Indonesia, as well as family and friends of the two officers, politicians, police officers from various ranks and states, and other service personnel from the military, ambulance service, fire brigade and State Emergency Services (Brundrett 1998). As a mark of respect, Premier Jeff Kennett ‘ordered the rare lowering of flags to coincide with the funerals of the policemen’ (Mickelburough 1998b). The unprecedented public effort to ‘pay tribute to police’ left Police Association State Secretary, Danny Walsh, ‘speechless’. Inspector Alan Carlisle was the officer in charge the night the two officers were killed. At the funeral he:

> told the congregation the bond between the police force and the community “grows ever stronger from the sacrifices Sgt Gary Silk and
Sen-Constable Rodney Miller made in the name of law and order”
(Mickelburough & Giles 1998a).

In many ways, these two young men were portrayed as ideal police officers representing the traditional national values such as ‘patriotism, honor, duty, and commitment’ (Manning 1997, pp. 19-23). Thus, the state said goodbye to a "bloke's bloke ... a copper's copper" as he was referred to numerous times in press reports (Brundrett 1998).

Constable Rodney Miller’s funeral was held on 21 August, 1998. With moving testimonials from family, friends and colleagues, Miller’s funeral echoed Silk’s funeral two days before. There were approximately 4000 people in attendance at the Police Academy Chapel, many wearing blue ribbons as a sign of respect. Here, too, another two kilometres of uniformed honour guard lined the road. Chief Commissioner Neil Comrie described the demonstration of community support during that week as ‘beyond comprehension’ (Mickelburough & Giles 1998). State Premier Jeff Kennett was able to attend Miller’s funeral where the idea of a police memorial starts gaining momentum.

A Herald Sun editorial suggested there would be considerable public support for Jeff Kennett’s suggestion for the establishment of a state memorial to police who had been killed on duty. The editorial also claimed that the Herald Sun had earlier ‘underlined the need for such a memorial close to the city centre… [and that the] St Kilda Road's associations with sacrifice and its central location make it the ideal place to remember all those police who gave their lives for the community’ (Herald Sun Editorial 1998a). As discussed in Chapter Two, politicians often compared the death of police with the death of soldiers. Here again, Kennett compared the thirty-one Victoria Police officers murdered since 1837 to soldiers killed on active service. There was no certainty as to what form the memorial might take, although a statue was mentioned, such as the one representing Sir Edward (Weary) Dunlop who became famous for his work saving lives in Japanese prisoner of war camps during the Second World War. Kennett
nominated St Kilda Road as an appropriate site. The initial rationale for this site was that it was green and pleasant, it already functioned as an avenue for military memorials to sacrifice, and it was a major thoroughfare with the public moving constantly past (see appendix maps 1 and 2). The intention to memorialise the two officers was bipartisan. The Labor Party suggested Karkarook Park, Moorabbin, near the site of the shootings, be renamed to honour the two deceased officers (Mickelburgh & Giles 1998).

The idea was then followed up on a number of top rating morning drive time talkback radio programs such as 3AW, where the State Premier spoke about it (Vicpol 1998b). Scanning the media every day for possible issues that might need a police response was part of Stuart King’s job as a Staff Officer to Assistant Commissioner Bill Severino. King recalls that:

…the community debate through 3AW and other radio stations, John Faine on the ABC, was quite emotional, and the police shootings that prompted it I think really acted as a catalyst for the community to say we need to do something to recognise police and their contribution.

While it appears senior police picked up the idea for a permanent police memorial from the Herald Sun, King suggests community sentiment was galvanised on the radio stations. King argued that the:

…Silk and Miller shootings were certainly the focal point for community debate about what police officers do for the community and how many have actually died in the service of the community (King interview 2014).

This community response provided the context for the informal discussions held at Miller’s funeral between Police Commissioner Neil Comrie and Premier Kennett who both supported the idea for a memorial (Herald Sun Editorial 1998a).

Public interest in memorialising Silk and Miller continued after the funerals. Victoria Police received a letter from Neil Mitchell, host of 3AW’s talkback radio
program, on 24 August. Mitchell informed Victoria Police that ‘several callers to
our program raised the possibility of a permanent memorial being erected
to…[Silk and Miller] in the new park in Warrigal Rd.’ He supported the callers’
ideas but suggested to them that any such initiative would have to be approved by
the deceased officers’ families and Victoria Police (Vicpol 1998d). Victoria
Police received other requests to memorialise the officers from civic organisations
such as the Rotary Club of Bentleigh Moorabbin Central, which wanted a plaque
installed near where the officers were killed (Vicpol 1998e).

On 28 August, 1998 a meeting was held at the Victoria Police Centre in response
to the shootings of Silk and Miller and the ‘unprecedented public action to
support police’, and subsequent suggestions to build a police memorial (Vicpol
1998b). The meeting was held to discuss ideas relating to the fundamental
concepts and parameters of the proposed state police memorial. This meeting
produced two pivotal documents outlining the thinking of the initial stages of the
memorial’s development: a ‘briefing paper’, which basically comprised the
minutes of the meeting and an ‘options paper’ compiled by Assistant
Commissioner Bill Severino who had been put in charge of the memorial’s
development by Chief Commissioner Comrie (Severino interview 2014) and
chaired the meeting. Also in attendance were various representatives from
Melbourne City Council, officials from the Premier’s Department and Cabinet,
Herald Sun and Weekly Times, the Police Association, Victoria Police Historical
Society, and the Public Arts and Acquisitions Committee. The most important
concept to be established in this first meeting was what exactly the Victoria Police
were aiming to commemorate (Vicpol 1998b). At this stage the site, the design
and purpose of the memorial were all open for suggestions from the members of
this first meeting. Indeed, pivotal issues, such as the memorial’s site and the
inclusion of names on the memorial, could well have taken very different
directions to the end product as the discussion of the memorial’s development
suggests below.
Deciding What and Who the Memorial will Commemorate

While the shooting deaths of two officers propelled the agency required to build the Victoria Police Memorial this did not necessarily mean the memorial would be exclusively commemorating murdered police. Vietnam War memorial committees in Australia faced the same kind of deliberations. In particular, whose names, if any, should be included on memorials? Whether names were included or not, to try to avoid exclusion, statements such as ‘For All Those Who Served, Suffered and Died’ were often inscribed on Australian war memorials (Linke 2009, p. 61). The participants at the first meeting for the police memorial discussed many possible options. For example, a prominent discussion point was whether the memorial should commemorate ‘Victoria Police Force as an entity or only members who have lost their lives in the line of their duty?’ (Vicpol 1998c). Also discussed was whether the memorial should commemorate the broader ‘police family’ like Protective Service Officers and the civilians working for Victoria Police or officers injured physically or psychologically in the course of their work or killed in motor vehicle accidents or other unintentional incidents resulting in death or injury. Such incidents have occurred during police rescues from burning vehicles and houses, from flooded rivers or events occurring further back in time such as being thrown off a horse. Other complexities were considered; should the names of those members dying sometime after an event as a result of injuries sustained whilst carrying out police duties, or those who died of natural causes such as illness, or members who committed suicide, be included? (Vicpol 1998b, 1998c).

During these early meetings thoughts returned to what it was exactly that captured the ‘public’s attention in response to the murder of the two members at Moorabbin’ (Vicpol 1998b). It was suggested that perhaps it was the ‘ideal’ of public protection that was threatened. As discussed in Chapter Two, academics such as Manning, and Brown, Presland and Stavely (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, p. 5) would agree with this idea. Manning (1997, pp. 19-23) argues that for many people in western industrialised societies, the police ‘represent the presence
of the civil body politic in everyday life’. The police are a symbolic reminder that the state can and will ‘intervene’ in the lives of its citizens to protect them and to maintain social order. The existence of a police force is also a visible symbol of an ideal society with stability, ‘continuity and integrity’ at its core. The ideal police officer is one representing and demonstrating traditional national values, such as ‘patriotism, honour, duty, and commitment.’ Moreover, there is the subtextual understanding that the state entrusts the police to discriminatingly use the ‘ultimate sanction’ of violence in the performance of their duties and that officers will be inversely exposed to force from time to time and occasionally die from it. The people entrust the state to enact the sacred task of producing, and ultimately enforcing ‘rules, laws and norms.’ The state supplies the police with moral and legal authority and the latest equipment, training and many other resources to keep social order. When all these resources fail to protect a police officer while they attempt to keep order ‘doubts are raised about the protective power of the symbols and the order they represent’. Thus, the memorial committee’s speculations on the degree of public support have some theoretical traction. In essence, the evident public support for the memorial was the public’s symbolic counter-attack in defence of the organisation charged with their protection.

Attacking the police is also an assault on a nation’s identity. Police legitimacy is positively reinforced when the majority values of the public and the police meet. Part of the memorial’s purpose then would be to symbolically represent this important relationship.

Some consideration was given to the proposed National Police Memorial in Canberra and the existing Victoria Police Memorial Chapel during discussions to resolve these questions about the Victoria Police Memorial’s purpose. It was understood that the national memorial would cater to a broad range of police death categories due to its wide criteria: any member of Australia’s police forces who died ‘as a result of their duties’ (Vicpol 1998c). It was suggested that some of the categories of police deaths could be omitted from the Victorian memorial, such as the deaths of non-sworn members, because they would be included in the national memorial. Moreover, the Victoria Police Memorial Chapel, which at that time was the most significant ‘site of memory’ for Victoria Police members,
already commemorated deceased officers in the ‘Blue Chapel’ where name plaques of deceased Victorian officers are displayed ‘within the categories of: feloniously slain, killed in the line of duty, and died having been a member of the force’ (Vicpol 1998c). Also, National Police Remembrance Day commemorates ‘all’ police who died in the course of their duties. The Victorian Chief Commissioner clarified his preference was for the Victoria Memorial to be for sworn members only and restricted to those who were ‘feloniously slain’ (Vicpol 1998b). Severino argued that there seemed little point in dedicating a state memorial to ‘Victoria Police’, in a general sense, because it would continue as an entity in the foreseeable future and the Victorian community was well aware of the Force’s continual role. Thus, Senior Victoria Police staff reached the consensus that it was more appropriate that any memorial ‘should specify, by name or generally, members of the Force who have been killed in the performance of duty’ (Vicpol 1998c).

As mentioned above, whether or not to include names on the memorial was also part of the discussion around defining what and how the memorial would commemorate. Providing inscription space for the names of people commemorated is a common function of many military and civil memorials. Sherman argues that listing names on memorials ‘serves as a connection between the living and the dead as well as providing an example of sacrifice for the nation, for future generations’ (see also Hass 1998, p. 15; Sherman 1999, p. 68). Hass’s (1998, p. 15) discussion of America’s national Vietnam War memorial in Washington, suggests that ‘the power of the design lies in the overwhelming presence of individual names, which represent complicated human lives cut short’. Moreover, a mass of names is a powerful feature having a greater impact than just listing one or two. Winter cites Freud’s 1917 work *Mourning and Melancholia* as a source that helps to understand the protracted suffering of some mourners. Freud identifies two types of mourners the ‘non-melancholic’ and the ‘melancholic’. The grief from loss is easier to bear for the non-melancholic. They experience the ‘reality of loss’ but are able to let go of the ‘departed’. The melancholic ‘become trapped in a forest of loss, unable to focus on what had been torn from their lives.’ These people often need some kind of ‘mediating element’
to help them identify ‘what is gone, and what has survived’ (Winter 1995, pp. 114-5). Winter suggests that rituals and commemorations at war memorials including the listing and touching of names assist in the letting go process:

"touching war memorials, and in particular, touching the names of those who died, is an important part of the rituals of separation which surround them…Whatever the aesthetic and political meanings which they may bear, [memorials] are also sites of mourning…" (Winter 1995, pp. 113-5).

Much debate ensued to determine what names, if any, should be included on the police memorial. At the heart of the matter, was the question of ‘who is to say which death is more deserving of being included on the memorial?’ (Vicpol 1998b). For some police and military personnel there is a clear divide between those who deserve to be listed on memorials and those who are not deserving. Personnel who have ‘faced an angry man’ or ‘seen action’ are considered more deserving than those whose roles did not expose them to danger (Severino interview 2014). Some on the committee argued that the memorial should have no names at all inscribed on it. A no-names option would save updating the memorial when new fatalities occurred. It would also negate having to make decisions as to who should be included. Thus, it was argued, a memorial with no names would be an ‘inclusive’ rather than an ‘exclusive’ memorial (Vicpol 1998b).

Examples of military memorials were considered by way of comparison and precedent to help clarify the issue of including names or not on the police memorial. Initially, Victoria’s main war memorial, The Shrine of Remembrance, commemorated all Victorians who died and served in the First World War and now commemorates all subsequent conflicts listing no names on the memorial itself. The Vietnam Forces National Memorial in Canberra also has no visibly inscribed names on it but instead they are all listed and hidden in part of the memorial (Linke 2009). The names of the Vietnam War dead are also listed nearby on a wall inside the Australian War Memorial along with names of all Australia’s war dead. Names are inscribed on most Australian suburban and country town war memorials. However, none present at the initial discussions
over a Victoria Police memorial felt it was necessary to follow the military precedents (Vicpol 1998b, 1998c).

![Figure 8: Example of the name plaques on the inside of the Victoria Police Memorial. Photo Courtesy of the Victoria Police Museum.](image)

The representative from the City of Melbourne (CoM) believed that the memorial ‘celebrates the relationship that the police have with the public’ (Vicpol 1998b). The suggestion here is police risk their lives to protect the public as part of that relationship. Therefore, names of those who give their lives should be publicly visible. The CoM representative also suggested names should be placed on the memorial to facilitate a ‘personal experience’ for the families of deceased officers. He also argued that the memorial needed a sense of ‘timelessness about it’ and would be refreshed each time a deceased member’s name is added (Vicpol 1998b). In most cases a ceremony is held at the memorial each time a name is added, and this keeps the memorial active as a site of remembrance. Such discussions also included the idea of leaving blank plaques on the memorial for future fatalities. In the end the committee decided the idea of leaving room for more plaques was in better ‘taste’ than having blank plaques placed on the memorial for future dead (Severino interview 2014).
By 9 September, 1998, the options for what the memorial might commemorate became one of four choices. These were:

- a memorial ‘to perpetuate acknowledgment of Victoria Police service to the community’;
- a memorial ‘to commemorate the death of any employee of Victoria Police who dies as a result of their duties (in line with the ‘National’ [memorial] proposal);
- a memorial ‘to commemorate sworn members who are feloniously slain whilst performing their duty’;
- a memorial ‘to commemorate sworn members (including Protective Services Officers and Reservists, but not recruits) who are killed while performing their duty’ (Vicpol 1998c).

The Chief Commissioner’s preference was for a memorial to sworn officers only given a general lack of enthusiasm to include members who died of natural causes and suicide. The fourth option including the inscription of names, was the preferred option by most who were involved in the early direction of the memorial (Vicpol 1998c).

Thus, it was decided that the commemorative purpose of the Victoria Police Memorial was to remember sworn police officers who had been killed while performing their duties. The memorial would accommodate displaying the names of the dead in order for the public to see who had died helping to keep the community safe. However, in order for the public to see the memorial it had to be in a prominent public site.
Finding the Site of Memory: the Search for the Memorial’s Location

Finding a suitable site for a memorial is critical if it is to be an ‘active site of memory’ (Beaumont 2004, p. 69). A memorial with very little public access or exposure is likely to fall into neglect and irrelevance. As the memorial committee discovered, there is no established method for locating an appropriate site for a memorial (Vicpol 1998b). The experience of many Vietnam Veteran war memorial committees suggests finding an appropriate site can be dependent upon good luck and good connections as much as anything else (Linke 2009). Choosing the site for a memorial is not always a straightforward matter and often results in contestation. Winter suggests that for some people placing a war memorial in a public space such as a town square where fairs, parades, festivals and other celebrations occur, is an offence to a sacred site and the solemn memory of those who gave their lives for the country (Winter 1995). However, erecting a war memorial in a cemetery assumes a more private and contemplative site which might benefit the mourning family members, but is not always the most practical site for public commemoration. Sherman suggests that the debates surrounding contemplative or public sites raises ‘emotional questions about the primary constituency of commemoration, the bereaved or the entire community’ (Sherman 1999, p. 218). As discussed in Chapter Two, more than half of the state police memorials in Australia have limited public exposure and access because they are confined within police academies. At the time of the Victoria Police Memorial’s development, there was already an established site of remembrance for police who had died or been killed at the Police Academy Chapel in Glen Waverly. The Necropolis Police Memorial in Springvale was also in development, as Chapter Three discusses. However, both of these sites lacked public access and exposure (Vicpol 1998c) and were largely dedicated to fulfilling the needs of police and their families rather than public display, as discussed above. The Mansfield memorial’s public access was undermined by the distance from Melbourne presenting logistical challenges for annual ceremonies and its exposure was limited to locals and tourists. Thus, from the beginning, public exposure and access were two of the main criteria for choosing the site for the Victoria Police Memorial.
Initial considerations for the memorial’s possible site were listed in an options paper Severino developed, to guide the Chief Commissioner and Executive Command with their decision making. The options paper was based on talks held at the 28 August meeting. The list urged the following considerations:

- the degree or prominence desired;
- accessibility to the public;
- the degree of “land mark status” desired;
- its aesthetic quality in a defined area;
- its ability to accommodate memorial ceremonies etcetera, and;
- the degree of security which it can be afforded (Vicpol 1998c).

Other issues also needed consideration, such as any interference with nearby sites of remembrance.

Many stakeholders, both before and after its construction, did not consider the current site of the Victoria Police Memorial on St Kilda Rd. Melbourne as ideal. As discussed above, then Premier of Victoria, Jeff Kennett first suggested at Miller’s funeral a site on St Kilda Rd. would be a suitable location for the memorial. However, some members of Victoria Police Command initially considered the St Kilda Rd. site as inappropriate because it was seen as a ‘military [commemorative] precinct’ (Vicpol 1998b). Indeed, the President of the Returned and Services League, Bruce Ruxton, was quick to respond to the Premier’s suggested site on St Kilda Rd. Ruxton sent a letter to the Chief Commissioner explaining that he supported the idea of a police memorial but thought it was inappropriate to place it on St Kilda Rd. near the location of the memorial to Weary Dunlop, the military doctor war hero who saved so many lives in Japanese prisoner of war camps. Severino suggested that there was strong support for keeping the police memorial well away from the Shrine of Remembrance and the surrounding area (Vicpol 1998c). Moreover, Melbourne City Council opposed St Kilda Rd. becoming an ‘avenue of statues’ (Vicpol 1998b).

Clearly, other sites needed consideration. At the outset, any site deemed suitable within the boundary of the state of Victoria was considered a possibility, as this was Victoria Police’s jurisdiction. Any location the Police Historical Society
considered as a ‘significant site’ was also considered possible, such as Stringybark Creek, various historical police graves and old police stations. However, it was quickly established that a site within the city of Melbourne would be best as ‘that is where the seat of Government is located.’ This suggests that part of the purpose of the memorial was for the public to see Victoria Police as an ‘official expression’ of the state’s governing structure. The Bourke St Mall was also suggested but considered unsuitable, no doubt because of the practicalities of holding commemorative services in a major shopping thoroughfare. Locating the memorial in front of a police building was also tabled but rejected because ongoing occupation of Melbourne police buildings was not guaranteed. Consideration was also given to a site in a new parkland development near Federation Square, edging on Melbourne’s central business district, the Botanic Gardens, Treasury Gardens, and the Exhibitions Gardens (Vicpol 1998c).

The Chief Commissioner and Executive Command also considered many possible sites. However, the St Kilda Rd option still loomed large in the mind of Severino despite Ruxton and some members of Victoria Police Senior Command expressing their dissent. Severino decided to explore the site himself and subsequently developed compelling reasons for why the site should be seriously reconsidered for the police memorial. It was aesthetically pleasing as one of the city’s most attractive boulevards. Upon inspection, he also found the Weary Dunlop memorial was the only monument between Princes Bridge and Government House Drive and that, in his opinion, provided sufficient distance from this military statue and the Shrine of Remembrance. Moreover, the definition of the so-called military precinct was unclear (Severino interview 2014; Vicpol 1998c).

During his reconnoitring of the area, Severino discovered some important linkages between Victoria Police history and the St Kilda Rd. site which ultimately provided him with the most compelling arguments favouring the appropriateness of this site. The old Police Depot, now part of the Victoria Arts Council, was also located on St Kilda Rd. and considered a ‘significant site’ in
Victoria Police history. The old depot was Victoria Police’s main recruitment centre and training establishment from 1926 to 1973. Additionally, the Victoria Police Mounted Branch was still located in what was the old depot’s grounds. Neither of these sites were apt for erecting a significant memorial, but directly across from the old depot on St Kilda Rd. was a suitably clear site Severino believed was far enough away from the Weary Dunlop Memorial to avoid intrusion into that site (Severino interview 2014; Vicpol 1998c). The importance of this discovery was not fully clear to Severino, but its significance would be revealed in the coming months when subsequent objections to the memorial, discussed below, manifested. In effect, Severino had identified a pre-existing legitimate Victoria Police historical precinct next to the military’s (Vicpol 1998c, 1998f) historical and commemorative precinct.

The options presented before the Chief Commissioner and Executive Command on 14 September, became clearer in light of Severino’s discoveries (Vicpol 1998c). The first option was for the Chief Commissioner and/ or the Executive Command to choose their favourite site and quickly putting it forward to Melbourne City Council. However, a design would have to accompany the application, meaning further delay while that was developed. The second option was for the public, via a competitive design process, to determine the site. The third option was to nominate the St Kilda Rd. site, across from the old Police Depot, as the preferred site and to take immediate steps to gain support from the City of Melbourne to secure that site. Severino suggested the third option was the one he preferred and later documents suggest that by late September the Chief Commissioner and the Executive Command decided to proceed on this basis (Vicpol 1998c, 1998f). Victoria Police argued the St Kilda Rd. site was appropriate because of the links to its history, while the site offered a degree of prominence, public access, existing aesthetic qualities, accommodation for commemorative ceremonies, and was public enough to afford a degree of security (Vicpol 1998f).
In late September, 1998, Victoria Police announced its intention to the State Government and Melbourne City Council to establish a memorial, and formed the Victoria Police Memorial Committee (Committee). The Committee included largely the same representatives as those in the initial August 28 meeting.\(^6\) It first met on 9 October 1998 at the Victoria Police Centre, revisiting the issue of the memorial’s proposed location. Melbourne City Council flagged that the Shrine of Remembrance policy prevented new monuments being erected in its general vicinity, so the proposed police memorial would have to fit into City of Melbourne’s parklands master plans and a planning permit would be required (Vicpol 1998g).

Melbourne City Council approved in principle the establishment of a Victoria Police Memorial on 27 January 1999, subject to further consideration of the site and the memorial’s design. The council formed the Victoria Police Memorial Working Group\(^7\), which ran parallel to the Victoria Police Memorial Committee. Over the following months, the distinction between the two committees became difficult to discern. One of the Working Group’s first actions was engaging John Patrick Landscapes Architects to investigate potential sites (COM 2001a). These sites were located in Flagstaff Gardens, Riverside Park, the Treasury Gardens, Kings Domain, Parliament Gardens, and Batman Park (COM 2002a; Vicpol 1998g).

However, the landscape architect’s report considered Batman Park and Riverside Park inappropriate because they were not ‘conducive to an atmosphere of reverence.’ Treasury Gardens was considered viable but there was uncertainty around how ‘the placement of another memorial may challenge the cultural values of the place, and diminish its impact as it would effectively be vying for attention within the park.’ Parliament Gardens would require ‘significant moderation of the

---

\(^6\) These being various representatives of Victoria Police and Melbourne City Council, officers from the Premier’s Department and Cabinet, the Police Association, Victoria Police Historical Society, and the Public Arts and Acquisitions Committee.

\(^7\) The Victoria Police Memorial Working Group was comprised of Council officers, representatives from Victoria Police, Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Justice and Council’s Parks and Recreation, Cultural Development and City Projects.
park’ to achieve the ‘ambience’ required for the Police Memorial. Flagstaff Gardens was considered appropriate but the architect’s report ultimately recommended the memorial be situated on the St Kilda Rd. frontage of Kings Domain between Linlithgow Avenue and Government House Drive, and between the Walker Fountain and the Statue of Weary Dunlop, – otherwise known as Tom’s Block8 (COM 2001a). The report argued this site was the most logical for the memorial because its spatial qualities were:

in keeping with existing themes present in the site, it fitted within the City of Melbourne’s Master Plan Guidelines for the Domain Parklands, and the site had historical links to Victoria Police (COM 2000a).

The Memorial Working Group and Victoria Police supported the landscape architect’s recommendation of St Kilda Rd. As Kevin Scott, then Chief of Staff to the Chief Commissioner, explains, Victoria Police consciously tried to avoid encroaching upon the military’s commemorative space. However, the St Kilda Rd. site was seen as part of an area commemorating Victoria’s military and police ‘protectors’ (Scott interview 2014). Jim Pilmer also agreed the site was appropriate because at the time the memorial was being considered there were no public monuments for police or emergency workers. He suggests the Victoria Police and the Victorian Government decided loss of police officers needed public recognition by locating the memorial: ‘in a public place…and to identify it with the shrine…raise the bar a bit in terms of respect for giving of life on behalf of the community’ (Pilmer interview 2014).

**Design Development**

Next to the importance of a memorial’s location, a memorial’s design is pivotal to the successful communication of a memorial’s purpose. Bodnar argues:

---

8 Tom's Block, a sloping green space boasts pine trees thought to have been planted before 1873 and red flowering gums that date back to King George V's silver jubilee.
the shaping of a past worthy of public commemoration in the present is contested and involves a struggle for supremacy between advocates of various political ideas and sentiments (Bodnar 1991, p. 13).

This suggests most public memorials emerge from a mixture of official and vernacular expressions. Vernacular expressions, in this case stemming from serving officers and the public, are often argued to focus more on grief, loss and mourning. Whereas, official expressions from stakeholders such as executive police command and Melbourne City Council often demonstrate a vested interest in valorising the policing experience in the name of national unity, public order and the rule of law (Bodnar 1991, p. 13). These tensions are often evident within war memorial committees where stakeholders are conflicted between designs having a more official bearing, or designs more relatable to the vernacular. As the detail below reveals, although not overtly so, the tensions suggested in the theory were evident during the deliberations about the Victoria Police Memorial’s design.

The first ideas for the Victoria Police Memorial’s design emanated from a public competition and from members of Victoria Police. However, committee members initially disagreed this was an appropriate method of choosing the memorial’s design. Indeed, concerns were raised that allowing the public to submit suggestions ‘could be a disaster’. It was argued a better alternative would be to invite expressions of interests from art or architecture companies and universities (Vicpol 1998b). Others agreed that certain risks were involved inviting design suggestions from the public. Such a process needed careful management and might take considerable time to organise. Representatives from the Herald Sun and Weekly Times offered running articles facilitating the collection of public design ideas. Severino’s options paper written for the Chief Commissioner, suggested that the Herald Sun’s offer would stimulate interest in the memorial while also eliciting design ideas from a wide segment of the community. Moreover, given the public’s support for the idea of a memorial, offering prizes for a design could be avoided as public acknowledgment for the chosen design might be reward enough.
Based on the 28 August discussions, Severino proffered four options for the Chief Commissioner and Executive Command to consider. The first was requesting ideas from pertinent professionals such as artists and designers. The second was to obtain design ideas from Victoria Police members. Option three involved inviting ideas from the general public. Option four, the preferred option, was for Victoria Police, in conjunction with *Herald Sun*, to invite ideas from the public (Vicpol 1998c).

By late September 1998, Victoria Police put forward its intention for the development of a Victoria Police Memorial to the Victorian Government. In a briefing note sent to the Premier and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Victoria Police declared the intention to build a memorial to all Victorian Police officers who had been deliberately or otherwise killed ‘in the performance of their duty’ (Vicpol 1998f). Design criteria would be established and once this was done, it was proposed that Victoria Police in conjunction with the media would invite design proposals from the community. The St Kilda Rd. site was nominated as the preferred site although there were still mixed feelings about the site’s close proximity to the armed forces’ commemorative precinct (Vicpol 1998f).

The Victoria Police Memorial Committee sent out their invitation to the Victorian community to submit design ideas in mid-October 1998. The invitation stated that the deaths of Victoria Police officers Silk and Miller instigated the memorial. The press release was announced on behalf of the Premier of Victoria and Chief Commissioner of Victoria Police. The memorial would recognise those people who had died whilst performing their duties as a member of Victoria Police (*Ballarat Courier* Editorial 1998; Vicpol 1998h; Wilkinson 1998). The Committee resolved that design features or parameters should not be imposed on the community. Free expression should be encouraged with the only parameter being the preferred location or setting on St Kilda Rd. However, the Committee did list a number of desirable features, including:
provision for ceremonial functions; areas for quiet reflection; a possible water feature; sculpture; provision for the names of those killed, within a floral or garden setting; a living, touching memorial encouraging people to attend it; eye-pleasing; interactive functionality; protection from graffiti or other damage; aesthetic and complimentary to surroundings and; provision for a flag (Vicpol 1998g).

On the 30 October, Victoria Police also separately invited members of Victoria Police to submit design ideas. Again, no specific design parameters were given to police members but the following was added to the above list of desirable features: lasting; respectful; reverential and; instantly identifiable (Vicpol 1998i). Many of the police and public design ideas, were submitted by mid-November and the Memorial Committee was asked to look at the submissions and discuss these concepts in the meeting set for Tuesday, December 1, 1998 at the Victoria Police Centre. The memory of Silk and Miller’s death would still be fresh, as only three and a half months had passed since the incident.

A number of design submissions from serving members and the public were retained in the Victoria Police Memorial files. These submissions might be described as ‘vernacular’ memorial expressions along the lines that Bodnar and Winter suggest, in that they emanate from non-official sources. Yet the designs contain a mixture of official and vernacular ideas. For example, one serving member suggested a black freestanding granite or marble wall inscribed with names of those who died in the line of duty. A sculptured arm protrudes out of the honour wall and comes to rest on the shoulder of a bronze statue of a uniformed police officer, standing on its own plinth. The suggested inscription on the memorial was ‘May Those Who Have Fallen Guide Us to Uphold the Right. Another submission, from someone having just returned from the United States described the Sacramento Police Memorial as an appropriate design. This was a large memorial area which included an honour wall listing the names of all those who died in the line of duty. In a bronze relief above the names are three police figures representing uniforms from 1837, 1920, and the 1990s (official). Across from the wall, a sculpture depicts a mother sitting crying with her child,
responding to losing her police officer husband (vernacular). Another submission featured a semi-circular bricked-in area, with a higher retaining wall at the back with name-plaques listing the dead. A large Victoria Police badge was at the centre of the back wall (official). In front of the oversized police badge was a small half-circle pond with floating lilies (vernacular). There were also provisions for flag poles (official) and small gardens on each end of the open semi-circular area (vernacular).

One entrant was a graphic designer who submitted a design for a plinth without a statue but names inscribed, enabling the onlooker to step up onto the plinth to complete the memorial. Another design featured two enormous sculpted open hands placed together forming a large cup or cradle. In the hands three large letters spelled ‘LAW’. The idea behind this design is that police hands uphold the law. Indeed, hands emerging from sculptured plinths or walls were often suggested, as were statues of police officers depicted with children. Such designs were attempts to demonstrate figuratively close connection between the public and Victoria Police and are thus a mixture of official and vernacular expressions.

One submission from an ex-police member, explicitly heeded the connection between the police and the public. The design itself was a basic bronze plaque with the words: ‘we the Victorian community here honour the memory of our police. They gave that we should stay free “UPHOLD THE RIGHT”’. The designer’s accompanying explanation stated the design sought to emphasise: ‘the police and the community being one, united by the same ideals and beliefs’. There are clear links here with notions, regarding police legitimacy whereby the public and police share the same values. The designer also suggested that the Victorian flag be raised and lowered each day and be flown at half-mast on commemorative days, or when a member was killed or died in any circumstances. The designer suggested the site should be on the Domain, close enough to the Shrine of Remembrance and Government House, so Shrine Guards could perform daily flag duties. Another designer offered a similar sentiment, suggesting the memorial’s inscription should read: ‘In Commemoration of Officers of the Victoria Police
Force who made the ultimate Sacrifice to protect our Community. “WE THANK YOU”.

What is clear, for the public and serving members’ submissions is that traditional commemorative designs outweighed abstract designs. Winter (1995) suggests the meanings of the traditional memorials, with statues or other devices that are obvious in their depictions, are easier for the general public to access. The traditional forms of ‘art, poetry, and ritual’ which were derived from ‘an eclectic set of classical, romantic, or religious images and ideas’, were more appealing and accessible to the majority as expressions of loss. Traditional designs are popular for war memorials although the cost of sculpted bronze statues often prohibits construction. Soldiers and veterans find soldier statues more accessible as an expression of their service and grief than the more abstract designs. This was certainly the case for the majority of the state Vietnam War memorials in Australia (Linke 2009). Moreover, no suggestions for utilities like public drinking fountains and public shelters were among the vernacular designs for the police memorial.

However, the results of the public and serving members’ design submissions are not recorded, even though the Memorial Committee reviewed submissions on 1 December 1998 (Vicpol 1998j). One Melbourne City Council (MCC) document suggested that ‘while no one design was wholly suitable, there were a few common themes and some individual elements which were identified as desirable for inclusion in the design brief’ (COM 2001c). Some of these involved the depiction of the police badge, a flagpole, a fountain or reflecting pool, and flower beds symbolising new life and hope (COM 2000a). It seems, in the end, vernacular expressions were used as a guide to indicate the kind of design features the public and serving members preferred to see included on a police memorial.

The City of Melbourne Arts & Acquisitions Committee agreed at a meeting with the Victoria Police Memorial Committee on 14 December, 1998 (Vicpol 1998k,
1999b) to the concept of a memorial being erected. However, in order to table a proposal for endorsement to the MCC’s Community and Social Development Committee, a working design and site needed to be provided. The working design depicted on the cover of Victoria Police’s proposal to the MCC appears to be a collage of many vernacular expressions submitted by the public and serving members (Vicpol 1999a). The ‘working design’ featured statues depicting two uniformed officers, a male and a female, holding hands with a child standing between them. The statues are on a plinth situated toward the back of a semi-circular paved courtyard with a bluestone retaining wall containing the names of the dead. Garden beds and flagpoles also formed part of the conceptual design layout.

The issues of the Victoria Police Memorial’s design and site could not proceed any further until the MCC’s Community and Social Development Committee accepted in principle the Victoria Police’s proposal. On 9 January, 1999, The City of Melbourne’s Parks and Recreation Department submitted the proposal, with the preferred working design and site at St Kilda Rd., on behalf of Victoria Police (Vicpol 1999b). In the meantime, the Herald Sun published an article on 20 January indicating the memorial’s design and site were finalised. The article triggered concerns in the Premier’s office and among Victoria Police senior commanders because nothing had been finalised at that stage. Victoria Police acted quickly, reassuring the new Premier Steve Bracks, that the article suggesting the memorial’s plans were finalised and its construction about to start was ‘far from the truth’. The Premier was assured that no decisions had yet been made and Victoria Police were still consulting with the MCC and he would be informed when further decisions were made (Vicpol 1999c). Moreover, the article also wrongly suggested the memorial was ‘something born from a desire of the Force’, and not from an outpouring of public grief and support for police. As we have seen from the above research, the memorial concept developed through demonstrations of public sorrow, and from there, the Premier and Chief Commissioner of Police giving support to the idea by facilitating further public discussion. Premier Bracks had in mind a Weary Dunlop statue-like construction. However, Victoria Police advised the memorial working group to consider and
assess carefully the community desires in regard to this ‘State community monument’. This because the monument would provide a grief-repository for public and serving police members, their families and the families of the deceased. The Premier’s vision might not have been shared by the community and this must be considered, so that the people of Victoria would have ownership of the monument and it would be something they could relate to (Vicpol 1999f).

By April 1999, the issues of the Memorial’s design and site were still undecided and resolving concerns about funding the project became paramount, lest to further progress be stalled. The MCC had given preliminary approval to Victoria Police for the memorial but all parties were waiting for the Premier’s endorsement of the project so the design-process could continue. In the second call for expressions of interest, only professional organisations or individuals would be invited to submit (Vicpol 1999d). However, as discussed further below, issues in relation to funding the memorial continued until February 2000.

Further discussions occurred during February and March 1999 regarding developing the memorial’s design. By now, the MCC was officially a partner with Victoria Police for the development of the memorial. The MCC would preside over the search for a design and finalisation of the site (Vicpol 2000a). Notices were also published on 11 and 18 March, 2000, in *The Age*, rather than the *Herald Sun*, inviting expressions of interest from professional artists and designers (Vicpol 2000c). They were required to write a succinct outline of their intended approach, detailing the philosophy and guiding principles for their work, as well as providing sufficient information on the direction and intent of the work for a preliminary assessment (Vicpol 2000a).

The selection panel, in addition to the usual committee members, included staff from the City Projects Division involved in the Weary Dunlop statue project, Police Chaplaincy, and Victoria Police Historical Society (Vicpol 2000b). It is
worth re-visiting the requirements for the memorial’s design here as they expanded considerably:

The design must be immediately recognisable as a Victoria Police Memorial and compatible with the Domain Parklands setting and in accordance with the Master Plan for this area. The work must be made of durable material suitable for an outdoor location with an aesthetic appeal and not appear institutional. The design must be suitable for ceremonial events such as wreath-laying, while allowing for personal quiet reflection. Horticultural elements could be included, sympathetic to the surrounding environment, with provision for lighting, water components, a sound element, an interactive facility or other features incorporated in the total budget allocation. The work must be environmentally sustainable with low-energy usage and consideration given to the level of maintenance required. The work should inspire respect and reflection while minimising, as far as possible, opportunities for vandalism, defacement and inappropriate uses including preserving personal security and safety. The design must recognise the risk to members of Victoria Police is ongoing and, for that reason, sensitive consideration should be given to how the names of individual members are depicted. Inclusion of police members’ names killed on duty was specified as an essential element of the design (Vicpol 2000d).

Bill Severino recalls there was a lot of discussion within the Committee about these design requirements:

We wanted it to be solemn without it looking like a headstone. …We were very conscious of it being something that could not be easily vandalised. …We thought it would be a target considering the fountain, just nearby, was often the target of soap suds. [Also] … being Victoria Police, there are a lot of people with a grudge to bear, who might want to come along and show their disgust and do things [to the memorial] (Severino interview 2014).

By the closing date for submissions on 7 April, 2000, one hundred and seventy commission kits had been dispatched to interested parties and thirty-one
expressions of interests were received. City of Melbourne’s Manager for Cultural Development, Program Manager for Public Art, and Parks and Recreation initially reviewed initially all submissions. The submissions were viewed separately according to a matrix based on eleven categories relating to the commission brief (described above), emphasising aesthetic merit, and an assessment of ability to construct the memorial. Six submissions were shortlisted by 12 April 2000 and given to the committee for consideration by the following companies and artists: Berkowitz & Harwood, Elizabeth Presa, Hasell & Ward, RMIT (Hogg), Aspect et al, and Studio Anybody & Green Bits. During this meeting, the committee resolved to omit the submission from Elizabeth Presa, the reason left unrecorded. The remaining five tenders attended a briefing to outline the next step of producing detailed designs, specifications, drawings and a model for which they were given a fixed budget of $5000 (Vicpol 2000c).

The selection panel met on 26 July 2000 to finalise a decision. After the five contending designers were introduced, their designs were each presented in order within thirty minutes, which included time for panel questions. The shortlisted artists could sit in on the other presentations but not ask questions. The artists and designers then left after the presentations concluded and the panel began making the final decision for the memorial’s design by rating each design from 1 to 5; number one being the most favoured (Vicpol 2000e). The panel accepted unanimously Hasell & Ward’s design, presenting it to Melbourne Council’s Planning, Development and Services Committee and the MCC on 4 September, 2000, then taking it to Public Art and Acquisition Committee, the Victoria Police Commissioner on 26 September 2000, and finally to the Minister for Police and the Premier before the media release on 29 September (Vicpol 2000e).

---

9 Presentations were ordered as follows: Aspect et al; Hasell & Ward; Berkowitz, King & Harwood; Studio Anybody & Green Bits and; RMIT Public Art.
10 The collective ranking results were: 1 - Hasell & Ward; 2 – RMIT; 3 – Aspect; 4 - Berkowitz, King & Harwood; 5 - Studio Anybody & Green Bits.
Jim Pilmer recalls during the selection process that many factors needed to be considered from the selections. Issues relating to form and practicalities had to be balanced:

there were some funny designs that came up that did not look all that attractive. I think our main issues of design was that – did it look dignified? … Consideration was given to the design’s practical accommodation of ceremony. It needed to fit into the landscape and not be too towering. It needed to be the right colour. Altogether, I think they delivered the goods in terms of a dignified and relatively low profile memorial but one where people can be remembered (Pilmer interview 2014).

Other Committee members like Stuart King (the officer responsible for monitoring media content following the Silk-Miller deaths) recalled deliberation around how best to convey the connection between police and community. He also remembered conversations about how to make the memorial interactive for visitors so they could: ‘move throughout the structure and be integrated with it… it was never going to be an Obelisk’. King argued that the memorial’s design had to be something the public could embrace because much of the initial support for the memorial ‘came from the community’. He said, ‘what we wanted to do with the design was have this structure that was indicating…collective solidarity… between the force and the community…I think it achieved it’ (King interview 2014).

Now that the designers were professionals, and the MCC provided artistic direction, the committee’s deliberations reflected, to some degree, what Sherman describes as the ‘art/commemoration dichotomy’; that is the tension between memorials and monuments as high art or expressions of popular culture. In essence, the memorial had to be something the public could relate to. The observer may look at a memorial and engage with it, without a thought as to how it was made or who made it. There is ‘the world that produced the object, and the world that activates its cultural meaning’ (Sherman 1999, pp. 143-44) Sherman suggests that between these two worlds there are ‘a set of discourses and practices…[which] frame our beliefs and assumptions about [these] two social
worlds’ (1999, pp. 143-44). A memorial that is too esoteric in its design may fail to produce the right kind of engaging discourse. Yet a memorial that is more blatant, such as a police officer holding a raised baton, lessens the possibility of an open discourse involving different interpretations of the form.

The designers chosen, Anton Hasell and Marcus Ward (Hasell & Ward) felt uncertain about their design’s winning chance at first. Both felt happy with the architectural model of their design. The model cost all the allocated $5000 (Hasell interview 2014). However, during the final presentations on 26 July, they began doubting their design. Hasell recalls another entrant engaged a filmmaker to reveal their memorial, a Ziggurat (rectangular shaped tower). The film showed aerial views of the surrounding just above the ground of the site, with the Ziggurat materialising just above the site, inverting and then sinking into the ground. Hasell said the rather spectacular presentation ‘convinced’ him their design had little hope of succeeding. However, problems emerged about how to clean out the sunken Ziggurat feature, as well as raising safety problems like potential loitering in the dark hole in the ground. Another design incorporated glass panels etched with deceased officers’, suspended above a memorial pond atop the gardens. The selection panel asked that team, what happens if someone smashes the glass? The artists said they would have spare panels kept in storage for quick replacement. Hasell and Ward agreed this would probably not work, and began feeling better about their chances compared to other seemingly less practical proposals (Hasell interview 2014).

Hasell and Ward’s design chosen for the Victoria Police Memorial was a: four-tiered amphitheatre set into the edge of Kings Domain with a curvilinear bluestone wall featuring slightly arched entry portals facing St Kilda Road. Inside the wall is an elliptical stage with circular pool in the centre in which water covers a mosaic depiction of the Victoria Police badge. The names of the remembered police officers are cast in bronze plaques set into the bluestone colonnade on the side of the elliptical stage (Vicpol 2000j).
This design was subject later to a number of changes the artists made, responding in part to the objections to the height of the design raised by the National Trust, and the impact on the original hill raised by the Australian Garden History Society, discussed below. Sherman suggests that its useful ‘to conceive of both monuments and commemoration as forms of cultural production.’ He suggests that an artist may give notoriety to a memorial through their name and or because of their original design. However, the commemorative monument or memorial is often more than the ‘creation’ of one individual. The community which wants to build a memorial often have their own meanings and aesthetic concepts which may influence, merge with, or supersede what a designer may envisage (Sherman 1999, pp. 143-4). The above detail of the police memorial’s development reflects Sherman’s idea of cultural production as both vernacular and official sources shaped the design criteria, the interpretations of the criteria by the architects, and resulting memorial.

**Funding the Memorial**

Initial ideas for funding options for the Victorian Police Memorial emerged in December 1998. Even though at one stage, a Senior Victoria Police member described funding the memorial as ‘tricky’ (Vicpol 1999f), like the earlier Mansfield Police Memorial, overall resourcing the Victoria’s Police Memorial was relatively easy compared to other memorial fundraising efforts (see Inglis & Brazier 1998, pp. 129-35). War memorial committees often have to raise funds through public subscriptions and donations, appealing to the public’s obligations to remember those who have given their lives for the nation (Linke 2009, p. 97). Raising funds through these methods is time consuming with uncertain outcomes. The police memorial Committee initially had to consider these and other funding options. The Victoria Police Strategic Development Department sent a briefing to the Assistant Commissioner setting out four possible funding options:

- One: solely State Government funding.
• Two: Joint funding through State Government and a memorial trust established to raise funds from the community and public and private corporations.

• Three: Joint funding between the Blue Ribbon Day Foundation and the State Government.

• Four: solely community funding and corporate donations established through a memorial trust (Vicpol 1998k).

A nominal budget for the memorial was $400,000 (Vicpol 1999d).

Deliberations about the memorial’s funding were sidelined until April 1999, while a nominal site was located. However, on 27 April, the Assistant Commissioner attended a meeting with the memorial working group, City of Melbourne, and Community Service Fund,11 which explored the possibility of partial financial support from the latter Fund. The representative explained that the Community Service Fund was not normally used for memorials and previous applications had been refused for not ‘being an appropriate use of community funds’. However, given the degree of community support for a police memorial, the Community Service Fund seemed an appropriate vehicle given that this was a State Government project for all Victorians, not just one section of the community. The Community Service Fund would be supportive if memorial funding had a ‘partnership flavour’ with the Department Of Justice, the Community Service Fund and the MCC. This would mean the MCC would need to provide costs for its involvement, including projected costs of maintenance to make the balance sheet reflect the partnership approach. The preferred applicant to the Community Service Fund was also determined to be the MCC, which would take full ownership of the memorial, its maintenance and the site as a whole. This would

---

11 Established in 1991, the Community Support Fund (CSF) is a trust fund governed by the Gambling Regulation Act 2003 to direct a portion of gaming revenues back into the community. Taxes on gaming machines in Victorian hotels contribute more than $100 million each year to the Fund. Funds from the Community Support Fund support a range of programs, which in turn support a wide variety of projects in the community.
include MCC providing a detailed maintenance plan for the memorial on behalf of both Victoria Police and the community (Vicpol 1999e).

Victoria Police also sought to contribute memorial funding but concerns were raised about using operational funds for this purpose. At the time, Victoria Police was under political pressure regarding numbers of police force personnel. Spending a large sum of the force’s operational resources on a memorial might be viewed as inappropriate given political pressure to expand the number of police personnel. It was suggested that some funding should come from the Department of Justice, rather than the Victoria Police, given issues associated with operational funding provided by government in the lead up a state election (18 September 1999) campaign. It was also suggested funding from the Department of Justice could be spread across two financial years: $100,000 from 1997/98 and $100,000 from 99/2000 thus dispersing the outlay (Vicpol 1999f).

Public subscription to assist with financing the memorial was also discussed at the 27 April, 1999 Committee meeting. The representative of the Premier’s Cabinet suggested the Premier would probably favour this option. However, collecting and utilising public and corporate funds might create naming-rights issues associated with the memorial. This meant clarifying with private or corporate donors that their contributions did not entitle them to associate their names with the memorial. Hypothetically, if a company offered significant funds for the project, the memorial could not be called, say: ‘The Smith&Baggins Police Memorial’ (Vicpol 1999f). Historically, collecting memorial funding through public subscription has been the main or only option available for most memorial committees. However, collecting funds from the public by door-knocking, holding raffles, or rattling collection tins at traffic intersections, is often time consuming, labour intensive, and uncertain in terms of time needed to collect the required amount (Linke 2009, p. 95). Thus, the public subscription idea was rejected by June 1999 in favour of obtaining full funding from the ‘State and local Government on behalf of the entire community of Victoria’ (Vicpol 1999g).
The proposed funding model for the Victorian Police Memorial had largely crystallised by late September 1999 and the Memorial Committee was optimistically anticipating a September 2000 completion date (Vicpol 1999o). Victoria Police would provide $100,000 (Vicpol 1999w), The Department of Justice would provide $100,000 (Vicpol 1999q, 2000h) and the City of Melbourne would provide $200,000. It was hoped a successful application to the Community Support Fund would provide the final $200,000 for a total budget of $600,000. It is not apparent why the initial budget increased from $400,000 to $600,000, as construction of the yet-to-be approved memorial had not begun. It seems the main issue surrounding this budgetary increase was to ensure a seamless division of costs between the various stakeholders behind the project.

The Victorian Premier endorsed the Community Support Fund application, making clear to Victoria Police and the Memorial Committee the application would have to go through proper procedures and be formally accepted or rejected on its own merits (Vicpol 1999j). Moreover, the Premier reiterated that the State Government would fund no more than fifty per cent of the memorial’s final cost which included the potential support of the Community Support Fund (Vicpol 1999t). There was some danger of the proposal requiring an additional $200,000 if the application failed. The Minister for Police and Emergency Services (Vicpol 1999r) and the Chief Commissioner of Victoria Police (Vicpol 1999n) invariably endorsed the Community Support Fund application, arguing it had broader social merit due to the extensive public support for the memorial. The Police Association and the Blue Ribbon Foundation also endorsed the application (Vicpol 1999p).

The letter of support from the Blue Ribbon Foundation stated that they strongly supported the proposed site for the memorial on Kings Domain and ‘…wholeheartedly’ endorsed the concept of the memorial, which was considered to be ‘well overdue.’ The Foundation also supported the application for financial assistance from the Community Support Fund, arguing the memorial seemed an appropriate to the funding criteria by honouring police members who give their
lives protecting the community. Moreover, the Blue Ribbon Foundation reinforced the importance of public’s demonstration of support for police memorialisation by wearing blue ribbons in the wake of the Silk and Miller killings, which suggested:

…there is a vast silent majority of the public prepared to publicly acknowledge and support the efforts of members of the Victoria Police as they perform their daily duties in service of the community. A memorial such as you have proposed permits that support to be converted into a tangible and lasting sacred site at which the public can be made continually aware of the total list of Police Officers killed on duty. It would also provide some comfort to the families of the deceased officers much as the Shrine of Remembrance provides comfort to the families of the service men and women killed in wars. It is the same analogy (Vicpol 1999p).

These suggestions show the importance of the prevailing view of the Victoria Police Memorial as a crucial symbolic representation of the connection between Victoria Police and the Victorian public. This is a core theme of police legitimacy. The shared salient value of honouring those who gave their lives for the nation or community underpins the connection between the police and the community through the memorial.

The funding arrangements for the Victoria Police Memorial were finally resolved by the end of February 2000 with a total budget of $600,000 (Vicpol 2000f). The memorial’s design and estimated construction cost $385,171.81, paid for with commitments of up to $100,000 each from Victoria Police and the Department of Justice with the Community Support Fund committing $200,000. Melbourne City Council contributed $200,000 towards staffing and other resources for the development and realisation of the memorial and a ten year maintenance budget of $13,000 annually (COM 2002a).
Objections to the Victoria Police Memorial

The next step was obtaining a planning order lodged with the City of Melbourne, enabling construction to begin. Expectations of a September 2000 completion date were ultimately to be unrealised, due to the considerable time lapse between the resolution of funding arrangements, which needed to be finalised for the submission of the planning order, and the proposed completion date. The proposal was submitted to MCC in September 2000, but further complications arose in November 2000 from unforeseen objections to the planning order by the National Trust of Australia (Victoria), the Australian Garden History Society (Trust 2000b) and the Returned and Services League (RSL). Victoria Police first became aware of these objections on 5 December, 2000, when the MCC, Parks and Recreation, indicated the planning order had not been issued and that no arrangements with the building contractors could commence until the objection was resolved (Vicpol 2000i). This surprised Victoria Police as only positive messages were received about the memorial up until that point.

The initial development of the Victoria Police Memorial mainly involved Victoria Police and the relevant planning departments with the MCC. However, the application for a planning permit in late October, 2000 required broadening the level of consultation with other organisations interested in the St Kilda Rd. site. The National Trust received notice of the application for the Victoria Police Memorial from the City of Melbourne on 31 October, 2000 (Trust 2000a). Rohan Story, then Conservation Officer for the National Trust, responded on 13 November, 2000, with several concerns about the memorial’s design and its perceived impact on the site. These objections initially emerged from the Australian Garden History Society which reported them to the Trust (Story interview 2014). The National Trust had no initial objection to the site itself because it agreed with the Domain Masterplan policy stipulating that public memorials can be placed along the St Kilda Road strip of the Domain. However, the Trust believed the proposed Victoria Police memorial was ‘too large and dominating’ for the site. The Trust argued that because the proposed design was 25 meters long, 15 meters wide and 3.6 meters high, it was a ‘monumental
structure, rather than a single statue or work of art’ (Trust 2000b). Thus, the memorial could require significant changes to the existing gardens around the site. The Trust stated that the memorial design:

…introduces a large area of hard paving, removing more of the valued greenery of the park than necessary, and the large scale wall will block views of the gardens. The creation of an amphitheatre seems unnecessary. Being on the road, it would not be an attractive place for park visitors to use. If it is intended for occasional ceremonies, it is perhaps not large enough, nor well located (Trust 2000b).

In February 2001, the National Trust and the Australian Garden History Society each sent a representative to inspect the proposed site on St Kilda Rd. Armed with plans of the winning design, the team developed a more accurate appraisal of the memorial’s suitability for the site. They began by inspecting the surrounds on either side of the proposed memorial’s location which included the Walker Fountain and Weary Dunlop statue. The fountain and statue were deemed ‘unobtrusive’ to the garden environment and maintained the form of the St Kilda Road frontage. When measuring the location of the proposed police memorial they found the design plans inaccurate and a centre point was estimated based on the space between existing trees having to be retained. Staking the memorial’s proposed layout raised concerns as the proposed structure would ‘cut back’ into the slope destroying the profile of the landscape along the existing footpath. The effect of the proposed memorial was considered by the Trust and Society representatives to be ‘over dramatic and out of character with the rest of the park’ including its spatial proximity to Walker Fountain and the Weary Dunlop statues. The wall height was also perceived as a visual impediment to the garden views on either side of the memorial. Additional inaccuracies in the scale of the original blue prints were also found when measuring the pool and amphitheatre. According to the two representatives, the memorial sketch showed the site and structure to be approximately ‘one-third of its actual size and scale’, with a 2 metre high seating cut back into the walls of the amphitheatre considered too visually obtrusive (Trust 2001a).
Overall this appraisal of the memorial’s design was unflattering. The large curving wall was considered more symbolic of the built up character of the landscape on the opposite side of St Kilda Road and ‘out of character with the openness of the Kings Domain and its garden areas. The wall was described as an aesthetic detraction to the front of the park as the large stone structure will ‘appear heavy in such a large mass…’ and ‘has a definite institutional quality’ (Trust 2001a). Safety concerns were also raised, as the wall’s intrusion onto the footpath might be dangerous for pedestrians at night. The wall’s creation of visual impediments in the proposed location might provide sleeping areas for homeless people and opportunities ‘for inappropriate use and risk to personal security and safety’. These comments especially relating to the wall’s institutional quality point to Bodnar’s discussion of the tension between official and vernacular memorial expressions (Bodnar 1991). According to the appraisal, the memorial’s form appeared more official in its expression. Furthermore, an initial aim for the memorial’s design, discussed above, was that ‘the design must have aesthetic appeal and not appear institutional’. Clearly, not all agreed the proposed design was appropriate for the site.

These concerns were aired at a meeting on 20 February, 2001, involving a Chief Executive Officer and representatives from the various departments of the City of Melbourne, including Parks and Recreation, Statutory Planning, Architecture, and City Projects, as well as senior representatives from Victoria Police, National Trust, Australian Garden History Society, Kane Constructions, and the memorial’s design artists. The National Trust’s representative reiterated the points outlined above, which emphasised the view that the memorial was a ‘serious intrusion into the landform…and a visual barrier to the parkland’. They also added that the memorial’s design was ‘too tomb-like rather than aesthetically pleasing’ and that the ‘incorporation of the police chequerboard logo misleadingly implies a police presence on site’ (Trust 2001b).

The Australian Garden History Society supported these objections from the Trust adding that the construction of the proposed design might ‘set an unfortunate
precedent’ for future memorial construction in the Domain Parklands (Trust 2001b). Helen Page, representing the Australian Garden History Society at the time, recalled the Society were never against the idea of a police memorial as such, but the Society was mainly concerned with Kings Domain becoming overcrowded with memorials. She argued if police were building on their own property they could do what they liked: ‘but … this was our space and we needed to ensure it retains the integrity the original designers had for it’.

She said two previous memorials (she did not name them) had suddenly appeared in the Domain with little consultation. These and other memorials disrupted space planned for the people of Melbourne a century ago. Page in fact believes the memorial’s design was chosen before the site was found, even though evidence suggests the site was found first. However, she understood there were no site inspections from the designers prior to the decision being made by the selection panel to award the design to Hasell & Ward (Page interview 2014).

The City of Melbourne referred these objections to the City’s Urban Design Department, which also had reservations about the monument’s scale and the impact the loss of 13 x 15 metres of grass might have on the surrounding parkland. The Department also queried the practicality of building the small pool and the cost of ongoing maintenance to keep it free ‘from becoming a leaf and litter collection point.’ The memorial’s design utilised bluestone cladding instead of bluestone blocks, which the Department found inadequate to produce a structure with the appearance of ‘solidity and strength’ and wanted the memorial to be of solid stone construction (COM 2001a).

The memorial’s designer disagreed with these objections. Hasell agreed that some of the design features needed refining but overall he reinforced the complementary nature of the memorial’s visible appearance and location (Hasell interview 2014). An impasse was reached during this meeting and a MCC representative suggested organising a separate meeting between the designers and City Projects to attempt the negotiation of design solutions that might ‘satisfy the concerns of all parties’. It was hoped these could be found before the next City of
Melbourne’s Development and Services Committee on 5 March, 2001, when the memorial was next tabled for discussion (Trust 2001b; Vicpol 2001b). The City of Melbourne and Victoria Police were open to negotiations and keen to avoid a lengthy appeal process should the National Trust lodge an application with the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) (Vicpol 2001a).

By late March, 2001, the City of Melbourne granted a planning permit for the Victoria Police Memorial subject to some minor design changes. The bluestone wall was reduced in length by 2 metres and in height by 0.6 meters. Wall ends and edges would be constructed with bluestone capping, ensuring a solid appearance. The memorial’s designers decided to replace the reflecting pool with a sand-blasted image of the Victoria Police insignia in the centre of the amphitheatre (Hasell interview 2014), which was redesigned allowing for only two, rather than four seating levels, maximising grass left on the natural slope. Bluestone capping would also be inserted to define the perimeter of the amphitheatre. These design modifications were aimed at reducing the impact on the surrounding landscape, especially the grassed bank and were proposed to satisfy any concerns held by the MCC’s Urban Design branch (Trust 2001d). The National Trust was informed of the decision to grant the permit on 30 March and that the proposed design modifications were to be part of the re-submitted construction plans that attempted ‘to address the concerns raised in [the National Trust’s] objection’ (Trust 2001e).

Randall Bell, Chair of the National Trust (Victoria) told the MCC the Trust would be proceeding with lodging an objection to the memorial’s ‘size and design’ with VCAT. The Australian Garden History Society and the RSL acknowledged that modifications had been made to the memorial’s design, but continued to be ‘aggrieved’ they had not been invited to participate in these discussions nor were

---

12 Local Governments such as the City of Melbourne issue most planning permits/approvals, the exceptions being, those deemed to be of state significance which are issued by the relevant state minister, and VCAT is the authority for hearing objections to local government planning approvals.
they invited to participate in the memorial’s development from the beginning. Bell acknowledged the MCC’s ‘work to obtain broad input to the design’ but argued that each of the aggrieved ‘parties and perhaps others should have been specifically invited to review the process’ (Trust 2001h). Thus, the Trust argued the planning process was flawed because a number of interested groups were not consulted at an early enough stage before the permit was issued by the MCC and ‘without the benefit of a planning officer’s report’ (Trust 2001i).

Moreover, the design alterations approved by the MCC did not, according to Bell, address the fundamental objections that the wall was too big for such ‘an already prominent and historic location’ and could overshadow the nearby Weary Dunlop statue, which risked setting a precedent for other large memorials in the area. Also undesirable was the memorial’s design cutting into the historic hill. Moreover, Bell argued the proposed modifications did nothing to alter the fact that: ‘the high wall shields the amphitheatre from the road and experience shows this attracts antisocial behaviour. It would be most unfortunate if the design were to lead to defacement, undermining the Memorial’s purpose’ (Trust 2001h). Bell reiterated the National Trust was never against the idea of a memorial to police. It was the memorial’s proposed design for that location that was objectionable. The National Trust regretted having to cause further delays but ‘it would be more regrettable if the final memorial was not embraced by the widest cross section of the community’ (Trust 2001h).

Bell’s final message was to highlight that the objections ‘already attracted wide public attention’ and that he planned to make his available to the media once the MCC had some time to ‘digest its contents’ (Trust 2001h). Indeed, the Herald Sun defended the memorial in early April, just after the Trust lodged its first objections. Two initial stories: ‘Trust Threat to Memorial’ (de Kretser 2001) and ‘Misguided Trust’ (Herald Sun Editorial 2001), as the titles suggest, were critical of the National Trust for causing further delays to the memorial’s construction, due to ‘aesthetic nit-picking’ and fears of ‘embarrassing’ the city. The Herald Sun only reported two of the Trust’s objections, that the memorial was oversized for
the location and would ‘dominate the Dunlop monument’. None of the objections regarding the dangers the large wall posed to public safety and to the memorial itself were published. Reported comments made by the Memorial’s designers and the Police Association endorsed the case for the memorial’s design approved by the MCC. The *Herald Sun’s* editorial stated the Trust’s objections to a memorial for 136 police officers who gave their lives protecting Victorian citizens, was ‘far more embarrassing’ than any apparent design faults identified by the National Trust (*Herald Sun* Editorial 2001).

Sentiments expressed by callers to Neil Mitchell on his 3AW radio talkback show on 4 April 2001, were also largely condemning of the Trust’s objections. Mitchell and his callers seemed heavily influenced by the *Herald Sun’s* reporting because only the issues relating to the memorial’s size and proximity to the Weary Dunlop statue were discussed. One caller suggested it should not matter how close the police memorial was to the Weary Dunlop statue, although another suggested the Weary Dunlop statue was more important because Dunlop was not paid for what he did, which Mitchell was quick to denounce as ‘offensive nonsense’ (Vicpol 2001d). Radio news stories on the ABC, 3AW, Triple J, 3AK, Melbourne Magic 693, 3MP, all reported that the National Trust claimed the memorial was oversized, which incensed Victoria Police because design compromises including height and length reductions had already been made. Randal Bell, speaking for the Trust suggested an inappropriate memorial design might mean less respect for the police who have given their service and lives to the State (Vicpol 2001d).

More newspaper articles followed after the National Trust lodged its objections with the VCAT, on 19 April, 2001 (Trust 2001i, 2001j, 2001r). The *Age* and *Herald Sun* both reported the RSL had also favoured the National Trust’s arguments, by agreeing in principle with the need for a memorial to police killed in the line of duty, but objecting to the site location. On the 12 April the RSL compiled a letter to the MCC stating:

> The RSL is most disturbed that the proposed new Police Memorial will be going somewhere alongside the statue of Weary Dunlop. This is not really
the place for the Police Memorial, and I am wondering if the Council could re-think their decision as to the site and location. Please we do not want the Police Memorial near the Weary Dunlop Statue (sic) (COM 2001b).

RSL President, Bruce Ruxton, stated to the *Herald Sun* that the City of Melbourne needed to find another space for the police memorial and he could not understand why the police memorial had to ‘be pushed up against the Weary (Dunlop) statue’. Randall Bell was also cited indicating that the police memorial size ‘makes Weary (Dunlop) look like a thrip’ (Hodder 2001). However, Bell expanded on arguments he presented in the previous *Herald Sun* articles by highlighting that the location of the memorial was ‘a tragic mistake’. The issue of leaving consultation with the National Trust until late in the memorial’s development was also raised in this *Herald Sun* report. The *Age* reiterated most of these arguments, but went further by highlighting for the first time in any media reporting on the memorial to date, of the concerns regarding the public safety implications of the design (Carson & Murphy 2001). The most pressing matter for the Victoria Police Memorial Committee and the MCC was to commence the memorial’s construction to meet the time line for the 2001 Police Remembrance Day and Blue Ribbon Day September commemorations. However, this was not to be realised due to the various objections.

The VCAT hearing date set for 25 July, 2001 (Trust 2001n), would eventually be superfluous due to the combined efforts of Victoria Police and the City of Melbourne to thwart the National Trust’s objection campaign. At a meeting held on 25 May, 2001, Victoria Police and the MCC discussed their strategy to avoid formal proceedings in VCAT, which confirmed the MCC followed proper procedure in their decision regarding the Victoria Police application. Moreover, council could issue itself with a planning permit, providing the application was appropriately advertised to ensure the continued transparency. Discussions around the Trust’s accusations of breaching procedure led to the idea that the National Trust might have misinterpreted the MCC’s support for the project, established
well before the planning application was made. However, the MCC decided there was no breach of procedure in these circumstances because it is ‘prudent economic management to support any process that will involve Council funds being utilised at any stage throughout the process’ (Vicpol 2001g).

MCC representatives at the 25 May meeting were confident the Victoria Police Memorial developmental process was sound and ‘would stand any scrutiny from the [National] Trust and VCAT’. Both organisations agreed ‘that the Trust was on a fishing expedition and would not follow through on the application to a hearing’. To weaken the Trust’s resolve, the MCC agreed to meet with Bruce Ruxton from the RSL, before its next meeting with the National Trust ‘to encourage the RSL not to support the National Trust with any objection by allaying any fears or misconceptions they may have about the project’ (Vicpol 2001g). If the Trust proceeded with a hearing at the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, then the MCC and Victoria Police would defend their joint interests by providing briefings to a leading barrister, although no details about cost sharing were discussed (Vicpol 2001g). A final alternative to avoid a hearing was put to Victoria Police by the MCC which suggested moving the proposed memorial to a site at Federation Gardens on the Yarra banks. This option was discussed at the Victoria Police senior executive level but was rejected because of the view that it would be preferable to pursue a VCAT hearing to preserve the permit authorisation for construction at the St Kilda Rd. Site (Vicpol 2001g).

On 30 May 2001, a last meeting between all parties attempted to avoid a lengthy VCAT hearing. Present were senior representatives from Victoria Police, MCC, the National Trust, and RSL. The meeting began with the National Trust reiterating its support for a police memorial, and arguing about its unnecessary large size and impact on both the garden landscape and the historic site of Tom’s Block. Concerns about the memorial’s close proximity to the Weary Dunlop statue and the Shrine of Remembrance precinct were restated. The Trust’s Chairman: ‘suggested that in his view the memorial lacked a sense of arrival and
that some of the most poignant memorials were small, such as the eternal flame’. Comments about the safety concerns, if mentioned at all, were not recorded (Vicpol 2001h). In response, Victoria Police advised:

that the planned location of the Victoria Police Memorial had significant heritage value and linkages to Victoria Police. The Victoria Police Hospital was there, the old Police Depot was there and the Police Stables still there. Thus, the proposed memorial site was part of a Victoria Police historical precinct making the location ideal and “exactly what the Victoria Police want” (Vicpol 2001h).

Victoria Police argued that several design compromises had already been made and there was no scope for any further alterations. Furthermore, the proposed site for the memorial was some 150 metres away from the Weary Dunlop statue, and shielded by large trees around a corner, while the area of Tom’s Block was claimed to be clearly outside the Shrine of Remembrance precinct. The proposed site was also in keeping with the master plan the City of Melbourne developed in consultation with various stakeholders, which clearly specified the suitability of the Kings Domain for memorials. According to the MCC which expressed total support for the Victoria Police view, that the Victoria Police Memorial Committee had followed due process and gave adequate consideration to the suitability of alternative sites. Moreover, ‘the community supported the proposal’. Victoria Police stated that ‘the Force was prepared to have the matter tested [at the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal] if necessary’ (Vicpol 2001h).

At this point the RSL, which was to this time the National Trust’s main ally, decided to withdraw its support and sided with the MCC and Victoria Police. The State President, Bruce Ruxton, stated: ‘that he had no objection to the design nor the location as the Force was para military and the location was not within the Shrine precinct’ (Vicpol 2001h). Committee members had taken Ruxton to the proposed police memorial site to examine whether the two memorials might impinge upon each other. He realised then the Weary Dunlop statue was invisible from the Police Memorial site (Hasell interview 2014). The meeting ended with the National Trust being the sole objector, which the City of Melbourne and
Victoria Police hoped would lead to a withdrawal of its VCAT claim against the planning permit. The National Trust’s opponents had successfully countered many of the objections relating to the memorial’s proposed development, and strongly supported the idea that Victoria Police had a proven historical connection to the area (Vicpol 2001i). Oddly, this last factor was not put to the National Trust at an earlier stage.

The *Age* reported the National Trust withdrawing its appeal against the planning permit on 1 June 2001. The article stated the National Trust ‘claimed the cost of fighting the memorial would be too expensive and against the wishes of the community’ (Murphy 2001). Moreover, it no longer wanted the ‘sensitive memorial’ to be over ‘shadowed’ by controversy. However, the issues relating to the memorial’s design and environmental impact remained at an impasse with both sides refusing any further compromises (Murphy 2001). The article was somewhat premature because the National Trust’s official withdrawal was not received by VCAT until 6 July 2001. In the end, the tone between the protagonists was one of reconciliation. The National Trust was invited to work with the City of Melbourne on future guidelines for other memorials in the Kings Domain precinct once its complaint withdrawal was confirmed (Trust 2001o), and the Trust welcomed this opportunity, believing the existing guidelines vague in relation to the size and types of memorials that could be approved. Thus, they argued, the original design competition was compromised because the designers had insufficient guidelines (Trust 2001h). In return, as a gesture of friendship, the National Trust extended the opportunity to market Blue Ribbon badges at National Trust sites around the state (Vicpol 2001i).

The planning permit was then formally issued and construction of the fully funded Victoria Police Memorial could begin at the preferred site and with the chosen design. Ironically, safety issues relating to the memorial were sidelined, seeming to vanish from the debate altogether. These concerns however resurfaced in the years following the memorial’s construction. These are discussed in the
final chapter along with issues relating to the memorial's construction and several post-construction developments.

Concluding Comments

The Victoria Police Memorial was born from a groundswell of public-support for Victoria Police in the wake of the shooting deaths of two officers in the late 1990s. The memorial blends vernacular and official expressions of physical memorialisation, representing both loss and grief as well as service, sacrifice, and the social stability derived from strong governance based upon the rule of law. The public will to memorialise these two officers was an opportunity for Victoria Police and local and state governments to turn this resolve into a public state memorial to all Victoria Police officers killed on duty. Thus, remembrance of two individuals evolved into a ‘collective remembrance’ of many, reflecting the later developments of the Mansfield police memorial. Importantly, the prominent public site of the memorial and the ongoing exposure of annual commemorative practices taking place there ensured it would remain an active site of memory. As pointed out by Jeff Kennett, the state’s political leader at the time of the Silk and Miller deaths, the location of the memorial clearly links police remembrance with the sacrifices made by the state’s military.

Given that police legitimacy is difficult to measure, such a demonstration of public support for the memorial suggests clearly a high point of police community relations; an overt converging of values between the public and police. This was not lost on Victoria Police. The memorial’s purpose became largely a means of celebrating the positive and protective relationship between police and the Victorian community. As the story in this chapter unfolds, it is clear the involvement of the Victorian community with the memorial’s development recedes, and is replaced by official state and local government bureaucratic involvement which dealt with technical decision-making over the desirable location of the site, funding and the memorial’s design specifications. Opposition to the memorial emerged from ‘agencies’ of articulation which were initially
overlooked by the Committee. The National Trust, The Garden History Society and the RSL were not identified as key stakeholders in the chosen site. Opposition is eventually swept aside but not before significant disruption to the planning process. The Victoria Police Memorial, reminiscent of Stonehenge, would stand like an ancient monument in permanent remembrance of individuals who died doing the sacred task of protecting the community in a preferred location readily accessible to the public and in a commemorative precinct that celebrates sacrifices to the nation.
Chapter Five: Victoria Police Memorial Outcomes

Introduction

Chapter Four examined the formative stages of the Victoria Police Memorial; the concept, design, site, and funding, and objections to the memorial. In this chapter the construction and dedication of the memorial is discussed, as well as a number of post-construction issues demonstrating how the memorial’s ‘symbolic communication’ was presented to the public and how the ‘agents of memory’, the Committee members, reacted to the final completed form of the memorial. Unlike the planning permission and subsequent objections discussed in Chapter Four, the construction was relatively straightforward with few delays. Ironically, after so much deliberation, planning and controversy, the memorial was built on St Kilda...
Rd. near the state’s most important war memorials, where former Premier Jeff Kennett initially said it should go, soon after Silk and Miller’s deaths. The dedication ceremony in 2002 was well attended by local, state and federal government representatives, friends and families of the deceased. Remembrance of ‘fallen’ police was equated with soldiers killed in battle and the use of high diction (Fussell 1975) dominated the dedication speeches with the common use of phrases such as ‘ultimate sacrifice’. The dedication ceremony was, like police funerals, a public spectacle (Manning 1997) but the public were largely not there to witness it. With the death of the two officers receding into the past, the people of Victoria were content to have a police memorial but left it to police and the governing bodies to enact and witness its dedication.

The chapter looks then at an evaluation of the projected outcomes and reflects upon some of the responses to the completed memorial from members of the memorial committee and its designers. Here, the memorial is described as effectively representing the symbolic connection between police and the community, an understanding that police risk their life and health in the defence of law and order. Listing the names of the dead reinforces this connection (Hass 1998; Sherman 1999; Winter 1995) as does the memorial’s structural design elements allowing, as they do, for the sounds and sights of the city, of the community, to penetrate the sacred space within (Hasell 2002).

Questions relating to the utilisation of the site are also addressed. Is the memorial an ‘active site of memory’ (Beaumont 2004)? The memorial is utilised for ceremonial rituals on Police Remembrance Day and Anzac Day. There are irregular visits by serving, and ex-serving members of Victoria Police as well as surviving family and friends of the deceased and tourists. There are suggestions that the utilisation of the memorial could be expanded but overall it is as active as many significant war memorial sites. For some, the fact the memorial exists is enough in itself as its permanent presence reminds some passers-by of police sacrifice.
Other post-construction issues are highlighted, including a particular act of vandalism relating to the names of the officers killed by bushranger Ned Kelly, connecting the state memorial back to the incident which began police memorialisation in 1889. The final discussion concerns the timing of the introduction of the state memorial: why did the memorial emerge after the Silk and Miller murders and not a decade earlier after the Tynan and Eyre murders in 1988 or even earlier such as following the death of Angela Taylor at the police headquarters bombing 1986. This is not suggest that the emergence of a state police memorial was inevitable. Such outcomes or developments are the result of active agents of memory, the socio-political spaces or agencies of articulation and the narratives shaping the possibilities of memorialisation (Ashplant, Dawson & Roper 2004). There were no plans by police or government to build such a memorial before the murder of the two officers in 1998. The evidence examined here suggests the memorial emerged when it did due to a number of correlating circumstances converging at a particular time in history. The death of Silk and Miller only partly accounts for the building of this memorial.

Construction and Dedication

The objections to the memorial from The National Trust ended in July 2001, but little progress was made in relation to beginning the construction of the memorial. The memorial’s designs needed amending and proper drafting and then City of Melbourne approval. This process was incomplete until 14 January 2002, when work finally commenced (Vicpol 2001k). However, the sod-turning ceremony did take place on 26 September 2001, close to Police Remembrance Day.

Chief Commissioner Christine Nixon, Police Minister Andre Haermeyer and the Deputy Lord Mayor of Melbourne turned the first sod on the memorial site. The well-established ritual of sod turning is enacted for memorials and other state-sponsored activities. The sod turning enables the symbolic communication of the associated narratives, in this case the importance of police and police sacrifices. The ritual was covered by the press reigniting public interest in and engagement
with the memorial. According to the *Herald Sun*, Nixon proclaimed (in another example of high diction), the new memorial to be a ‘symbol of ultimate sacrifice’ (Cullen 2001). In a police journal, she was quoted as saying it was a ‘special police memorial’, something to remind all Victorians that the community’s safety sometimes comes at the cost of officers’ lives (Editorial Vicpol Association Journal 2001). Police Minister Haermeyer stated that the memorial to remember police deaths was long overdue. He compared it to the long-standing tradition of remembering military deaths as he drew attention to the Shrine of Remembrance ‘just up the road’ highlighting both the physical and symbolic proximity of police and military sacrifices to the state (Cullen 2001). He might have said ‘just far enough’ up the road, referring back to the objections relating to the close proximity to the military commemorative precinct and the Weary Dunlop memorial.

Work commenced on the Victoria Police Memorial in mid-January 2002 and was efficiently completed by June that year without any recorded incidents or further delays. Planning for the dedication of the memorial began following a meeting of the memorial committee on 15 August 2001. The Office of the Chief Commissioner Equity and Diversity Unit was informed to start planning for a dedication, which at that time was envisaged to take place in December 2001 or January 2002. The dedication was expected to be a significant public event requiring careful planning and it would also be a significant police operation. The recommendation was that the event should be managed by the State Emergency & Planning Co-ordination office highlighting the ways in which a relatively mundane event such as project commencement is transformed into an act of symbolic communication of police involving the community and the state (Vicpol 2001L). At first, the event was planned to be invitation only, which was unusual considering this was meant to be the public’s memorial (Vicpol 2002a). At a subsequent meeting in May, the Committee discussed the decision to make attendance at the ceremony by ‘invitation only’ and that doing so could be counterproductive. It was then decided that, although specific invitations would be sent out, there would be no bar to general attendance by members of the public. Specific invitations to staff, at deceased member’s former stations, were
limited to incidents dating back to and including the Tynan and Eyre shootings in 1988 and to the Angela Taylor family whose daughter was a victim of the Russel Street Police Headquarters bombing discussed below (Vicpol 2002b).

Minor problems were anticipated for the dedication day going by the completed standard Victoria Police risk assessment form, used for most events. The form lists risk categories such as ‘Road Management’ (uncontrollable, traffic disruption); ‘Resources’ (possible insufficient numbers, insufficient transport,); ‘Accidents’ such as fire hazards. The vast majority of the possible risks were rated as ‘D, unlikely’, the chance of traffic congestion was rated as ‘C, moderate’. The only category rated high risk was vandalism which was rated as ‘A, almost certain’ (Vicpol 2002c). The risks to this memorial were not as great as in places like Northern Ireland where police memorials are safely located within the confines of police facilities (Mulcahy 2000). Yet there are elements within the Victorian community who had targeted police memorials before. The Stringy Bark Creek Memorial and the headstones of the officers killed by Ned Kelly had been damaged in the past. As mentioned below, this same element who contest police remembrance of Ned Kelly as a cowardly criminal, would later damage the Victoria Police Memorial. To mitigate the vandalism risk, the construction fencing was left standing until a day prior to the dedication and twenty-four hour police guard was placed to prevent any acts of vandalism (Vicpol 2002d). Some consideration was given to using Shrine Guards for ongoing security. In the short term, police based at the St Kilda Rd. station were asked to provide security by way of drive pasts, in the immediate aftermath of the opening ceremony’ (Vicpol 2002b).

The dedication ceremony was held on the 5 July 2002, the culmination of approximately five years’ work. Prominent dedication ceremonies like this are important opportunities for police and government to reassert public police as the dominant protectors of law and order (Manning 1997). Such ceremonies also reassert the sacredness of policing given that Reiner suggests policing in many western cultures is undergoing a ‘desacralisation’ and ‘detraditionaisation’
process (Reiner 1995). As discussed in Chapter One, the introduction of managerialism and a distancing of government from policing in Australia provide some support for Reiner’s arguments. Loader and Mulcahy agree that policing has undergone transformations and various incidents can influence police legitimacy but they argue that public police are still firmly entrenched as enactors of the sacred task of defending law and order (Loader & Mulcahy 2003, pp. 32-6). Loader and Mulcahy suggest that these kinds of ceremonies provide opportunities for media ‘promotionalism’ which in the Australian policing context means reaffirming and locating the ‘sacred’ value of dying for the nation within the pre-existing military commemorative traditions. As the following detail reveals, the speeches made at the dedication ceremony confirm this kind of promotionalism by the use of high diction and by making links to Australian military deaths and highlighting the memorial’s location next to Victoria’s military commemorative precinct.

The addresses for the ceremony were conducted in order by the Senior Police Chaplain, Reverend Jim Pilmer (opening prayer), Steve Bracks, Premier of Victoria, Andre Haermeyer, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, and Chief Commissioner Christine Nixon. Non-speaking attendees were Kimberly Kitching, Acting Deputy Lord Mayor of Melbourne in attendance on behalf of the City of Melbourne. There were also representatives from every state and territory police force, as well as representatives from the Victoria Police Association, Victoria Police Legacy, Retired Police Association of Victoria, Victoria Police Historical Society, Victoria Police Blue Ribbon Foundation, Australian Federal Police, Metropolitan Fire and Emergency Services Board, Country Fire Authority, Metropolitan Ambulance Service, Rural Ambulance Service, State Emergency Service, and Emergency Services Super (superannuation) (Vicpol 2002e). Unknown numbers of family, friends and colleagues of deceased police officers also attended (Costa 2002). Among these supporters were the families of the murdered police personnel Angela Taylor, Tynan, Eyre, Silk and Miller (Police Association Journal Edditorial 2002). Thus, the majority in attendance were from the larger ‘police family’. The ‘ground swell’ of public support which initiated the memorial in 1998, was not demonstrated by any significant non-police related
attendees at the memorial’s dedication in 2002. This may well have been because of insufficient publicity leading up to the event. Invitations to guests were dispatched in late May, but for some unrecorded reason, the Committee had trouble convincing media outlets to promote the dedication in the month leading up to the date (Vicpol 2002f).

The dedication ceremony began, largely following a similar format to most National Police Remembrance Day ceremonies. As discussed in Chapter Two, police commemorative ceremonies developed into a standard form similar to and enacted in much the same way as Australian Military commemorations. The ceremony opened with the Vigil and Colour Parties entering the memorial amphitheatre, accompanied by the Shrine Guards to the sound of the lone piper (Vicpol 2002e). This was followed by Jim Pilmer’s opening prayer: ‘…may this memorial serve as a constant and dignified reminder of the community’s respect for both the profession of policing and for those, who in following that cause, made the supreme sacrifice’ (Police Association Journal Edditorial 2002). Pilmer continued on with a short address following the prayer, speaking of the 137 officers who had lost their lives and that it was ‘essential that the memorial is hallowed and blessed not only by ceremony’ but by the personal thoughts, feelings and memories of those present. Christian symbolism has a strong presence in police commemorative ceremonies. Pilmer made the religious linkages clear but his spiritual message was one designed to make all of the attendees feel included in the proceedings regardless of their beliefs (Vicpol 2002g).

The Victorian Premier Steve Bracks spoke next on behalf of all Victorians. The memorial, he said was a ‘place for reflection and a symbol of the ultimate sacrifice made by 137 of our finest officers while protecting the public’. He mentioned the dangers of policing and that the memorial was a symbol of the Victorian community’s ongoing gratitude for the service given by Victoria Police. Bracks then said that the idea to build the memorial was a result of the ‘enormous outpouring of grief’ in the wake of the Silk and Miller shootings. He said
‘Victorians wanted a public demonstration of their support and gratitude…’ and that this ‘memorial was a fitting tribute’ (Vicpol 2002g). There was some initial concern raised by the memorial committee about mentioning the Silk and Miller shootings preceding the dedication due to concerns about jeopardising the ongoing legal case against the accused gunmen (Vicpol 2002h). Despite these concerns all three key speakers referred to the death of the two officers as the catalyst for the memorial.

Andre Haermeyer described the dedication as a significant day to all Victorians and the ‘long-overdue’ memorial was one of Victoria’s most important. The memorial, he said, would mean different things to different people, a quiet place of reflection for families and friends and colleagues of the deceased. For tourists, the memorial demonstrates the pride Victorians have in their police force. For non-police related Victorians, the memorial may help to bring a deeper understanding of the sacrifices made and the dangers faced by Victoria Police in protecting the community. Haermeyer saw the memorial as an extension of the pledge made on Blue Ribbon Day by the State Government to annually remember police who lost their lives. That pledge was further extended after the Silk and Miller shootings to include a more ‘tangible monument that honours the sacrifices of our police officers’. He then went on to thank former Chief Commissioner Neal Comrie, and the current Chief Commissioner, Christine Nixon, for their efforts in helping to bring the memorial to fruition. He also gave a general thanks to all the other members of Victoria Police who were involved with the memorial (Vicpol 2002g).

Christine Nixon highlighted the importance of the ceremony and asserted that it was a time to reflect on the history of the Victoria Police and the many sacrifices made – indeed the memorial is ‘an enduring symbol of the ultimate sacrifice’ (Vicpol 2002g). The memorial, she said, ‘would always ensure that our colleagues who were killed serving the community will always be remembered’ by their fellow officers, families and the broader community. She pointed out the young average age of the officers who were killed and the loss of human potential
that also represented. The emergence of the memorial was something positive that came out of the Silk and Miller shootings along with Blue Ribbon Day. Nixon also mentioned the history of the memorial’s site and its close proximity to the old Police Hospital, and former Police Depot and the then current Mounted Division’s stables. Nixon thanked Victoria Police’s memorial development design, funding, and construction partners, the Department of Justice, the Community Service Fund and the City of Melbourne, the designers and Cane Constructions.

The memorial’s naming plaque was then unveiled by Bracks, Haermeyer and Nixon. Numerous wreaths were laid, followed by 137 police officers placing single red roses around the police badge symbol in the centre of the amphitheatre to represent the 137 officers whose names line the wall; officers killed since 1854. The red roses symbolise the reburying of each individual officer at the memorial centralising remembrance of the many death across time and space at one sacred site. This was followed by the reading of ‘Poem in Remembrance’ written and read by Senior Constable Trevor Sweeney, Hamilton Police Station. The ceremony then concluded with the Requiescant memorial bugle call written for Victoria Police by Inspector Don Jarrett (retired) (Vicpol 2002e). Thus, the fully completed Victoria Police memorial was dedicated and blessed, its sacred site and its messages of sacrifice, loss and grief and police legitimacy were in place for the next fifty years; the minimum expected life span of the memorial.

Thirteen years later, Kevin Scott remembers that there were some sound problems on the somewhat-windy day and the quiet-spoken contributors were sometimes difficult to hear. But this did not detract from the importance of the occasion. Scott was glad the work was finally finished but believed that it was ‘important to recognise those who had gone before us… and that [the memorial would] be more important as time goes on’ (Scott interview 2014). Jim Pilmer stated that he ‘…can remember being very moved that we got to that point really and just a feeling of gratitude – we were able to show the Silk and Miller families that there was now a place and that the Police Memorial Chapel would run in parallel with it
and would always be there’ (Pilmer interview 2014). In the mind of the committee, the memorial project had been successfully completed. The speeches made at the dedication reaffirm the sacred nature of policing as the risking of lives in defence of the nation and police were symbolic soldiers of the law.

**Post-Construction Evaluations**

Evaluating the success of a memorial is not always easy. There are often many difficulties to overcome with memorial construction and stakeholders might see the completion of a memorial as a success in itself. In 1999, the Victoria Police Memorial Committee were obliged to provide detailed success criteria for the Victoria Police Memorial as part of the application for financial assistance from the Community Support Fund. It’s worth examining the success criteria to ascertain how many aims were realised and to bring further elucidation to the thinking behind what the committee thought a memorial might achieve.

The application documents stipulated that the success of the project was to be gauged according to:

- public support for the concept when announced, expressed by the press, the media, and letters;
- public interests in the commissioning process, for example public display of the short-listed works;
- national and international media interest in the completed work;
- tokens of sympathy and support left at the work;
- how well it is reviewed in specialist professional journals for design & artistic merit; being included as one of the central city’s major points of interest;
- and low levels of vandalism (Vicpol 1999g).
The first criterion related to the amount of public support for the memorial. Initial public expressions supporting the memorial in the immediate aftermath of the Silk and Miller shootings were substantial in relation to letters of support and supporting press articles (see Chapter 4). Yet there were very few expressions of public support for the memorial in the intervening years between the memorial’s conception and its completion. There was some interest demonstrated by entrants for the design competition but the records do not stipulate how many public submissions there were. Only about ten public and police members and ex-members submission drawings remained in Victoria Police files. During the time of the National Trust’s objections to the memorial, discussed in the previous chapter, some members of the public expressed their support on various public radio talkback shows, but this was limited, certainly not a significant public ‘out-cry’ in defence of the memorial. There is no record of objects being left by the public at the memorial that might express interest and sympathy in the same way as objects are left for the dead by family and friends at the American Vietnam Veteran’s memorial in Washington (Hass 1998). As mentioned above, the general public didn’t attend the dedication in significant numbers. Public support for the memorial was initially evident in the press and radio in 1998 but little of that could be found around the time of the memorial’s dedication in 2002.

The memorial committee’s criteria for success also included the possible emergence of quality responses to the memorial’s design from national and international media and professional interest by way of reviews published in artistic and design journals. Press coverage of the Victoria Police Memorial’s dedication was adequate in local and some national papers. But there is scant evidence of international interest or professional interest in the memorial’s design. Indeed, the only post-construction mention of the memorial’s design in the media, aside from the dedication articles, was an article by Liz Minchin entitled ‘Police Memorial “Out of Place”’, published in The Age newspaper (Minchin 2003). The article discussed the new Melbourne City Council policy regarding the placement of memorials in Melbourne’s parklands. From that point on, all proposed parkland memorials needed a direct connection to the parkland site. It’s worth reiterating here that the National Trust would be part of the body overseeing the
implementation of the new policy. This was part of the settlement made between
the Trust and the City of Melbourne, discussed in Chapter Four, in relation to the
Trust’s objection to the memorial. The new memorial policy was drafted by a
private consultant Georgina Whitehead, who described many of Melbourne's then
most recent memorials as ‘ghastly and out of place’. She argued that under the
new guidelines many of these memorial sites would not have been sanctioned. As
an example, Whitehead suggested that ‘I don’t think…that the police memorial is
in a suitable spot in Kings Domain, because those sorts of memorials should be on
police grounds’ (Minchin 2003). Whitehead failed to realise the importance
Victoria Police placed on a public site.

Thus, in relation to an indication of success, national, international and
professional interest in the memorial was limited and some of it was not
supportive. But this was no surprise to the memorial’s co-designer Anton Hasell.
Hasell is unaware of reportage on the memorial, adding that public art is often not
written about. He can’t recall any of his works being written about. Public art, he
argued, is in a grey area between architecture and art, and the art world often
doesn’t look upon public art as art. Hasell also suggests that, in a very general
sense, people don’t like Melbourne’s public art, which he bases on personal
experiences and research (Hasell interview 2014).

The Memorial Committee thought the success of the memorial might also be
measured in terms of it being a significant point of interest in the central city
district. The City of Melbourne was a significant partner in the memorial’s
construction and is responsible for its ongoing maintenance. The memorial is
included on tourist pamphlets and websites alongside other important landmarks
in the Kings Domain precinct, such as the Weary Dunlop statue and the Victoria
College of the Arts. Clearly, the City of Melbourne regards the memorial as a
significant site fulfilling this success criteria.
The final criterion of success was to be measured by the amount of vandalism the memorial attracted. Drawing conclusions about success based upon the amount of deliberate damage is problematic. Low-level vandalism could suggest a significant amount of public respect for the memorial thus making it a worthy target that might obtain notoriety for potential offenders. On the other hand, little or no damage might indicate significant public indifference as much as it might suggest respect. To date, recorded incidents of vandalism have been few. There was only one incident which was recorded in the press since 2002. On Sunday, 6 October, 2013, a Victoria Police press release appealed for any witnesses to contact Crime Stoppers, if they had any information regarding a 1.5 meter black ‘graffiti tag’ which appeared on one of the memorial’s pillars (Seach 2013).

A far more significant vandalism incident occurred in 2009 when Ned Kelly supporters defaced the memorial. Evidence of this damage can only be found in the Victoria Police Honours and Awards Section, in archived photographs of the damage and an email request for it to be repaired by the City of Melbourne. The incident involved damage to the brass name plaques for Sergeant Michael Kennedy, Constable Thomas Lonigan, and Constable Michael Scanlan, killed by Ned Kelly in 1878. The asterisks on the name plaques, denoting felonious slayings, were chiselled off. The unknown perpetrators were suggesting that these officers’ deaths were not felonious slayings but were the result of a fair fight between the Kellys and government agents sent to hunt and kill them. The chiselled-off-asterisks incident did not appear in the press, most likely so as not to give notoriety to the perpetrators. This incident clearly reflects the undercurrent of contested remembrance between Ned Kelly sympathisers and Victoria Police. However, the amount of vandalism since the memorial’s construction can be considered low, thus fulfilling this success criterion.

The Victoria Police Memorial did not score well with only two criteria fulfilled of the possible six. The success criteria can largely be seen as a bureaucratic exercise, part of an application for funding and were not based on issues of greater concern for Victoria Police: establishing a publicly accessible memorial in
a high profile location that would enhance the capacity for symbolic communication.

**Memorial Committee Responses**

Only two out of the above six success criteria were fulfilled. Nevertheless, the interview responses from some of the remaining ex-memorial committee members about the finished Victoria Police Memorial were largely positive, highlighting, among other themes, the importance of the memorial as a symbol of the connection between the police and the community. The ‘connection’ the interviewees are referring to involves trust in the organisation and its members and an understanding of shared values, these ideas forming the core of police legitimacy. One of those shared values being the public reverence for citizens who offer or forfeit their lives for the nation or community. Moreover, the fact that the memorial was located in a prime public space was also an important success. The rituals of National Police Remembrance Day could now be performed in the public domain and would not be confined to police grounds like the Police Academy.

Retired Chaplain Pilmer’s comments reiterate the importance the Committee placed on moving police commemoration from a private to a public setting: ‘…one of the main factors is that we lifted the commemoration of police members who have died out of a sort of in-house chapel so to speak…out of a private area and made it public…I’m sure that was one of the driving factors…we sort of felt that the public didn’t recognise the sacrifice that police make for them generally speaking…So you got it out into the community as a permanent thing’ (Pilmer interview 2014). Committee member Stuart King, supports and expands on this idea:

…I think it symbolises continuity because of the nature of the structure…it’s imbedded in the hill…there’s that sort of continuity and …connection with community. Not just for those community members who have lost somebody, but the community generally. For me the value
and purpose of it was connection. And at that time…the community was rocked by how could this happen, how can those two officers be shot, it was a very public experience…so I think connection was important at that particular time and I think it still is. [The memorial] is important to me because it perpetuates the contribution that officers make to community and the connection to community. There is a lot of literature around about how policing works and why it works…policing could not function without the support of the community. People have to make a personal choice to support the police or not…I think it’s those sorts of values and connections that brings around people (King interview 2014).

Committee member Kevin Scott’s opinion was:

symbolically it looks good and it feels good, it feels as though it represents those that have died’. [For Scott, the memorial is] ‘really about a place that people can go and remember’ and it symbolises the unknown everyday risks faced by officers. ‘You don’t know when you jump in a police [vehicle] or go out on patrol, what you will encounter…999 times out of a thousand you are certainly not going to be damaged… For the community it represents…a physical, tangible symbol of those who have died in the line of duty (Scott interview 2014).

Committee member Bill Severino thinks the memorial symbolises:

the ongoing service of Victoria Police to the community of Victoria [and that] people have given their lives in that service. ….it was to be a public memorial which would symbolise all Victoria Police members who have been killed in the line of duty. The manner of each individual’s death on duty does not place them above any other on the memorial (Severino interview 2014).

For the families of the dead, Scott believes the memorial: ‘gives the sense that people have not died in vain. They have had their service recognised and that they have paid the ultimate sacrifice –it’s that sense of contribution.’ He knows of a
father who lost his police son in an off-duty car accident – his son’s name is not on the memorial – but the father takes great comfort from the police memorial because it represents the community’s connection to and approval of policing. It is important for him to feel that sense of policing and the community. This got Scott thinking that there is a lot more than just the police ‘reflecting, thinking and thanking’ those who have passed on – this is about the families and the wider community understanding that (Scott interview 2014).

Jim Pilmer agrees the memorial provides: ‘…a place for families to go, to know that all the stuff they have been through as a family has not been put away and shelved and forgotten – that it’s out there. It’s there for the community to remember’. Pilmer said that the fact that both the public and the police communities engage with the memorial either on Police Remembrance Day or other occasions is very important to the families of the deceased members and their dealing with the grief. Pilmer said that he has been at the memorial when Miller’s son was there and saw how important his father’s plaque was to him (Pilmer interview 2014).

Few comments were made about the structure’s design. Like most military rank and file, police officers are not trained art critics and find it difficult to articulate thoughts and feelings evoked by a memorial design other than to say it is appropriate or not. Indeed, the designer’s claim that they never really received any feedback about the memorial from Victoria Police. They heard on the ‘grapevine’ that their design was chosen because it was ‘the most sensible’ (Hasell interview 2014). However, King provided some insightful reflections on the memorial’s design. He suggests above that the memorial’s embeddedness (amphitheatre) in the hill reflects that police are part of the landscape and symbolically part of the community. He stated that:

…the [memorial’s] columns were suitable, well I think, because it presents a robust structure, its resistant to weather, its solid, it’s quite an impression I think when you walk up to it and walk within it. …you can see through the memorial to the old police depot across the road as a
relevance to the police family, especially some of the older serving members. I think it symbolises strength… (King interview 2014).

King’s observations about the memorial’s embeddedness (amphitheatre) into the hill on the site resonates with the architects’ intentions for the design. Hasell explains that the initial:

theme driving the design was cupped hands. That’s why we wanted the earth to be shaped as cupped hands so that the memorial becomes this place of loving care. Because we were thinking of the wives of the police who have died and how they feel and so we want to embrace them with a space that isn’t wide open to the winds or whatever comes through (Hasell interview 2014).

The architects’ intended evocation for police members was that the space is:

designed for them to be thoughtful about their place in the community, and their responsibility to the community and themselves… The police have a job to do but they are not a brotherhood…their job should not define them, their job is what they give to the community. The memorial is meant to remind [the police] they are people who have chosen to work in the service of their community…and some of them took the ultimate consequences and the community honours them for their bravery…and respects them and cares for them and loves them because they do a necessary job (Hasell interview 2014).

For the designers, the amphitheatre represented a protected space for the living to connect to the dead and for officers to reflect on their own ongoing service. For King, the amphitheatre represented the police force’s connection to the community. King’s comments about the memorial’s columns also has certain resonances with the artists’ intentions. The columns King referred to are the openings in the curved wall running along the street at the head of the amphitheatre allowing entrance into the inner space. It is these spaces that give the wall its Stonehenge-like appearance allowing movement between the outside and inner space of the memorial. The artists specifically designed the memorial’s
wall to run along the street. Hasell is an architect but he is also a sound artist and this is a central part of the design.

Hasell explained that:

…the police work on the street, and I wanted the sound of the street to infiltrate. We wanted the hands of comfort but we also wanted the sounds of the street and the smells of the street’. A multi-sensory site of experience. ‘I wanted all the sensory input to be flowing through that site because that’s the daily life of police on the street (Hasell interview 2014).

Hasell indicated that he believed the memorial’s close proximity to the street helps to evoke the sights, sounds and smells of the police’s working environment. The porous wall was designed to allow sensory experience of the street to leach into the amphitheatre. But at the same time the inner part of the memorial provides secluded spaces for people to privately grieve. This was a delicate balance to achieve and is why an architectural form was used rather than a sculptural form, like the statute of an officer (Hasell interview 2014). King’s experience does differ to what Hasell suggested above, but there is the same sense of the external surroundings penetrating the memorial’s inner sanctum. King’s experience of the porous wall (columns) was that he could see across the road to the antecedent police sites and buildings.

The designers would delight in King’s engagement and interpretation of the memorial’s design because, although they had their own ideas about the meanings of the design elements, they did not want personal engagement with the memorial to be prescribed in any way. They resisted any suggestions about descriptive plaques being attached to the memorial, including any large title lettering such as ‘Victoria Police Memorial’. The blue-and-white checkers laid into the wall’s exterior and the police badge in the centre of the amphitheatre were overt police connections. Otherwise, the artists’ intentions were for each visitor to have their own interpretations and experiences of the memorial and to subscribe their own individual meanings to it (Hasell interview 2014). The memorial’s abstract design lends itself to individual interpretation (Winter 1995). It is a piece of public art demanding interaction with it because a visitor must enter the inner space of the
memorial to learn more about it. The interactions are more complex and as James Mayo suggests ‘…memorials derive meaning from the sentiments and utilitarian purposes we impose on them’ (Mayo 1988, p. 4). Sentiments would considerably vary from grief, sorrow, regret, pride along with more negative sentiments possibly from those who opposed the memorial or who perceive themselves as victims of policing in some way. The utilisation of the memorial for say a rememberance ceremony, might also effect the kind of sentiments a visitor brings to the site. Thus, each visitor to the memorial will derive their own meaning partly drawn from their response to its form and partly from their own sentiments which might be heightened by the reason for the visit.

The original memorial committee members who committed to an interview, could not recall any disappointment from other members at the time. The designers were disappointed to have been largely made ‘irrelevant’ by the Committee and Victoria Police after the memorial was completed. However, this lack of appreciation was not a rejection of the architects’ designs but perhaps an inability to articulate appropriate responses to design elements. It was not possible to interview current serving members of Victoria Police about the memorial but every opportunity was taken to ask serving members what they thought of it. Like the Committee members, the responses from serving members was mostly positive, although one or two did not know where it was. It seems the Committee members and the broader police family understand what the memorial’s purposes are. They appreciate the memorial’s design, but just how the design elements convey the memorial’s purposes is not always clearly discernible to them. This is the case for most abstract designs.

The memorial Committee wholly accepted the memorial’s design and indeed defended it against criticism from the National Trust and the Garden History Society, as discussed in Chapter Four. Part of these design critiques centred on safety concerns, such as how the memorial’s inner space might create seclusion in order to commit crimes harming people or damaging the memorial. These safety
Concerns were all largely rejected as was the suggestion to provide close-circuit television for the site. These concerns came close to realisation in 2014.

The Victoria Police Memorial made media headlines in 2014, ironically due to a murder committed within a few meters of the memorial site (Zielinski 2014). The incident is worth mentioning because of the concerns raised by the National Trust in relation to the memorial’s design and public safety as part of their objection in 2001. The murder was not committed on the site but a photograph taken from across St Kilda Rd. shows that the memorial does block the view from the street to the murder site on the grassy high ground behind the memorial, though only from certain angles. There is no suggestion here, or in the press, that the murderer purposely chose the site to commit the crime. Nevertheless, the incident echoes the concerns raised by the National Trust about the possible dangers to public safety. The installation of closed-circuit television on the site was suggested a number of times during the memorial’s development, by the Committee, the National Trust and by the memorial’s designers, but was mostly considered cost prohibitive. Had the crime taken place within the Memorial’s inner space, the rejection of safety features such as closed circuit television may well have been difficult to defend.

**Active Site of Memory?**

The Victoria Police Memorial is utilised annually on Police Remembrance Day, and Anzac Day. This is similar to the rate of activity for most war memorials except for the larger military remembrance sites such as the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance and the Canberra War Memorial which have other attractions, such as displays and museum components. Active sites of memory relate to memorials and public or sacred sites where private and public memories intersect. Memorials that do not engage with private memories, grief and mourning and are not linked into regular commemorative activities are likely to be ‘exclusively the products of official orchestration’ and are not active (Beaumont 2004, pp. 69-70). Aside from the annual days and infrequent visitors and passers-by, the St Kilda Rd. police
memorial site remains, like the vast majority of memorials, mostly inactive. Evaluating a site of remembrance as active or inactive is an unclear process and the frequency of use or visitation is not always the best measure of a site’s value. There are no research studies counting the number of visitors over a set period and as it is an ‘open access’ site there is no recording of gate entry data. While it would have been possible to conduct a systematic observational study of the site, such studies are time-consuming and more suited to scholarship that focuses on site use and activity alone. Furthermore, the thesis utilised a ‘proxy’ measure in the form of the perspectives of those with a stake in understanding and monitoring the use of the memorial: the planning committee members.

Some serving members say they often see people at the memorial reading the plaques. Others suggest the visitations are less frequent, and based upon the interviews conducted, many never really think to take notice of who might be at the memorial as they drive past it. Some are curious visitors such as tourists passing by or sightseeing all the memorials in the area. Such visits disseminate awareness of the memorial and its message of sacrifice for the community. Other visits are personal and might involve family, friends or colleagues of the deceased. Bill Severino made such a visit to the memorial to have a few quiet moments remembering his old friend and colleague Bob Lane, shot and killed while investigating a petty car theft:

Bob and I were room-mates at the old depot. He was in my training squad. So I walked in there and touched the plaque and said, g’day Bob sorry you could not live a longer life but that’s the way it went. So for me it’s a very personal thing (Severino interview 2014).

For Jim Pilmer the rate of usage is not as important as the fact the memorial is there (Pilmer interview 2014).

Kevin Scott suggests the site could be utilised more by Victoria Police by including more ‘reflective activities and events’. Scott’s example was the service held for Paul Carr, an officer who died off duty while climbing Mt Everest for the
Make a Wish Foundation. Carr’s service was held at the Police Academy but Scott suggests this is the kind of ceremony that could be held at the Victoria Police Memorial. Carr was not on duty nor performing any emergency off-duty police work when he was killed so he does not qualify to have his name on the memorial. Nevertheless, Scott argues that the officer ‘symbolically’ represented somebody ‘who made a significant contribution to Victoria Police whether on or off duty’. Furthermore, Scott thinks there is more room for ‘reflective’ ceremonies which are aimed not only to think of lost colleagues but bringing into focus the policing community and their current ‘living service’ (Scott interview 2014). Stuart King also thinks the memorial is underutilised:

I don’t know how to do it, it’s a vexing question. But for me I would just be suggesting to bring the community closer to it. Perhaps there could be installation ceremonies when a name is added or something like that. There could be an interactive component…given the IT [information technology] we have that we did not have back then.

He suggested an audio tour for the memorial so people could hear the full stories of each officer on the memorial (King interview 2014). The memorial’s designers also had similar ideas when they proposed the memorial site be monitored by close-circuit television, not to protect the memorial, but so that when ceremonies are held they could be televised or streamed to police stations around the state – but there was no budget for it (Hasell interview 2014).

The Victoria Police Memorial is an active site of remembrance on certain days of annual commemorative ritual, such as Police Remembrance Day. Otherwise, aside from occasional visitors the memorial is not active, not utilised. The memorial has custodianship of the names of the dead but, as King points out, it is not part of the funeral process. Instead, the annual rituals held at the memorial on Police Remembrance Day are a symbolic re-enactment of all the funerals held for the officers listed on the wall.
**Why Did a Public Police Memorial Take so Long to Emerge in Victoria?**

Most police memorials constructed in Victoria relate to the death of individual officers or specific events. The one exception being the Pioneer Police Memorial, discussed in Chapter Three, which was erected to commemorate the ‘service of officers’ before the establishment of Victoria Police. The death of more than one officer from a single incident is very rare in Victoria and in Australia generally. The incidents where multiple officers have been killed or injured are usually fairly spectacular attracting considerable media and community responses. The first police memorial built in Victoria was in response to the three officers killed by the Kelly Gang in the 1870s. The Victoria Police Memorial was constructed in reaction to the deaths of two officers Silk and Miller. However, there were two other significant events, discussed below, preceeding the Silk and Miller shootings involving multiple deaths or injuries of officers. These incidents did not spark the call for a state police memorial. Some Memorial Committee members suggest that the Victoria Police Memorial emerged when it did because of a culmination of several conducive elements. The discussions below suggest the social and political climate was crucial element in the emergence of the Victoria Police Memorial.

Respondents had some difficulty addressing the question of why the memorial took so long to emerge but a few did offer some perspectives. Stuart King suggests that communities’ attitudes toward their police force is susceptible to change depending on certain events such as perhaps a negative outcome from a Royal Commission:

> I really think that the answer to that question really lies, at that particular time, what was the relationship between the community and its force? …I think that that’s what the memorial represents at that particular time – what the value of that relationship was like and I think that’s an important thing to reflect on (King interview 2014).
Kevin Scott suggests:

I personally believe that policing as an entity in this state…was put aside [for many years]. Not until [Chief Commissioner] Miller do we see a change in the way that the police are remembered (Scott interview 2014).

As discussed in Chapter Three, Miller initiated the first list of Victoria Police deaths as a result of duty. Scott suggests that the 1950s under Commissioner Porter and the 1980s-90s under Commissioner Miller were times of significant investment in policing. The 1980s was a violent time for Victoria Police (discussed below) and although the government did not approach the police to say ‘let’s build a memorial’, they were prepared to give it moral support when it was proposed in the late 1990s. It was, Scott argues, politically expedient to build the memorial at that time. The Police Association was very active in the 1990s in terms of advocating for more recognition and industrial improvements for policing. This reached a peak in the late 1990s with the change of government. Scott believes the combination of the number of police deaths and increasing injuries and declining police numbers created an undercurrent of momentum for the idea of a public memorial by the time of the Silk and Miller shootings (Scott interview 2014). Bill Severino agrees the undercurrent for a memorial was already there (pre the Silk and Miller deaths) and the momentum self-perpetuated once the idea was suggested (Severino interview 2014).

When the question of why the memorial took so long to emerge was put to Mick Miller he suggested that it might be that: ‘nobody thought of it, it’s as simple as that’. He then added that ‘it’s a sad fact of police life that the best publicity that police can get is as a result of the murder of one of its members. Nobody wants it but it attracts public concern and opinion…’ It was no real surprise to Miller that the memorial emerged from the groundswell of public support in the wake of the Silk and Miller shootings (Miller interview 2015).

Police deaths provided the impetus to build the Victoria Police Memorial. Discussed below are two other high profile police deaths occurring in the decade preceding the Silk and Miller shootings: the Russell St Police Headquarters
bombing, resulting in the death of Constable Angela Taylor and the injuring of many others (1986), and the Tynan and Eyre fatal shootings (1988). Why was it that these earlier police murders did not provide impetus to build a public memorial to all Victoria Police who died on duty?

At approximately 1pm on 27 March, 1986, a car bomb exploded outside the Russell St Police Complex in Melbourne Central Business District. The attack was described as ‘probably the most serious attack on police and public order generally since the Kelly era’ (see Chapter Three; also Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, p. 131). The bomb consisted of fifty to sixty sticks of gelignite and the explosion could be heard many kilometres away. Unfortunately, for twenty-year-old Constable Angela Taylor, she was walking right by the car bomb when it exploded. Despite the extensive injuries including burns to seventy percent of her body, she remained alive in an unconscious state for twenty-four days before dying of her wounds. She became the first female police constable to be killed as a result of her duty. Constable Carl Donadio was also seriously injured and another nine police members received lesser injures. Ten civilians were also injured. The combined damage to the police and court buildings was approximately one million dollars. The investigation found a small syndicate of armed robbers were responsible for the bombings and their motivation was hatred of police (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, pp. 127-34). This event had a significant public impact and highlighted the risks associated with policing. There was, however, no apparent momentum to do anything more than provide a local memorial to Taylor’s memory. The building is no longer used by Victoria Police but her memorial plaque is still affixed to the Russell St. building exterior wall which can be seen by all who walk past it.

The next significant event involving the death of two officers happened just two years after the bombing. The shooting deaths of Constables Steven John Tynan and Damian Jeffrey Eyre occurred on Wednesday, 12 October 1988, in the Melbourne suburb of South Yarra. At 4:45am the two Constables, assigned as crew for the Prahran divisional police van, were despatched to check on an apparently abandoned vehicle left in the middle of the road in Walsh St. a narrow suburban back street. The two officers arrived at the scene and started to inspect
the abandoned vehicle. Tynan was sitting in the driver’s seat of the vehicle and started to get up when his attacker appeared and fired a shotgun at close range hitting him in the head and he slumped back dead into the vehicle. Eyre received a shotgun blast to his back but did not die instantly. He had a brief melee with his attackers who managed to take his service revolver off him and used it to kill him with two shots to the head. Later, one of those involved in the killings said that the two officers were shot as ‘payback for the fatal shooting by the Armed Robbery Squad of an allegedly armed criminal, Graeme Jensen’. The killing of Jensen occurred the day before the officers were shot (Brown, Presland & Stavely 1994, pp. 139-46).

These two critical incidents created a ‘siege’ mentality among many Victoria Police officers during this period. The media reports of retaliatory shootings between Victoria Police and offenders created an atmosphere of undeclared war. King, Scott and Miller, have suggested that the appearance of the Victoria Police Memorial was directly related to timing, the aligning of a critical incident, the death of two officers, and with the right political and social attitudes towards police. The arguments about the right timing have credence when the context of the two shootings, that of Tynan and Eyre (1988) and Silk and Miller (1998) are compared. Victoria Police were suffering an image crisis in the mid to late 1980s, which was the context for the Russell St. Police Headquarters bombing and the Tynan and Eyre shootings. Victoria Police were responsible for the shooting deaths of eleven citizens between the years 1987 to 1989. This was a high number of citizen casualties compared to any other time in Victoria Police’s history and many of the deaths were concentrated on young male citizens from the inner city working class (at the time) suburb of Flemington (McCulloch n. d). The circumstances surrounding these deaths are still controversial. In the early 1990s, some of the families of those Victoria Police killed found support for their concerns about illegal police shootings from the Flemington/Kensington Community Legal Centre. Meetings of the family members were facilitated by the legal centre, and ideas and experiences were shared between them. This led to accusations of police corruption, police cover ups for unnecessary police violence, a culture of fear and revenge within Victoria Police in the wake of the Tynan and Eyre shootings and a general lack of police accountability. Demands
for a judicial inquiry into police shootings emerged, when Gary Abdallah, a suspect in the Tynan and Eyre shooting investigation, was shot and killed by Victoria Police in April 1989, again in controversial circumstances. A coronial inquiry was held into the shooting deaths of seven people by the State Coroner, Hal Haldenstein from July 1989 to December 1991. The police officers involved in the shootings refused to give evidence on the grounds that they might incriminate themselves. From then on, there was little faith in the objectivity of the inquest. Protests were held outside the Corners Court in 1990 featuring banners saying ‘Who Polices the Police’. Another banner read ‘The Police Control Our Media’ which referred to accusations that the press, in particular The Sun and Herald Sun, reporting was not being impartial and were supporting the police (Fitzroy Legal Service & Centre 1992). The level of police legitimacy at the time was unlikely to have been at a high point. However, the emergence of the coronial inquest and the subsequent laying of murder charges against four police officers, undermined a simple narrative of police service and sacrifice. Jude McCulloch, a community lawyer from the Flemington Legal Centre, argued that if police are perceived to misuse the ‘power of deadly force’ and are not held accountable, ‘then public confidence in the police force will be damaged…’ (McCulloch n. d). Indeed, Matthew Logan’s work on the recent spate of police shootings in America argues that reports of unnecessary police violence have negative effects on public perceptions of police, reducing trust in them (Logan 2016).

Public perceptions of Victoria Police had changed by the time of the Silk and Miller shootings in 1998. The public were not being influenced by reports of controversial police actions involving inappropriate use of force in an ongoing war with criminal elements. Additional firearms training was provided to Victoria Police officers in 1989 and there was a drop in the number of shootings. However, the numbers spiked again in 1993 with a spate of police shootings of mentally disabled offenders. The official response by the Victorian State Government was to establish an independent body to investigate police shootings known as Task Force Victor. The task force undertook a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative analysis of police use of force including firearms, and made recommendations to be implemented by Victoria Police (Victor & Swanton
1994). It’s unlikely that all of the recommendations were effectively implemented by the time of the Silk and Miller Shootings in 1998. Nevertheless, the situation changed after Task Force Victor in that the number of police shootings had dropped and were no longer of interest to the media. The Tynan and Eyre shootings were seen in the context of an undeclared war between police and criminals whereas Silk and Miller were seen as two young officers killed trying to protect the community. In both cases the officers were innocent; only public perceptions and public responses differed.

The suggestion that the Victoria Police Memorial emerged resulting from various alignments and timing of circumstances holds considerable argumentative weight given the contrast in perceptions of policing between 1988 and 1998. Adding further weight was that the political context was also conducive to certain kinds of memorial building, namely war memorials in the late 1990s. Indeed, military commemorations and memorial building were lavishly funded under the Bob Hawke and Paul Keating federal Labor governments (1983 to 1996) and the John Howard federal Liberal government (1996-2007). There was a new wave of Australian nationalism during these governments and projects supporting images of public unity were often favoured. Vietnam War veterans used the opportunity to obtain federal funding for memorials and commemorative events. The above governments were keen to repair past divisions and debates over the Vietnam War (Linke 2009, p. 52). It was under the Howard government that consent was given to the National Police Memorial in 2001. Shifting the focus to the Victorian State Government, the construction of a state police memorial fitted within the prevailing nation-building ethos with a strong message of unity between the police and the community. Moreover, while there is no identifiable public statement directly linking the memorial to restoring the public image of police, for politicians and the broader public service the circumstances of the 1980s were largely viewed as an aberration, something marginal to the broader sacrifices made by police generally. Part of the idea behind the memorial was to give voice to the silent majority, to redress the unacknowledged sacrifice of ‘all’ officers who died in the line of duty.
There is, then, considerable evidence suggesting the Victoria Police Memorial emerged in the late twentieth century because the social and political context was conducive to it including the construction of other police memorials such as the state memorial in NSW and the national police memorial. The context of the remarkable police deaths in the 1980s was very different to that of the late 1990s. Public attitudes towards Victoria Police were possibly influenced by negative reports about controversial civilian deaths, misuse of force and lack of accountability. Police were seen to be partaking in unrestrained violence as part of a war with a certain criminal element. This is more difficult to substantiate for the Russell St. Bombing. In many ways, Angela Taylor was the ‘ideal victim’, as a promising officer, not doing anything wrong and going about her normal duties, involving on that occasion walking between buildings. The significant tensions between criminal elements and Victoria Police were only pushed into the public domain and the press after the bombing. However, the bombing of Russell St. was part of the undeclared war between Victoria Police and the criminal elements that were set against them. This may well have been a factor in conjunction with the less favourable political circumstances, for the lack of will to construct a significant memorial at that time. The situation had changed by the time of the Silk and Miller shootings and a culmination of conducive social and political attitudes facilitated the emergence of the Police Memorial.

**Concluding Comments**

After the construction and dedication of the Victoria Police Memorial, a satisfied memorial committee could stand back and admire their efforts. The memorial now formed part of police sacred ground. Victoria Police had a public site to conduct their annual rituals and to honour the names of the dead in a place of permanent remembrance. The memorial’s utility is similar to that of many war memorials and is largely an ‘active site of memory’ only during annual ceremonies, such as Police Remembrance Day and Anzac Day. Its location near Victoria’s military commemorative precinct, symbolically equates the service and sacrifice of soldiers with that of Victoria Police. The appropriation of military customs for police ceremonies and the chosen site, close to war memorials,
reaffirms the argument maintained throughout the previous chapters, namely that police remembrance and memorialisation can be located within the broader discussion of military commemoration. This was clearly reiterated with the use of high diction during the sod turning and dedication speeches where the ‘ultimate sacrifice’ of soldiers is compared to that of police sacrifices. The names of the deceased police listed on the memorial facilitate a connection between the living and the dead, often discussed within memory of war literature, and fulfils the obligation of the state to honour those who give their lives in service to it. The sod turning and dedication ceremonies also reflect the theoretical underpinnings of Manning’s ‘public spectacle’ and Loader and Mulcahy’s ‘promotionalism’ whereby such activities are used to communicate ideas of service and sacrifice in defence of law and order. However, it is reasonable to suggest that these opportunities for the symbolic communication through the memorial seemed to have been underutilised by Victoria Police. For although there was significant press coverage, the public did not experience these ceremonies by attending them in any significant numbers nor was there a concerted effort by Victoria Police to promote public attendance. The lack of public involvement at these ceremonies and on Police Remembrance Day, speaks to the different attitudes held by the public towards the respective remembrance of police and military services. Nevertheless, the lack of public participation does not dilute the memorial’s message that sacrifices for the state should be considered equal, whether from the police or military services.

The personal judgments and experiences of the memorial from ex-memorial committee members were positive, reflecting a general contentment with the final product and its location. The memorial committee experiences resonated with the artists’ design intentions concerning the purpose of the structure and the importance of personal interaction with it and interpretation of it. Not all interactions with the memorial have been positive with one incident evoking the controversial violence associated with the beginning of police memorialisation. The long time-distance between the first Victoria Police memorial in Mansfield (1880), and the state’s police memorial (2002) was brought closer through an act of vandalism. The deliberate damage targeting the names of the three officers
killed by Ned Kelly, links the Victoria Police Memorial to the ongoing symbiotic remembrance of police and their nemesis as discussed in Chapter Three.

Its emergence in the early twenty-first century was propelled by the death of two officers and propagated by the culmination of conducive social and political circumstances. Victoria police legitimacy had been under considerable strain in the 1980s and early 1990s. The police deliberately killed in that period, were concerning to the public and to Victoria Police, but did not give rise to a call for a state police memorial. By the late 1990s, when Silk and Miller were killed, attitudes had clearly changed, with an outpouring of public grief that surprised many including Victoria Police. The political climate was also conducive to memorial building with both federal and state governments focusing on nation building projects including the National Police Memorial. It was the right time to reaffirm Victoria Police legitimacy through the construction of a state memorial to police who died doing their duty.
Conclusion

This thesis set out to examine Victoria Police memorialisation, commemoration and remembrance, contextualised within broader national and global developments. The findings of the preceding five chapters contribute knowledge to the global study of police remembrance, highlighting its close linkages to war remembrance practices and theoretically locating it within memory literature. It contributes to the growing literature on police remembrance produced by academics such as Manning (1997), Mulcahy (2006) and Palmer (Palmer 2012), broadening the understanding of how government law enforcement organisations are legitimised in western liberal democratic nation states, with the aid of commemorative activities such as memorial building. The work demonstrates sacrificing life in service to the state is central to Victoria Police remembrance, from its beginnings in the late 1800s to the present day. Focussing on sacrifice in service to the state closely emulates the central tenets of national and global military commemoration, nevertheless police remembrance resonates with populations in a different way – in short, not as enthusiastically. It is difficult to speculate exactly why this is but perhaps it relates to the Australian public’s uncomfortable relationship with authority at times. However, now police remembrance is more prominent than ever before, in national and international memorial landscapes, media outlets, and government rhetoric, the associated rituals of commemorative practices are increasingly more orthodox and public.

The thesis framed police memorial construction and commemorative activities within four central elements of memory theory: the level and scale of memory; whose memories are memorialised; forms of memorialisation; and the political, social and cultural contexts shaping the memorialisation. We saw memory theory accommodating the academic discourse of police remembrance, because the same three levels of memory: personal, collective, and national remembrance, are at work in the development of police memorialisation. Personal and collective expressions of grief merge with the political need to reaffirm the police in western democracies as prime defenders of contemporary social values: police embody
the state. Large segments of the public in countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, value honouring deceased soldiers. Many symbolic links connect the military and police in history and in commemorative practices. Police memorials and associated memorialisation and commemoration practices suggest a shift from police as a profane bureaucracy to that of a ‘sacred’ entity by performing sacred duties (Manning 1997, p. 10): their ‘sacrifice’ an ‘occasion for a public, collective display of society’s view of itself’ (Manning 1992, p. 151).

This research showed development of police commemoration and memorialisation in Australia through a historical investigation into the establishment of dedicated days and dedicated national sites. National Police Remembrance Day (NPRD), and Blue Ribbon Day were the first dedicated days to emerge. Holding of these commemorative days adds credence to scholarly debate about whether or not collective remembrance stems from political and nation-building processes, or ties more closely to social forms of bereavement. Scholars, such as Ashplant, argue military commemoration develops from complex combined processes, from the top down and bottom up. Ashplant’s assertion is evident in the development of NPRD. The idea for this commemorative day originates from an individual officer trying to remember a deceased colleague’s name but then migrates beyond this ‘fictive kin’ to the agency of police senior executives who then develop it into a national remembrance day. The complex combination that Ashplant asserts continues unfolding as the development of NPRD rituals and practices appropriate and modify elements of pre-existing military remembrance nation-building traditions and concepts, such as ‘the ultimate sacrifice’ for the nation. The strong historical and operational connections between these two services produce an affinity facilitating the cross-over of commemorative practices and conceptualisations. In short, police and military remembrance share elements of a common broad ‘narrative of articulation’; one is of sacrifice to the nation at a collective level, and one is of trying to accommodate the grieving whose memories are of the loss of an individual.
To what extent police actively and purposefully appropriated narratives and practices of war remembrance into police commemoration, and as part of their organisational communication, also was empirically examined here. The evidence demonstrated numerous appropriations of military customs and practices, in this way adapting the existing, dominant and highly effective memorialisation narratives found in military commemorative practices. The establishment of annual remembrance days with military-style ceremonies and rituals, such as marching to memorial sites where the names of the dead are recited and venerated as state-sacrifices, wearing of military-style uniforms as the Shrine Guards do, and re-enactments of the ‘lone charger’, are all borrowed from military-remembrance practices. Yet, adopting these practices is largely organic in nature, due to the affinity between these two services, as observed through historical developments and operational similarities. As Manning suggests, any attempt to distinguish the ‘instrumental’ and ‘expressive’ forms of communication is artificial. This thesis found little documented evidence of Australian police deliberately harnessing Anzac fervour to enhance their legitimacy, by elevating their social standing to military heroes. Both Manning (1997) and Mulcahy (2000) argue that ‘high diction’ is an established form of organisational communication police utilise to send service-and-sacrifice messages in other respective national contexts. Australian police have embraced high diction, to some extent, but the press reporting and politicians’ speech-making about police remembrance have more so embraced it, equating police sacrifices with military sacrifices. Press and politicians highlight sacrifice for the nation, on Australia’s military commemorative days. Police and military deaths are seen as extraordinary deaths by governments that are obligated to remember service personnel killed serving the nation. For Australian police, the event of mass police casualties in the United States on 11 September 2001, localised press and political articulations of police deaths as being sacrifices for the nation. Thus, for agencies, including the press, political parties, and policing organisations, using ‘high diction’ is an accepted articulation of police remembrance.

World events, such as the September 11 terrorist attacks, nationalistic sentiment various state and federal governments propagate, and Western emphasis on commemoration and remembrance have all helped to significantly expand
Australian police memorials’ creation in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Within this commemorative climate the National Police Memorial emerged in Canberra. Further research will more precisely identify the ‘agents’ of memory’ who conceived the national-memorial idea though evidence suggests ‘police union lobbying’ (Williams 2006b) attempted seeding of a national memorial in the early 1980s, but twenty years passed before the right conditions appeared. Representing Australian police rank and file, police unions worked from the ‘bottom up’ promoting the idea for a memorial and from there, the Australasian Police Ministers Council manifests the memorial from the ‘top down’. It takes its place close to the nation’s memorials to military sacrifices, sending parallel ‘symbolic communications’, prompting remembrance of lives given in service to the state. Like the nation’s soldiers, police are situated here as legitimate servants of the state.

Chapter Three’s detailed examination of Victoria Police memorialisation development revealed something quite unexpected: the symbiosis between Victoria Police remembrance and ‘counter narratives’ relating to bushranger Ned Kelly. The Kelly narrative is the main ‘oppositional discourse’ to policing history in Victoria, but it has a different intensity to what Mulcahy described between police and para-military elements in Northern Ireland. Kelly was of Irish descent, and to some extent anti-British, and references exist to a war between the police and the Kellys (Kenneally 1969, pp. 49, 83, 64), however there is no comparison to the extensive conflict known as ‘The Troubles’ in Northern Ireland. The Mansfield Police memorial (1880) was identified as the first memorial, and for years as the only significant memorial constructed to honour state police killed in the line of duty. The contested remembrance surrounding the death of these officers, Scanlon, Lonigan and Kennedy stimulates and propagates two divergent counter narratives. Through agency and counter-agency, the ongoing contestation inspires memorials, museum displays, tourist attractions, commemorative events, literature, and other products and activities prompting remembrance of both police and Kelly. Moreover, both police and Kelly narratives feed into elements of national identity found within the nation’s founding myths. The volunteer soldier, or in this case police officer, giving his or her life for the nation, part of the Digger Myth and Anzac Tradition and the rugged antiauthoritarian Bushman
Myth also part of the Digger Myth, enacted by Kelly’s criminal career. The Mansfield Police Memorial (1880), rededicated in 1993 and the later Stringybark Creek Police Memorial (2001), are maintained as active sites of memory partly because they are symbolic communications within a symbiosis generated by an ongoing ‘history war’.

The Mansfield Police Memorial is one of the first memorials to honour men who ‘fell’ in service to the state. In the 1880s, the people in the Australian colonies sought Australian heroes to define the emerging national character, for as yet the people had not been involved in any major conflicts, which might yield such heroic individuals. Dying for king and country was part of early social values in the colonies. Thus, the memorial is linked to early remembrance practices via listing names of the ‘fallen’ on public memorials. Death in service to the state remains a salient social value in Australia. So is military commemoration an important part of Australian national identity, and as this thesis shows, police remembrance has close connections to military remembrance. This close relationship is well demonstrated in Victoria with the emergence of special police, known as Shrine Guards who were specially recruited in 1934 to protect the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance, dedicated now to honouring all of the state’s war dead in all conflicts. The examination of these officers and their activities provided an important example of how police have appropriated some elements of military commemoration. Partaking in military commemorations, Shrine Guards, by osmosis, also feature in police annual remembrance ceremonies. The Shrine Guard example demonstrates how infusing police and military commemoration in Victoria was driven by the services’ affinity and in the case of the Shrine Guards, also by practical necessity. At times, the military has reciprocated, providing military personnel and equipment for police commemorative activities, such as the Pioneer Police Memorial dedication in 1972.

The dedication of the Pioneer Police Memorial formed part of 130th anniversary commemorations of policing in Victoria. This memorial was unusual in its honouring of the ‘service’ of the pioneer police. It was unlike other memorials discussed here, reactions to deaths of officers performing their duty. Both the Police Museum and the Pioneer Memorial exemplify early police memory work,
showing how public involvement in police remembrance is neither only reacting to tragic police deaths, nor resulting from annual commemorations. Indeed, the Police Museum was initially developed as a training aid but expanded to fulfil the public’s desire to examine firsthand the relics, equipment and paraphernalia associated with policing history. The museum later develops more orthodox narratives pertaining to police as a positive public force. The 130th anniversary activities also had an historical focus, where historical pageantry featured more than solemn ceremonies honouring the dead.

Before the adoption of NPRD and the construction of the Victoria Police Memorial, the Victoria Police Chapel of Remembrance (1988) was the main active site of memory for police. The Chapel housed names of police killed in the line of duty, their massed representation having been instigated by the agency of Chief Police Commissioner Mick Miller (1977-1987). Miller helped formalise police commemoration by initiating the creation of the first official ‘Deaths of Serving Members’ list, so that when NPRD emerged (1989), the Victoria Police Chapel formed the nucleus of the ceremonies until the later, more publically accessible, development of the state memorial. The Victoria Police Chapel and the Necropolis Police Memorial show there is more to police commemoration than building memorials in the landscape to remind the public of police risking their lives for the communities they serve. These sites of memory connect more to Winter’s (1995) concepts of memorialisation, relating to the grieving process and the sacredness of human lives. The Necropolis memorial particularly shows communities wish to remember and honour police deaths. Here the community demonstrated appreciation of Victoria Police through providing a memorial and private-contemplation space, demonstrating tangible measurements of police legitimacy.

The initial conception for the state’s police memorial was a direct result of the execution-style killing of two young officers, Senior-Constable Rodney Miller and Sergeant Gary Silk in 1998. The officers’ were farewelled with the largest police funerals yet seen in Victoria, involving some-8000 people, with all the trappings reminiscent of the public ‘spectacle’ Manning described in relation to police funerals (Manning 1997). The initial public push for this memorial
suggests what Winter (1995) and Bodnar (1991) would describe as significant ‘social agency’ from the ‘bottom up’. However, government (official) sources entirely funded the memorial. Decisions about what would commemorated, what form the memorial would take, and where it would be sited, were in the hands of the Victoria Police Chief Commissioner and Executive Command, and the official Memorial Committee. Thus, although the initial push for the memorial was from the ‘bottom up’, the locus of decision making about form and content came from the ‘top down’. This mix of influences is argued by Ashplant (2004) and Blair (2010) to be a more accurate description of the motivations for memorial construction. The memorial’s ‘official’ remembrance of the ‘sacred fallen’ symbolically communicates the connection and shared values between police and the Victorian community, the key component of police legitimacy. The final site of the memorial, near Government House also reinforced Victoria Police as central and essential to governing Victoria. Importantly, the military connections discussed throughout the thesis solidify with the choice of the memorial’s site, close to the heart of the state’s military commemorative precinct and centred on the Shrine of Remembrance. Locating the police memorial at this site also facilitated the public spectacle of police remembrance practices with the annual march traversing part of the same route taken by military processions on Anzac Day.

The ideal St Kilda Rd. site, initially suggested by Kennett, the State’s premier, was uncertain and opposed. The investigation into the state’s police memorial demonstrated the complexities of establishing memorials in public spaces where competition occurs from other ‘narratives of articulation’ and from other ideas about the aesthetics and utilisation of limited public space. The Memorial Committee’s records show it had its own internal debates and deliberations while seriously investigating a number of alternative sites. Resistance emerged from other ‘agents of articulation’, the National Trust and The Garden History Society transpired, disagreeing with both the site and the design. The Returned and Services League, which in many ways might be seen as the natural allies of police remembrance, expressed concerns of an intrusion into the state’s military commemorative space. Yet once the Memorial Committee had decided on the site and form they wanted, it was difficult to prevent them from fulfilling their aims.
They had an assemblage of significant supporting agencies such as Melbourne City Council, the state premier and other state government departments, and other police organisations.

The memorial’s form, an abstract monumental structure, was chosen from professional design submissions with some initial input from more ‘vernacular’ sources. Reminiscent of Stonehenge, with a façade suggesting solid stone construction, its form was emblematic of the strength, permanence and legitimacy of the state’s law and order governing structures and organisations. The design also accommodated the grieving. The openings, in the large curved wall forming the front of the memorial, are an artistic device allowing the sights and sounds of the city where police work, to flow in and out of the internal amphitheatre on which names of the sacred dead are engraved, where ceremonies are held, and at other times, where private contemplation occurs. Official speeches at the dedication in 2002, equated remembrance of fallen police with soldiers killed in battle with the common use of high-diction phrases (Fussell 1975) such as ‘ultimate sacrifice’. Few Victorians observed the public spectacle of the dedication ceremony. Nevertheless, for members of the Memorial Committee, the memorial effectively represents the symbolic connection between police and the community and the implied acknowledgement that police make sacrifices in the defence of law and order. Listing names of the dead reinforces this connection (Hass 1998; Sherman 1999; Winter 1995) as does the memorial’s structural design elements allowing, as they do, for the sounds and sights of the city, and the community, to penetrate the sacred space within (Hasell 2002). Annual rituals, irregular visits by surviving kin and colleagues, and promotion as a tourist attraction ensure the memorial remains an active site of remembrance.

Thus, the first Victoria Police memorial (1880) and the most recent (2002) transmit the same ‘symbolic communication’: that of service and of sacrifice to the community. Yet the state memorial and its message of service and sacrifice was not immune to the ‘counter narratives’ relating to the bushranger Ned Kelly. The Victoria Police Memorial was incorporated into the symbiosis by deliberate vandalism targeting the names of the officers killed at Stringy Bark Creek in
1879. In this case however, Victoria Police downplayed the vandalism, keeping it from the press, and the damage quietly repaired.

This thesis suggested the emergence of a state police memorial was not inevitable. Victoria Police, local and state governments did not plan to build such a memorial before the killing of Silk and Miller in 1998. Yet their deaths only somewhat account for the building of this memorial. Its emergence in the early twenty-first century was also facilitated by the culmination of conducive social and political circumstances. Police being deliberately killed in periods before Silk and Miller concerned the public and Victoria Police, but no call was made for a state police memorial. By the late 1990s, when Silk and Miller were killed, attitudes had changed, with outpourings of public grief that surprised many including Victoria Police. Several police deaths in the 1980s were seen as part of an on-going war between police and a criminal underworld. The perception of police initiating ‘revenge killings’ undermined police legitimacy (Fitzroy Legal Service & Centre 1992). However, unlike the Ned Kelly story, these later counter narratives, lacked endurance and attraction. To some degree however, the development of police commemorative practices in Victoria attempted the reassertion of a positive image of police, damaged during the 1980s. The political climate of the late 1990s benefitted memorial building, with both federal and state governments focusing on nation-building projects, including the National Police Memorial. Victoria Police legitimacy was enhanced through the construction of a state memorial to police who died on duty.

The research for this dissertation began with lofty goals of exploring all Australian well-known, and lesser known, police memorials. Instead this work initiates the first study of Australian police memorialisation with a focus on the Victorian experience. A broader study lies beyond the scope of this thesis. The other state police memorials in New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and Queensland are worthy of academic exploration in their own right, with opportunities to draw comparisons with the Victorian example. Further investigation into the multitude of other Australian police memorials is essential. These smaller memorials are localised constructions, or plaques, often honouring officers killed serving Australian rural and suburban communities.
Investigating the motivations, developments and possible contestations involved with local police memorials is also needed to complete the full story of Australian police remembrance. Police remembrance has largely focussed on lives lost. However, recent NPRD ceremonies overtly remembered officers who continue to suffer from physical and psychological injuries as a result of their service (Evans 2018). For the first time a wreath was laid in recognition of officers suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder at the Victoria Police Memorial on NPRD 2018 (Boseley 2018). Future research might focus on how police commemoration is used to raise public awareness of the ongoing suffering of injured personnel. This study of Victoria Police memorialisation, commemoration and remembrance provides a foundation for on-going collaborative investigation into Australian police remembrance.
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